

**PRESIDENT'S COLLEGE-WIDE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC
PLANNING**

Minutes of the May 18, 2011 meeting

Location: MH-405

Present: William Cornwell (Recorder), Mark Fregeau (Chair), Kristen Kuehnle, Raminder Luther, Michele Sweeney

Mark convened the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

Mark proposed asking the provost for an extension of the deadline for the committee's report:

1. Mark would tell the provost that the committee has worked hard and done a lot of work, but the committee cannot finish its work in May. Even if the committee finished the draft of the report this week or next week, which looks unlikely, there would not be time for the committee to get feedback from the community and make revisions to the report before it was sent to the provost. He wanted to ask for an extension to mid-September, which means that the committee would continue its work into early fall. Mark knows that the provost wanted to use the committee report as a basis for making recommendations to be submitted for governance, but the governance process already has shut down for the academic year, so she cannot forward any recommendations until the fall anyway. Mark said that the other advantage to waiting until the fall to release the draft of the report is that at the end of the academic year, people in the community are too busy to review the report; the committee would get better feedback in the fall. One committee member underlined the importance of getting comments from people in the community.
2. One committee member will be on sabbatical in the fall and wondered how that would affect the composition of the committee. Mark responded that most of the committee's work is already done, so he did not think that having an empty seat on the committee in the fall would be a problem. One committee member said that if it was necessary, MSCA could fill the vacant seat with someone, but the bother probably would not be worth it for a new person who would join the committee when its work was almost done and would not know what was going on.
3. One concern about requesting an extension is that the provost had wanted to use the committee's report when she made budgeting decisions for the next fiscal year that begins in July, but nothing can be done about that now. In any case, the provost this summer will have the departmental reports that were prepared for the committee, as well as the departmental reports that get submitted to deans this month.
4. A committee member noted that the committee has faced challenges to completing its work: It got its charge a semester late, and most of the original committee members, including the original recorder, are no longer on the committee, so the committee had to go over a lot of ground a second time.
5. One committee member suggested that the committee could hold a forum on Opening Day so that the committee can encourage community members to read and comment on the report that soon would be released. The committee was supposed to have faculty meetings but never did them. Another committee member noted that instead of faculty meetings, Mark gave updates at chairs meetings.

6. Mark asked whether committee members would be willing to meet during the summer for a stipend. Then the committee could finish the draft report during the summer so that community members could review it in the first couple of weeks of the fall semester.
 - a. A committee member liked the idea and observed that the university has done this process on the cheap by putting lots of people's time but almost no money into the academic planning process. This committee member observed that the committee has asked for very little from the university and thought that a request for summer stipends so that the committee could finish the draft report was reasonable.
 - b. Another committee member asked whether it would be a problem if some people could not meet during the summer and the entire committee was therefore not represented. Mark said that if everyone came prepared, one meeting might be all that is needed, and no committee of this size can get everybody in one place at one time even during the school year. In any case, committee members who could not make the summer meeting still could provide comments, and Mark thought that the majority of committee members probably could make a summer meeting.
7. All of the committee members present favored Mark's proposal, and he will send an e-mail to the other committee members to find out if they concur.

Mark wants a summary report on each department. Those reports can be used as the basis for the full committee report. He has created teams with two people each, and each team is responsible for developing the summary reports on certain departments. Ideally one person is from that or a cognate department. The second team member can be from an unrelated discipline, which can be helpful because that person will look at the department in a different way. Eight departments still haven't been assigned to committee members for summary reports because (a) Mark was waiting for some of the minutes to go out, given that the minutes have information that are useful for the summary reports, and (b) two or three reports per team are the maximum that can be assigned now without overloading the team. Those eight departments include Economics, Foreign Languages, Mathematics, Music, Political Science, Sociology, and Social Work. Mark is now assisting Louise Swiniarski with Education.

At the meeting, the following assignments for department reports were made:

1. Economics: Raminder Luther. Mark and Raminder have not yet heard from Edward Desmarais.
2. Nursing: Kristen Kuehnle and Arlene Greenstein.
3. Occupational Therapy: Jeramie Silveira and Kristen Kuehnle.
4. Psychology: Kristen Kuehnle and Arlene Greenstein.
5. Sport and Movement Science: Michele Sweeney and a second person to be named.
6. Theater and Speech Communications: William Cunningham and a second person to be named.

The committee discussed the content and format of the report:

1. One committee member said that a recommendation in the report should be that the administration develop criteria that are widely publicized about how resources (e.g., budgets and faculty lines) are allocated. The committee member has been chair for a long time but still does not know the criteria for how these decisions are made at the institution.
2. One committee member would like to see the report identify issues that affect many departments. Another committee member noted that the draft of the report now circulating discusses some themes such as the need for more space/facilities and faculty lines, and the report also should address "lessons learned." There also was agreement that the committee needed to review past minutes for ideas about what should be in the report. One committee member suggested that instead

of addressing the departments in the report alphabetically, presenting the departments by categories (e.g., human services, business, sciences, and humanities), because departments in the same area often face similar challenges (e.g., inadequate laboratory space for the sciences). Another member suggested that instead of (or in addition to) organizing the report by department that the report be organized by problem areas (e.g., inadequate facilities and need for more tenure-track lines). Decisions about how to organize the report are being postponed until after the departmental summary reports are completed.

3. One committee member suggested that the report note the net change in the number of flowsheets from various departmental recommendations, because the provost said that she would use that number as a metric for gauging the financial effect of the committee's recommendations. Another committee member said that we could say that as a result of the academic planning process, X number of flowsheets already has been eliminated and Y number of flowsheets is under consideration by departments for elimination. A third committee member said that it would be too difficult to identify what flowsheet changes were made as a result of the academic planning process, because some departments were planning to make these changes before the process began; nonetheless, the report could state that over the last few years departments have been eliminating or contemplating the elimination of flowsheets. Another complicating factor in reporting net flowsheet changes is that some changes are linked (e.g., Philosophy will eliminate six flow sheets only if it gets approval for a new philosophy major).

The chair announced that the minutes for 4/11/11 were approved electronically with 11 votes in favor and four abstentions.

The minutes for 4/25/11 and 5/2/11 still have not been approved, but some corrections to and votes regarding those minutes have been forwarded to the chair and/or recorder. The 4/25 minutes are being voted on as a whole, not by parts. So far there have been six votes in favor of the 4/25 minutes with three abstentions, and there have seven votes in favor of the 5/2 minutes with one abstention.

The committee adjourned at 11:00.

Respectfully submitted by William Cornwell, recorder.