

**President's College-Wide Advisory Committee on Academic Planning
Meeting Minutes
3.1.10**

Present: J. Cullen, W. Cunningham, N. DeChillo, N. Dennis, B. Doran, M. Fregeau, A. Greenstein, E. Haran, K. Kuehnle, L. Little, K. Mallick, K. Ratner, P. Sablock, M. Sweeney, L. Swiniarski.

Chair Mark Fregeau called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. in CC 131.

Transparency in meeting minutes

In the interest of transparency, committee members sought clarification in the minutes of the February 22, 2010 meeting. The committee will observe confidentiality, but will not be meeting in executive session. The minutes of the February 22 meeting will be revised to reflect this.

Chair's report

Chair Mark Fregeau reminded the committee that the next meeting will take place on March 8, 2010, from 11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. in the Harrington Building, Room 104.

Draft subcommittee report

Neil DeChillo distributed two documents: "Draft Program Criteria for Use by Advisory Committee" and "Draft Program Criteria for Use by Departments." While the two documents were largely the same, the department document included specific directions for the compilation of data.

DeChillo asked the committee to consider the following questions in their review of the documents: What is the purpose of the criteria? Who will be using the document: the Advisory Committee or academic departments? How will the documents be used: to tell the story of departments or to evaluate them?

Discussion of draft criteria documents

Concern: The documents do not ask departments to indicate quality. There need to be quality indicators.

Response: Are we not talking about outcomes? Quality is subjective. Evidence is objective.

Concern: We still need to define the definition of a "program." If we look at majors, minors, tracks, concentrations, and certificates, are we not comparing "apples and oranges"?

Responses:

The Provost asked us to look at all programs – including majors, minors, tracks, certificates, and concentrations.

Perhaps departments will decide how to define “programs”.

Perhaps the inclusion of an “Other” category could help clarify programs.

Concern:

Are these criteria adequate for the Provost’s needs? The “Format and Guidelines for Departmental Reports” is more detailed than these draft documents.

Response:

We need to align our criteria with the new criteria expected to be provided by the Provost to the chairs on March 3.

Concern:

It would be helpful if we fleshed out the criteria with questions to help chairs know what we are asking for.

Responses:

We don’t want too many questions.

We need to keep the same format as the Provost’s guidelines.

Concerns:

Why do we have two sets of criteria? Why not just have one?

Could we appoint another subcommittee to reconcile the two documents?

Further, how will these documents compare to the Provost’s revised guidelines?

Can we reconcile our documents with those of the Provost?

Response:

We need a single message.

Concern:

How can we reconcile the various criteria? Should we talk to the Provost and department chairs?

Concern:

We need to develop a rubric from the criteria to give to chairs.

Reconciliation subcommittee

Neil DeChillo, Keith Ratner, Louise Swiniarski, and Peter Sablock will continue their work on the draft subcommittee. This week, they will work to produce a “consensus document” that merges both drafts and reconciles the finished product with the Provost’s revised guidelines.

If there are major differences between our criteria and those of the Provost’s, we will have to negotiate differences.

Governance

It was noted that criteria produced by the Advisory Committee will be submitted to the All College Committee for review by the Academic Policies Committee, Curriculum Committee, Student Life Committee, and Library Media Development Committee.

Time frame

It may take until late May for the entire process of creating the criteria and shepherding them through governance to be completed. With this timetable, chairs could receive the criteria at the annual chairs' meeting in August 2010. Department reviews would not begin until Fall 2010.

This may necessitate extending the time frame originally outlined by the Provost. (See "Academic Planning Process 2009-2011" 11.06.09).

Concerns were expressed that delays would prevent the Advisory Committee from having input in the academic planning process. The President needs our analysis and input by the beginning of the 2012 budget year, in July 2011.

It was noted that the academic planning process was not just about cutting resources, but also about adding programs for the future. Our input will help the President make the best strategic decisions with expected budget constraints.

Academic planning guidelines distributed to chairs

It was noted that the Advisory Committee should have access to materials the Provost was distributing to chairs about academic planning. Recorder Nancy Dennis will work to retrieve relevant documents and distribute them to committee members.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m..

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Dennis
Recorder

