

**President's College-Wide Advisory Committee on Academic Planning
Meeting Minutes
9.20.10**

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

The meeting was called to order at 11:08 a.m. in the Martin Luther King Room, Campus Center.

Recorder's note: some points have been shifted and consolidated to facilitate continuity in reading.

Chair's Report

The committee is still awaiting the appointment of a replacement for Michelle Sweeney. The union issued a call for two anticipated sabbatical vacancies in spring 2011.

Planning Process

Chair Fregeau referred to the "Academic Planning Process 2009-2011 (Revised 9/16/2010).

He called attention to the following items and dates:

- Advisory Committee provides comments on preliminary data analysis report to Departments (by 10/4/10)
- MSCA Executive Committee appoints faculty to serve as Faculty Review Team members (by 10/18/10).
- Advisory Committee Chair assigns faculty to Faculty Review Teams (by 10/27/10)

Departmental Review Teams

The Salem Chapter/MSCA issued a call for 60 tenured unit members to serve on the Faculty Review Teams.

The teams will have 3 members: 2 unit members from outside the department and 1 unit member nominated by the department.

Ideally, this person will have read the departmental report as it is being written and can speak with authority on the report and activities of the department.

Fregeau is advising departments to assemble a list of tenured faculty, but this is not a requirement.

A department chair could serve on the review committee, presumably if he/she is not the author of the report.

It is not clear if a member of the President's Advisory Committee is eligible to serve on the departmental review committee.

It was agreed that the Advisory Committee will assign faculty to the review committees.

Fregeau has asked each department to designate a "point person" to be the contact person for the Advisory Committee.

Indicator Reports

Fregeau has received all department indicator reports. The reports reflect the charge given to department chairs in part 6 of the 12.19.09 document "Format and Guidelines for Departmental Reports."

Amie Goodwin has made available to chairs APR data, and that Karen Sayles is available to assist chairs retrieve data from the Z drive.

Fregeau distributed disks containing all but 6 of the indicator reports. He called members' attentions to reports from Sociology, Chemistry/Physics, and Philosophy. These exemplify the varied nature of reports.

Fregeau also distributed a checklist he made to ascertain if all of the data asked for in the committee's review criteria were contained in the indicator reports.

He views the Advisory Committee's role in the indicator reports, not as assessors, but as reviewers. He envisions the committee asking:

- Are the indicator reports complete?
- Is material presented in a clear, organized fashion?
- Was the information provided important?

It is important that departments receive feedback on the indicator reports since they form the "back bone" of the final departmental reports.

Due to the desire of the committee to meet the October 4 deadline for providing feedback to chairs on the indicator reports, the committee agreed to send comments to Mark Fregeau by the morning of Friday, October 1. Mark will send the names of two departments to each person on the committee, inviting comments. Mark's scrutiny of each department will provide a

second review of each indicator report. Mark will provide his template for comments for members to use, or not, as they prefer.

Discussion of indicator reports

Committee member: Can we ask departments to follow a certain format?

Chair: We might provide guidelines, but have to consider that departments vary widely.

Question: When does this Committee help departments with fulfilling our criteria?

Chair: Each department will have a point person who will be in touch with us with questions.

Committee member: Is it possible to recommend to departments that they format reports in accordance with the review criteria?

Chair: Departments will receive feedback on the indicator reports. There will be a dialog with the contact person. If a department wants guidelines on the format at the point, it will be given. Comments will be qualitative.

Committee member: Has the Provost seen the indicator reports?

Chair: Five department chairs sent them to the Provost, but were not required to.

Committee member: If the Advisory Committee notices that a department is missing any data asked for in our criteria [and not just item 6 of the "Format and Guidelines for Departmental Reports"], we will tell them to put it in?

Chair: Yes, the indicator reports serve as a primer for the larger departmental report.

Committee member: Did any departments notice any discrepancies in the data they had on hand and that on the Z drive?

Chair: Yes, and they were referred to appropriate persons.

Committee member: Are we staying with the same review period originally asked for?

Chair: Yes, the dates of data are shown in Item 6 of "Format and Guidelines for Departmental Reports."

Guidelines for Departmental Review Teams

The Advisory Committee must develop guidelines for the departmental review teams. Mark Fregeau expected to provide directions to the teams once they were assembled.

He observed that it would be helpful for the Advisory Committee to have a standardized format for the reports. This would expedite our review in spring 2011.

Further, the departmental review teams will be the "last line of evaluation" before the reports come to the Advisory Committee. It is important for us to support the improvement of departmental reports before they come to us. For instance, we could ask the review teams to

critique reports against the review criteria, and get back to the departments with suggestions and comments.

Committee member: Are the departmental reports the same as the indicator reports submitted last May?

Chair: No. the departmental report is expected to be an expansion.

President's Advisory Committee Final Report

Committee member: What will go into our Final Report?

Chair: We have no guidelines for our final report. There is only a 3 week time frame in which to write the report. These are the action dates in the revised timetable:

- Departmental Reports, Faculty Review team comments and Departmental Responses (if written) are posted to Navigator (by 2/7/11)
- Advisory Committee considers all comments and department responses and writes its DRAFT report (by 2/28/11)

The Advisory Committee is scheduled to hold a workshop for the Faculty Review Teams on November 1.

Committee member: We need to come up with guidelines for ourselves, not just the review teams.

Committee member: Should we look at reports submitted by other schools in their program reviews? Morehead State, for example, makes suggestions for setting up new departments.

Committee member: There will be down time for this committee. We have to get a handle on what will be done with the departmental reports. Would it make sense to look at other reports? We need to make recommendations.

Committee member: What does the Provost want in the report? What we ask faculty review teams to do is dependent on what the Provost wants.

Committee members: What is the the role of departmental review teams? Will they serve as reviewers or evaluators?

Chair: My understanding is that the departmental review teams would review the reports, not evaluate. This committee would be the evaluating body.

Committee member: If the departmental review teams are evaluating, the members should be tenured faculty. If they are reviewing and not evaluating, anyone can be appointed.

Committee member: Should we ask the Provost if our assumptions about the review teams are correct?

Chair: I have no problem asking the Provost or the President to come and talk to the committee about their expectations for the final report.

Committee members: Would you email the Provost to clarify if the reviewer function, rather than evaluator function for the departmental review teams is okay?

Committee member: Do we want the review teams to be non-evaluative? This would leave the Advisory Committee in the sole position of evaluator. Is this what we want?

Committee member: The literature shows that evaluations are more effective if input is spread across campuses. The responsibility is spread out.

Committee member: The original charge to the Advisory committee was for us to make recommendations on enhancement, reallocation of support, or reorganization. How can we do that if we do not know the budget figures?

Committee member: One way the Advisory committee might approach the report is to pose questions. For instance, we could ask departments: Is there a reason the enrollment is low? What can be done to address this? You have no one in this track. What do you propose to do about it? As a committee we can say resources need to be shifted to help departments address concerns. The budget is something the Administration does.

Chair: I don't see the role of the Advisory committee as making recommendations for shifts in the budget.

Committee member: If the departmental review teams do not evaluate, won't this put the onus on the Advisory committee to say a department should cut a concentration?

Committee members: We could focus on questions: How can you justify this program? We can't find the justification for this program. Can you help?

Committee member: And, if a department doesn't respond to questions, they are making the recommendations for us.

Committee member: So, the Advisory committee will function as a high-level collator and nothing else?

Committee member: Well, we would collate, look, and recommend. I think this is a path we can think about.

Committee member: There were examples in the original packet from the Provost of other program reviews.

Committee member: I'm a little hesitant to do this. I don't have the whole picture – the budget.

Committee member: I don't mind posing the questions, but I don't want to find the answers.

Committee member: Won't departments use their reports to self-evaluate and make recommendations for reducing programs?

Committee member: I think this has happened already. In the School of Education, we have a committee to review and evaluate, with rubrics. We look at what we've achieved, and what we haven't achieved. This led to the creation of three new departments. I think our colleagues need to do this for their departments. It would be presumptuous of us to suggest moving programs. We don't know what the budget is.

Chair: As a committee we can see all reports and see things that maybe even departments don't see. We may be able to make recommendations on linkages. Our "global" view of academic departments will enable us to see commonalities that individual departments might not be able to see.

Committee member: The tone of the report is important. Instead of harshly making recommendations, we should say things like: Have you considered? Are you working on? The report needs to look for commonalities.

Motions from the meeting:

Motion: It was moved and seconded that Mark Fregeau e-mail chairs recommending that they organize departmental reports according to the order of the latest review criteria.
The motion carried.

Actions from the meeting

- 1) Chair Mark Fregeau will email chairs with comments on the Indicator reports by October 4. He will include the suggestion that they organize material in the departmental reports in accordance with the review criteria.
- 2) Chair Mark Fregeau will talk with the Provost to clarify the role and responsibilities of the departmental team reports and the purpose of the Advisory Committee's final report. Fregeau will tell Arlene Greenstein what the Provost says. Arlene volunteered to draft instructions for departmental review committees. The Advisory committee will review these the next meeting.
- 3) Mark Fregeau will send each committee member the names of two departments. The members will review the Indicator reports, looking for their completeness in addressing

the review criteria. Committee members will get back to Mark by Friday morning with suggestions.

- 4) There is no meeting on Monday, October 4.
- 5) If the Provost's vision for the departmental reports is very different from that discussed by the committee, Mark will invite the Provost to our next meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m..

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Dennis
Recorder