APASP Task Force Meeting

Friday, October 20, 2017 | 2-3 p.m. | UC #225

In attendance: Scott Whittenburg, Ona Renner-Fahey, Stephanie Domitrovich, Braden Fitzgerald (phone), Andrew Ware, Rozlyn Haley, Chase Greenfield, Paul Haber, Erik Johnston, Nathan Lindsay, Dawn Ressel, Claudine Cellier, Beverly Edmond, Liz Putnam, Paul Haber, Anisa Ricci, Kate Shanley, Jen Zellmer-Cuaresma

MEETING MINUTES

1. Approval of 10.6.17 Meeting Minutes – approved as amended.

2. New Business: Forward 125 concerns about implementing decisions for Administrative Services – Braden Fitzgerald (2:05-2:10 p.m.)

Reviewers keep in mind identifying duplication of resources/inefficiencies when reviewing AS reports. Provost Edmond wanted to make sure the TF was aware of the concerns brought to Forward125.

3. Communication Update (Claudine Cellier) (2:10-2:30 p.m.)
    a. Information items:
        i. Planning ARSA-APASP TF on October 26

What does the TF want the ARSA committee to come away from this meeting understanding?

Educating ARSA on the process, challenges, some of the nuances. Needs to happen at a level that is broad, overarching, don't get into the weeds. Key parts of process, values, outcomes, why specific metrics, etc.

1. Welcoming Remarks - Beverly Edmond, Chair, APASP Task Force (2 mn)

2. The prioritization process at UM – APASP Task Force members (15 mn)
    • Framework - John DeBoer
    • Criteria - Steve Schwarze or Jen Zellmer-Cuaresma
    • Metrics - Andrew Ware

Snapshot on what framework, criteria and metrics are.

3. The report submission and review process – APASP Task Force members (20 mn)

- Description of review process, response mechanisms; prioritization and development of Task Force's recommendations to President and Cabinet – Liz Putnam
- Academic program report review discussion – John DeBoer
- Administrative service report review discussion – Jen Zellmer-Cuaresma

Review process must be contextualized in a way that connects back to framework, criteria, and metrics.

ARSA committee would prefer to focus meeting time on interaction between ARSA group and Task Force. Presenters don't just summarize documents that ARSA will have already read.

Change "demonstration" to "discussion". Provide nothing except a discussion, to demonstrate comprehensive process. What do reviewers look for, are questions answered, evidence provided, etc.

Build in time for clarifying questions from ARSA members after each segment… (5 mn after each block)

4. The importance of data in APASP and the challenge of data integrity/trust – Dawn Ressel & Andrew Ware (10 mn)

Highlight the importance of institutional research in informing decisions. Pull out lessons learned – program vs department, etc. Outline how we're going to change our practices based on what we learned.

5. Next steps in the prioritization process at UM – Sheila Stearns, President and Beverly Edmond, APASP Task Force Chair (10 mn)
- President and Cabinet decisions and implementation
- Addressing "things we've always done this way"
- Creating a continuous review process linked to Strategic Vision, Assessment, Institutional Accreditation

Claudine will get examples of "things we've always done this way" from John
On third point, just using the data points we've used for APASP in program reviews would bolster our efforts in this regard

6. Q&A for members of the ARSA Committee with members of APASP Task Force (30 mn)

7. Public comment (30 mn)

What is the role of Faculty Senate committees in the decisions the President and Cabinet make. There are already mechanisms in place to deal with what the Cabinet will recommend. This needs to be addressed when we do a controversial review.

This concern was discussed recently with President Stearns.

      i. External & internal communication update
     ii. Campus forums Nov 13 at 9 a.m. and Nov. 14 at 2 p.m. – Cancel these, schedule at a later date
    iii. Topic of next campus update - around Nov 8, preliminary categorization complete, posted, how to respond

MOTION: Amend framework timeline to match Review Schedule. APPROVED

    4. Review Process (Subcommittee Chairs, Dawn Ressel) (2:30-2:45 p.m.)
        a. Information Items
            i. Update on Review Process

Communication to reviewers must stress hard deadlines, provide reminder on what to do for programs that didn't submit (John DeBoer's email)