APASP Task Force Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 29, 2017 | 8:00-10:00 a.m. | UC #330-331

In Attendance

Beverly Edmond (phone)	Liz Putnam	Andrew Ware
Laurie Fisher	Erik Johnston	Chase Greenfield
Stephanie Domitrovich	Tom DeLuca	Ona Renner-Fahey
John DeBoer	Chris Fiore	Nathan Lindsay
Rebecca Power	Rozlyn Haley	Jen Zellmer-Cuaresma
Braden Fitzgerald	Scott Whittenburg	Lucy France
Dawn Ressel	Mike Reid	Hillary Stowell

Approval of 6.22.17 Meeting Minutes
The meeting minutes were approved.

Metrics Sub-Committee

Information Items
Andrew Ware requested that the Task Force members review the drafts of the units of analysis for the academic programs and administrative services and provide feedback to the sub-committee by the end of the week.

Action Item: Proposal to review only programs with at least 4 years of data
Andrew Ware reported that the sub-committee has been working closely with Dawn Ressel and the DATA Office to finalize the list of programs. Given the current size of the list (approximately 500, including both academic and administrative), the sub-committee wanted to find a way to either modify or prioritize the review process. Based on their conversation, they put forward the following motion:

> "All units of analysis that have less than four years of data (i.e., those programs, units or centers that have been in existence for three years or less) be exempt from APASP review."

The motion was based on the following rationale:

> "We will not have the data to accurately analyze these new programs. When we suggest an ongoing prioritization process, these programs will be examined

in the next review process. As a task force we might want to express a concern over the large number of new programs during a time of shrinking enrollment."

After some discussion, it became clear that the Task Force was not ready to vote on the motion. Several members expressed their concerns with the idea of exempting some programs, while others expressed concerns about the lack of data the new programs would have. It was decided that the sub-committee would discuss the topic further at their next meeting and then bring forward a new motion for the Task Force to consider.

Action Item: Proposal to review programs in two waves
Andrew Ware reported that this proposal also came out of the sub-committee's conversation about ways to modify/prioritize the review process. Based on their conversation, they put forward the following motion:

> "All Administrative Services and Academic Programs will be asked to respond to the appropriate survey but our analysis in the fall will begin with units that receive resources from the General Fund. All other programs will be evaluated as time permits with some of these possibly being evaluated in the spring."

The motion was based on the following rationale:

> "Our draft list of units of analysis has a total of well over 500 hundred units (approximately 580). Reviewing these in a three-week period would be unfeasible. Choosing to focus on those units that receive General Fund resources will remove a hundred or more units from this list and will make finishing the review in three weeks possible."

The discussion ranged from task force members being supportive of the motion because it will create a more reasonable workload, while others expressed concerns about not taking a holistic view of the campus and the possible impacts of that on the final report. There was also concern about the sentence "All other programs will be evaluated as time permits with some of these possibly being evaluated in the spring" as several members felt that it was too ambiguous. John DeBoer put forward a motion to replace the sentence with "All other units will be evaluated in phase two." The motion to approve the revised statement was passed.

Criteria Sub-Committee

Action Item: Scoring Rubric – Academic Programs
Tom DeLuca introduced the document and turned it over to the task force members for conversation and questions. The conversation on this item was primarily focused on the efficiency criterion. Some members mentioned that it was difficult to connect efficiency to budget practices given the way the budget allocation system is structured on campus. Other members also voiced the opinion that they felt that the

quality criterion should be weighted more heavily. No amendments were proposed. Hillary Stowell called for a vote on the item and it was passed.

Framework Sub-Committee

Information Item: Pilot Process Update
John DeBoer is working with the folks who volunteered to serve as "super trainers". They will be responsible for training the authors of the unit reports. The trainers are planning to attend the next task force meeting.

Information Item: Definition of Terms
John DeBoer asked the task force members to review the current draft and make edits as appropriate before next week's meeting.

Communications Sub-Committee

Information Item: Communications Update
Jennifer Zellmer-Cuaresma reported that Dawn Ressel is working on a message to send to campus on July 11th. It was also decided that there would be a campus communication next week as the timeline dictates that several items are due to be shared with campus on June 30th. It was decided to wait until later next week because of the holiday.

One of the task force members brought up the fact that there are no volunteers from administrative service units on the list for the pilot project and asked the communications group if they had any ideas for outreach to these areas. It was suggested that the group work directly with the Vice Presidents to get the information out.

New Business

Online submission mechanism for reports
The Criteria sub-committee is working to develop an electronic submission and tracking process but is still working through the details. They will likely use a combination of campus software systems including Qualtrics and UApprove.

Timeline check-in
The group went through the bulleted list for June to make sure that all items are on track. The majority are on time and specific follow-ups were assigned for the ones that are taking longer than anticipated.

APASP Task Force develops: • Weights and formulas to be used • Categories of rankings and associated actions • Rubric to be used in review process for ranking by APASP Task Force • Template for use by programs/services to prepare assessment reports • Guidance for units to use in completing reports and or in reviewing of reports • Potential metrics, criteria, and units of analysis • Key operational definitions • List of all programs and services to be reviewed	June 1 – 30, 2017
Institutional Research produces *pre-FY17* data sets associated with metrics to be sent out to program/service heads for feedback on data and list.	June 1 – July 31, 2017

Open Discussion

One of the task force members asked about the status of the ongoing conversation about the role of the Academic Deans in the process. John DeBoer indicated that it was being discussed by the Framework sub-committee and that he'd been in contact with the Deans as well.

There were two corrections to the minutes for the June 22nd meeting. The changes will be made before the minutes are posted online.

- Under 3. Scoring Rubric – Administrative, "All in favor, no opposed – criteria for academic programs approved" needs to be changed to "All in favor, no opposed – criteria for administrative services approved"
- Under Framework sub-committee item: APASP TF Report Review Process, "All in favor, no opposed – criteria for academic programs approved" needs to be changed to "All in favor, no opposed – APASP Task Force Report Review Process approved"

The meeting adjourned at 9:39 a.m. Meeting minutes prepared by Rebecca C. Power, Assistant to the President.