



## **APASP Task Force Meeting Notes**

Thursday, July 13, 2017 | 10:00 a.m.-Noon | UC #330-331

### **In Attendance**

Beverly Edmond (phone)  
Hillary Stowell  
Andrew Ware  
Steve Schwarze (phone)  
Braden Fitzgerald  
John DeBoer  
Stephanie Domitrovich

Erik Johnston  
Jen Zellmer-Cuaresma  
Chris Fiore  
Chase Greenfield  
Paul Haber  
Dawn Ressel  
Anisa Ricci (phone)

Rozlyn Haley  
Liz Putnam  
Laurie Fisher  
Tom DeLuca  
Lucy France  
Nathan Lindsay

### **MEETING AGENDA**

#### **Approval of 7.6.17 Meeting Minutes**

The meeting minutes were approved.

#### **Communications Sub-Committee**

##### **Campus Updates**

Dawn Ressel is writing the next update, which will go out this week. Tom DeLuca will write the update for the week of July 17. Scott Whittenburg will write the update for the week of July 24.

##### **Responding to Campus Feedback**

Tom DeLuca and Steve Schwarze are responding to criteria feedback. Andrew Ware and Christine Fiore are responding to metrics feedback. John DeBoer is responding to framework feedback.

There is some concern that there are too many ways to respond on the APASP website and we need to streamline. A suggestion was made to add a header at the top of the website for just feedback. The Communications sub-committee will work on this.

##### **Units of Analysis**

The units of analysis feedback deadline was extended to July 21. Dawn will send out a reminder on Friday.

## **Framework Sub-Committee**

### **Pilot**

The sub-committee met yesterday and talked about how to review the pilot.

### **Open Meeting Laws**

John Deboer, Nathan Lindsay, Cody Meixner and Lucy France met to talk about open meeting laws. Lucy will present at a future meeting on how to meet these standards.

## **Metrics Sub-Committee**

### **Faculty and Units of Analysis**

The question was raised about programs will report on faculty FTE, when faculty are hired to teach across multiple programs. The metrics sub-committee decided the data would not go down to the program level. Each program report within a department will have the same FTE for faculty and staff, regardless of size or degrees offered.

Dawn Ressel raised this question with Johann. Johann advised going down to the program level and dividing FTE. She provided Dawn with the formula that they have used in the past. The taskforce discussed the item and agreed that a decision must be made by July 24. All task force members are invited to the bi-weekly data meetings to review the FTE data for themselves.

### **Research Productivity**

The question was raised, how do we align research productivity with programs? Faculty often do research in areas that are not relevant to their program. Dickeson evaluates research as a separate program. If research were evaluated separately, the taskforce would not be able to connect research productivity with workload.

### **Administrative Services and Units of Analysis**

When reviewing units of analysis feedback, the sub-committee is breaking things up by function. Some units with many different functions have advocated for submitting one report. The sub-committee advised against this because it will not give the taskforce the opportunity to scrutinize a unit and provide valuable feedback to the President. The units of analysis will be added to the Finalized Documents Box folder so everyone can review them.

## **Criteria Sub-Committee**

### **Action Item: New ranking categories for programs with less than 4 years of data**

Motion passes to use the new ranking categories for programs/units with less than 4 years of data.

### **Program and Services Rubric for New Programs**

The question was raised as to whether we need a different rubric for new programs/services and should the weights be changed. A concern was raised about the word “reasonable” in the rubric as it could inject a significant level of objectivity to the review. A suggestion was made to keep the same rubric as non-new programs, but add a caveat for new programs. It was sent back to the committee for more work with a plan to vote on it at the next meeting.

### **Criteria Sub-Committee**

#### **Author Trainings**

John DeBoer gave an update on the author trainings, with additional notes sent to the committee last night and in the Box folder. There was good attendance at the trainings. They were treated more like working groups with good discussion throughout the trainings. The super trainers view themselves as serving as a conduit for feedback to the taskforce. This method removes the possibility of undue influence or collusion between the department and the taskforce.

#### **Open Discussion**

In two weeks, the taskforce will need to review the pilot group’s submissions. During weekly sub-committee meetings, members should be discussing the pilots.

The meeting adjourned after open discussion. Meeting minutes prepared by Hillary Stowell, Director of Academic Fiscal Affairs.