APASP Task Force Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 3, 2017 | 10:00 a.m.-Noon | UC #330-331

In Attendance

Erik Johnston	Laurie Fisher	Paul Haber
Colin Henderson	Tom DeLuca	Jen Zellmer-Cuaresma
Stephanie Domitrovich	Steve Schwarze	Scott Whittenburg
Ona Renner-Fahey	Anisa Ricci (phone)	John DeBoer
Andrew Ware	Rebecca Power	Chris Fiore
Liz Putnam	Rozlyn Haley	Claudine Cellier
Nathan Lindsay	Kate Shanley	Hillary Stowell
Lucy France		

Approval of 7.27.17 Meeting Minutes

- The 7.27.17 meeting minutes were approved.

Metrics Sub-Committee

Action Item: Units of Analysis
Based on the feedback from the campus community, and additional conversation, the Metrics sub-committee put forward revised units of analysis for the academic programs and administrative services. The major change was the consolidation of some of the programs/units (per feedback from campus). The sub-committee brought forward the item to be voted on by the full task force with the understanding that members of the campus community can still submit corrections until August 10. The motion was approved.

Action Item: Modification to APASP Data Timeline
The sub-committee proposed the following changes to the timeline:
  - o Task Force votes on final Units of Analysis next week – August 3
  - o All reporting definitions are finalized by August 10
  - o All reports are updated and finalized by August 24
  - o Individual unit of analysis templates are finalized by September 1

The motion was approved.

Action Item: Proposal: SCH (Student Credit Hour) is any credit taught at the undergraduate or graduate level that can be assigned to an instructor within a major no matter the funding source
The definition of "student credit hour" has caused some concerns in the sub-committee meetings, so they decided to put forward an official definition for the APASP task force to use. The motion was approved.

Action Item: Proposal: Merge Administrative Services associated with majors/programs into the major/program report
The revised units of analysis voted on and approved earlier in the meeting contained these changes. This motion was also approved.

Information Item: Definitions
The sub-committee shared the following proposed definitions for discussion:
- Interdisciplinary Programs – programs that share student credit hours with other programs across campus where the productivity is primarily measured by contribution to general education and number of majors/minors/certificates
- Instructional FTE – the total time instructors (tenure-able, non-tenure-able, Teaching Assistants) in a program dedicate to instruction regardless of funding source.
- Teaching Assistant – graduate students paid to perform instruction or academic support for the program
- Research Assistant – graduate students paid to support faculty research in the program
- Will bring back a definition for Instructional FTE next week; working in collaboration with Criteria group

Information Item: additional discussion regarding problems with the instructional FTEs that we are getting feedback on in terms of department data
The sub-committee has been hearing some concerns from academic departments about how course release time and accounting for research and service when evaluating faculty productivity. The task force members agreed that these are important factors and that they need to be clear in communicating how they're producing the numbers and how they counted/weighted each of the components.

Consider possibly adding to data collected on all programs the following non-centralized data to be verified by Dean's:
The sub-committee proposed adding the following items to the list of data to be collected on all programs: number of faculty (TT,NTT, TAs, sabbatical/backfill), faculty teaching 1.0 load, CH/enrollment, # of TAs, # of RAs, and teaching reductions (chairs/directors). There was no discussion on the proposal.

Criteria Sub-Committee

Action Item: Rubric Scoring Scale
Steve Schwarze asked the Task Force members for their feedback via email about which scoring scale to use – 1-3 or 1-9. Over half of the Task Force voted for 1-9. This motion was to officially adopt the change. The motion was approved.

Action Item: Deans/Directors Input
The sub-committee put forward the following proposed memo to send to the Academic Deans and Administrative Services leaders:

> This questionnaire has been developed by the APASP Task Force to solicit input from Deans/Administrative Services leaders about the programs they oversee. The Task Force will consider this input after we have scored reports and developed preliminary rankings, prior to developing action recommendations.
>
> 1. Please explain what you see as **the most appropriate action recommendation for each program/unit in the category of "Modification Required"** (e.g., budget enhancement, program consolidation, reduction, moratorium, discontinuance) and identify the likely costs and savings that would result from such action.
>
> 2. What opportunities for integration or efficiency do you see across programs in your College? Identify the likely costs, savings, and revenue that would result from such action.
>
> 3. What opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration do you see across programs in your college or across colleges? Identify the likely costs, savings, and revenue that would result from such action.
>
> 4. Are there programs/units in the other ranking categories on which you would like to comment? Please explain what you see **as the most appropriate action recommendation for each program/unit** and identify the likely costs, savings, and revenue that would result from such action.

In terms of the timeline, adopting the motion would mean that the task force would delay the start of their review of the reports until receiving the feedback from the campus leaders. There was some discussion about how the input from the campus executives would impact the final report from the task force. There was also some discussion about the number of reports the executives would need to produce. A friendly amendment was introduced to change "each" to "those" in the first bullet point. The motion, including the amendment, was approved.

Information Item: Criteria/Metrics Revisions
The sub-committee asked the full task force to think more about how to assess the efficiency. It will be discussed further at the next sub-committee meeting and they would appreciate input from the full group in the meantime.

Information Item: Ranking Categories
The sub-committee put forward some possible revisions to the ranking categories, along with the following questions:
- o Is it beneficial to have more categories or fewer?
- o Is it beneficial to have categories that reflect scoring differences, or differences in action recommendation? We can envision situations where low-scoring programs might have very different recommendations. High-scoring programs may not be top candidates for additional funding.
- o Is it beneficial to rank academic programs with like programs (e.g. 2-yr, 4-yr, Masters, PhD, certificates)?
- o Ultimately—how will these categories be used for decision purposes?

It was decided that some of the task force members would meet with the President and Provost to discuss further.

Framework Sub-Committee

Action Item: Proposal re. Executive Input
The Framework sub-committee put forward the following motion:

> During the executive input period of the review process in early November, the following campus leaders will be asked to respond to the initial rankings of the programs and services in their respective areas. We will receive one report from each of the following campus executives.
>
> All academic deans:
> - Business Administration
> - Education and Human Sciences
> - Extended and Lifelong Learning
> - Forestry and Conservation
> - Health Professions and Biomedical Sciences
> - Honors
> - Humanities and Sciences
> - Journalism
> - Law
> - Visual and Performing Arts
>
> All sector-heads in collaboration with any members of their leadership teams they designate:
> - Academic Affairs
> - Administration and Finance

- Athletics
- Information Technology
- Integrated Communications
- President
- Research and Creative Scholarship
- Student Affairs and Enrollment Management

With the following rationale:

> Limiting our request for input to these campus executives will allow for comprehensive and appropriate scope of responses to inform our ranking and recommendations following the initial review period in October.

A concern was raised that the proposal would not allow the direct supervisor of some of the units to provide input. The motion was approved, with one "no" vote.

Information Item: Procedure for APASP Scoring
The sub-committee put together a proposed procedure for scoring and asked that the task force members review and share their feedback before the next meeting.

Information Item: Fall Review Considerations
The sub-committee edited their previous proposal regarding the fall review period and asked that the task force members review and share their feedback before the next meeting.

Information Item: APASP Terminology
There was no discussion about this item.

Communications Sub-Committee

Information Item: Timeline for website and the questions it brings up
The sub-committee put together a simplified timeline to post online and sent around for feedback from the task force. Several of the task force members suggested a little more detail (specific dates) to make it more helpful to report authors.

New Business
The task force members discussed how to manage the flow of information once the unit reports and executive reports are submitted. It was decided that the Framework sub-committee would discuss the topic further.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m. Meeting minutes prepared by Rebecca C. Power, Assistant to the President.