

APASP Task Force Meeting

Friday, April 14, 2017 | 2:00-4:00 p.m. | Gilkey Board Room (Room 103)

Attendance

Scott Whittenburg	Mike Reid
Paul Haber	Andrew Ware
Stephanie Domitrovich	Laurie Fisher
Colin Henderson	Liz Putnam
Steve Schwarze	Tom DeLuca
Chase Greenfield	Sam Forstag
Chris Fiore	Nathan Lindsay
Hillary Stowell	Rozlyn Haley
Dawn Ressel	Erik Johnston
Jen Zellmer-Cuaresma	Beverly Edmond
Anisa Ricci	Claudine Cellier
Rebecca Power	Chris Comer
Lucy France	John DeBoer
Camie Foos	

Welcome and Opening Remarks (Beverly Edmond)

- Overview of meeting/agenda

Budget for FY18 and FY19 (Mike Reid)

- Budget of \$143.5 million for FY 18 (2.15% reduction from FY 17)
- Even with a completely flat budget, we'd still need to take cuts because of rising costs, etc.
- Departmental impacts can be up to 12% cuts
- Actual impact for FY 18 = \$6 million deficit
- Questions/discussion:
 - Range available for FY 19? (Can get you a good range in late May/after BOR meeting & session; OCHE developing 6-year model to release over summer)
 - How will the \$6 million deficit be divided
 - Deficit goes up to \$9 million if we allot money for special initiatives

Metrics Developed for the University Budget Committee (Chris Comer)

- Resource: BMB Document Slides
- Every sector should have consistent metrics
- Formed with prioritization in mind
- Each sector has very different characteristics, making it difficult to collect the data
- Removed IT and Athletics from President's Office Sector

- Drill down within Academic Affairs to see differences between schools, colleges, and other departments/programs
- Student-centered
- 7 basic metrics

Review of DATA Office Metrics (Dawn Ressel)

- Resource: 2 spreadsheets of available data
- Some flexibility, just need some guidance (ex: how to measure six-year graduation rate)
- Second document – shorter list/areas with strongest data
- Primarily focused on academics so far
- No questions

Open Meeting Requirements (Lucy France)

- This meeting would be a “public meeting” but does not necessarily trigger the right to participate (which would include noticing meetings and calling for public comment)
- Public meeting – don’t have to notice or allow participation, but people can sit in back and observe
- Executive Session – would not apply to discussion of ranking of programs; only to discussion of specific personnel matters (only when the individual’s right to privacy outweighs the public’s right to know)
- Also applies to APASP subgroup meetings
- What counts as public notice? (48 hours or more notice, post agenda & location)

Ex-officio Membership (Beverly Edmond)

- Proposal to add ex-officio members to the Task Force:
 - Mike Reid, Dawn Ressel, Lucy France – content experts
 - Nathan Lindsay, Hillary Stowell, Claudine Cellier – staff
 - Kate Shanley – diversity advisor
 - Paula Short – communications advisor

Communication Process (Beverly Edmond)

- Heard a lot of questions about communication at the last meeting
- Did not include communications in list of subcommittee functions/assignments but wants to check with Task Force about adding, now or in the future
 - The group should be able to do this with their stakeholders
 - Value to having a consistent voice/method

Orientation Overview of Proposed APASP Process (Beverly Edmond)

- Resources: PowerPoint Slides and APASP Process Document

- TF Charge (primary and secondary)
- Conversation with Bob Dickeson earlier today; he will send some additional resources for our consideration/use
- Will likely use different criteria, metrics, and process for academic and administrative
- Two main anchors needed within categories for ranking (graphic on slide #16)
- Metric = data; Criteria = quality indicators
- One form developed for each administrative and academic programs; develop template for people to use when submitting their information
 - "Author training" from Dickeson to ensure consistency
- Yellow dates on timeline = some flexibility; Green dates = set deadlines
- Divide into working groups
- Questions/discussion:
 - Where does feedback from shared governance fit into the proposed timeline? (will work into the timeline; should be shared throughout by representatives on the committee)
 - Where does appeals process fit in the timeline? (Will be one of the working groups; timeline placement TBD)
 - Guidance from people who have done this before on how to present to campus and gather feedback? (lots of resources/examples available; would be valuable to bring in Dickeson for overview)
 - Faculty Senate has explicitly requested to review this over 2 meetings before it goes to BOR meeting on October 26th so they'll need to schedule special meetings
 - Mainly focused on Dickeson so far but wondering if you reviewed other models before choosing his? (yes; turns out that most reference back to Dickeson)

APASP Interface with Forward125 (Beverly Edmond)

- Oversight role of Forward125 Project Management Team

Strategic Plan (Scott Whittenburg & Brock Tessman)

- Use of strategic vision document is embedded in the procedural document
- Version 1.0 was released to campus yesterday and 2 sessions with campus held today – receiving lots of feedback
- SPCC members look forward to helping APASP
- Consider how to work systematic program review into normal University planning process

Next Steps and Adjourn (Beverly Edmond)

- Sign-up sheet for sub-committees (A, B, C); always free to send suggestions to other groups
- Items to share with campus before spring semester ends: framework, metrics/data, criteria

- What does the metrics sub-committee need to accomplish before the criterion sub-committee can start their work?
- One person from each sub-committee will be the chair, meaning spokesperson and organizer
- Share meeting dates/times/locations of all sub-committees to full group