Committee of Chairs
Minutes
October 28, 2004

Present: Paul Alberto, Dean Dabney, Marty Fraser, Charles Marvin, Richard Miller, Dave Pavesic, Cora Presley, George Pullman, George Rainbolt, Don Reitzes, Tim Renick, Debbie Rupp, P. C. Tai, and Laurie Tis.
Absent: Sam Cox, Bill Fritz, Hugh Hudson, Amy Lederberg, George Rainbolt, Rebecca Stout, and Carol Winkler.
Guest: Michelle Brattain

The meeting was called to order by the chair, Paul Alberto, at 12:16 p.m. The discussion centered on the proposals from APACE and the Deans Group regarding the process for academic program evaluation. There was much discussion on the data definitions and the route the data will take through the various reviewing bodies. It was agreed that the Deans’ proposal focused on the present budget crisis situation while the plan from APACE describes the process for the present circumstances and then evolves into policy for the university. It was suggested that the Executive Committee, rather than FACP, and the Deans Group conduct the discussions on the Provost’s recommendations for deactivating/downsizing of departments or other units. After these discussions, the recommendations would then go to FACP for financial considerations and the strategic planning committee for long range planning implications.

The point was made that the data from the Board of Regents regarding viability was missing under the Deans proposal. There was continued discussion on the criteria used for the program analysis. It was stated that the viability data from the BOR is open for interpretation.

The floor was opened for comments on the proposal from APACE. Paul Alberto suggested that a sentence be added to point 3 under “procedure”: “It is therefore the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils in their review that will ensure consistent applications of the evaluation indicators.” There was discussion of the term “expertise” under 2b. It was agreed that the chair of the department being reviewed would be consulted before the committee member with “expertise” is selected. The last sentence under 2c was edited for clarity.

Faculty Affairs has a subcommittee on “standby” to deal with the consequences of the budget cuts. The subcommittee is in place so that, if necessary, it can operational very quickly. The question was raised regarding the Faculty Affairs Committee’s role in this process. It was decided that after the Budget and APACE committees approve the final proposal, it will be sent to FAC for comment before it goes on to the Executive Committee.

Dr. Tai distributed last year’s subcommittee report on budget principles and priorities for comments by November 10. The subcommittee will meet on November 17 to draw up the principles and priorities for this year. Bad data that surfaces during this evaluation process will be routed to the Data Management Committee for correction.

Since there was no further business the meeting adjourned at 12:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Nell Stone
Committee assistant