MINUTES OF DEANS’ GROUP
November 12, 2003

Attendees: Ron Henry, Chair
              Adamson, Fritz, Griffith, Hurt, Kelley, Moore (B), Moore (M), Rupp

Minutes: 10/15 & 10/22/03 approved.

Henry: Budget considerations FY 04 (handout attached). The handout prepared by Jerry Ratcliffe, has not yet gone to FACP. Comparing revenue vs. expenditures we anticipate a $6.1M budget shortfall. The sources identified to cover the shortfall will balance the budget with a $482K surplus.

Rupp: Has there been discussion on changing the plateau?

RJH: There has been some discussion to do so in President’s group, but no formal proposal and no recognition by the Chancellor’s staff for making a change.

RJH: Draft 5 of programs, centers, and activities doc. Advised of edits to draft 3 (no draft 4). Under centrality the deans will detail program clusters that might cut across traditional colleges.

Adamson: Last sentence in “evaluation of criteria for activities,” replace transparency with efficiency and effectiveness. PR and good stewardship of activities we certainly want to display.

RJH: Under “timeline for process” - the 12/10 timeline will not work for the deans. We will amend to 12/19.

Adamson: When FACP teams make recommendations on potential budget decreases to programs and centers in terms of colleges, we would like to know what aspect of the college budget they will be looking at. If programs and centers are to be evaluated on all 4 variables, why combine sets of 2 variables and add up the ratings? Why not give ratings on all 4 variables to the same committee?

RJH: Quality and centrality are the two main drivers. If a program is central, but not of higher quality it will be looked at secondarily for viability. If there are not many students in a high quality program, we will have to look at how strong we want to make that program.

Fritz: If the program clusters are to be developed from the areas of focus RFP’s, how do we identify quality and centrality of programs for investment before the clusters are identified?

RJH: Areas in which we will invest in the future are research and graduate programs. We will also look at what signature undergraduate programs we may want to invest in, and at programs that are of major thrust and central to the university.

Adamson: There are 5-6 clusters mentioned in the Strategic Plan. I can conceive of more than 1 RFP to link them.

Fritz: Was there a reason for not listing the program clusters before putting out the RFP?

RJH: I didn’t want to limit faculty input.

Adamson: Our standard methodology for ranking is to use % not figure scores. If the goal is to review a certain percentage of programs, I don’t see why we are to rate in figures.

RJH: Viability: we will look at whether there are enough students in programs; whether there is student interaction and connectivity within programs; and, whether there is a pool of good students we could attract if we had the resources. We will also look at programs to determine whether we could better
Kelley: Will centers on soft money be examined?

RJH: If a center doesn’t fit the mission of the college/university we will look at whether we want to continue it. There are still expenses involved in supporting centers even if they are on soft money.

Adamson: What about the centers and institutes under the Provost?

RJH: Those the Deans will evaluate.

Hurt: Will factors looked at under viability include library costs? If it would be useful to you, we do know which programs are expensive to support.

RJH: We will be looking at program costs versus viability.

If we combine the 4 areas of evaluation we wouldn’t have the same amount of faculty input into all areas. Faculty can evaluate quality and centrality of programs, while comparative value and viability would be evaluated by the administration.

Adamson: Humanities has some programs that want to produce a small number of high quality students – these programs would rate low on viability, but high in quality.

RJH: The issue is the same with doctoral programs. The university wants to produce more doctorates so we will look at where best to invest resources. We will look at both programs already producing the numbers, and how we can invest to improve others. The deans will rate the programs to assure normalization across departments.

Adamson: As we rank programs, what will the boundary be between a rating of high and a rating of medium? What is the distinction? We need a formula to work with.

B. Moore: Isn’t the rating what the deans will determine and use to rank their programs? It is important that each college has consistent rankings of programs within their college.

Fritz: If faculty are used to peer review programs and there is a lot of faculty input, the rankings would not be consistent.

M. Moore: How will you evaluate the viability of centers and institutes – credit hour production?

RJH: They will be rated on quality and comparative advantage.

Adamson: Can we use another process for identifying strong programs that may need improvement other than what we are using for programs that need review?

RJH: Rather than H (1), M (2), L (3) you may want to identify programs that are L or ML on all 4 variables using a 2.5 or 3 pt scale, that might be more manageable. Programs in which you wouldn’t invest you can take off the table, leaving those in which you want to invest.

B. Moore: If a program is rated low on any one of the variable, then it will be rated on all four variables?

RJH: That will be the process.

Rupp: Do we have to rate all programs, bachelors, masters, PhD’s?

RJH: Yes. We will break out degree programs where there are different viabilities.

RJH: Program clusters: these you can identify if you have definition of program clusters within your colleges. Some will cut across disciplines. For example, business degrees cut across 6 departments.
Therefore the college has identified six program clusters.

M. Moore: Work from the set of your Strategic Plan. If you have programs that don’t fit within it then they should become part of your evaluation.

Enrollment

Fritz: It has been evidenced that retention increases if students register before the end of their current semester. For next fall students will register in May. Registration before semester break also spreads the workload in the Registrar’s office.

B. Moore: There will be costs to us if we have to have curricular changes made early in spring for fall semester. That will put an extra load on staff.

Fritz: The change is being made for the following fall when we anticipate we will be in a more stabilized environment.