Planning for Distinction  
Instructional Program Task Group  
Meeting Notes  
January 25, 2013

Note - three observers were present.

1) **Review and approve meeting notes from Jan. 18, 2013 meeting**
   a. Top of page 2: strike the sentence referencing fairness as that does not reflect the idea behind the group’s comments.
   b. **Notes from 1/18/13 were accepted.**

2) **Report from subcommittee on Potential (Opportunity Analysis) criterion**
   a. (see PowerPoint presentation for details)
   b. The focus of this criterion is on what programs could do with additional resources and what evidence would demonstrate that potential.
   c. There was discussion about keeping this criterion focused on the future and that departments can use other criteria to describe the past and present.
   d. Members of the task group were reminded that criteria still needed to be weighed and that categories for placement of programs still need to be established.

3) **Updates from subcommittees**
   a. Criteria 1: Alignment with Strategic Commitments and ILOs
      i. Two questions that the narrative should provide:
         1. Describe the activities.
         2. Provide evidence that those activities are useful.
      ii. There was discussion about possible scoring rubrics.
      iii. Members of the task group will assist with explaining the report templates and the criteria to department colleagues so they understand clearly the objectives of the task group.
         1. Report writers will be encouraged to review the entire report before they start writing their responses.
   b. Criteria #2: Internal and External Demand
      i. There was discussion about external demand and how that might be measured and whether the data could apply to all departments.
      ii. One task group member has done some preliminary analysis using federal and state employment demand information.
         1. There was agreement to continue to explore this potential source of demand data and provide it to the departments before they start completing the report template.
iii. There was discussion about whether internal and external demand criterion is combined.
   1. There was further discussion about weighting these two factors, which might justify separating them.

c. Criteria #3 – Revenue, Cost, Efficiency
   i. The subcommittee members described how the majority (generally 80%) of a program cost is associated with faculty salaries, which will vary across departments.
   ii. It was noted that cost is not a direct reflection on efficiency and efficiency should consider both inputs and outputs.
   iii. This criterion won’t be useful unless it can be compared across programs so the group is looking for a mechanism to do that, perhaps focusing on dollars, WTUs, etc.
   iv. Finally the subcommittee mentioned that it is important to not let costs/salaries overshadow other qualities of the department.

d. Criteria #4 – Program Quality
   i. The subcommittee divided quality into three main categories: faculty, curriculum, students.
   ii. They identified a couple of issues associated with this criterion:
      1. How do you represent qualitative issues in quantitative terms?
      2. Internal weighting is potentially important.

e. There was discussion about getting some feedback on the criteria/template from outside the task group. Members were reminded that the consultants had suggested doing pilot tests, and that the Steering Committee will formally solicit comments from the campus once the criteria are finalized.

4) Update on programs list
   a. Vice Chair Mangold continues to work with the deans and associate deans to refine the list of programs from each college, resulting in a reduction in the number of programs.
   b. Location of the review of academic department offices is still an outstanding issue with the SPTG and the IPTG. Department offices fits the definition of a program established by the SPTG but not the IPTG. Those who have comments on this topic should send those to the chairs.
   c. Edited materials will be sent to the task group with the updated numbers.

5) Assessment of criteria
   a. There was general discussion about the criteria as a whole and how the task group will approach reviewing the reports, with acknowledgment that not every program will be able to be fully responsive to every criteria.
However, the task group will look at the criteria in toto not in isolation. Everyone agreed that programs should be given ample opportunity for open-ended comment.

b. A question was raised about whether there will be a similar scoring rubric for each criterion, which will be discussed further with the task group.

6) **Other**

a. Members of the group were informed about the creation of a blog on the PFD effort. A question was raised about whether a response from the task group should be formulated but time did not permit discussion of this question. It will be discussed at the next meeting.

b. A revised program definition was presented to the group: "A program is defined as an academic activity that is required for degrees, credentials or certificates."