Planning for Distinction  
Instructional Program Task Group  
Meeting Notes  
March 15, 2013

1. Review and approve meeting notes from March 8, 2013 meeting  
a. The 3/8/13 notes were affirmed with no changes.

2. Review Program List  
a. The updated program list was presented, which includes identification of GE with each academic program as well as a comprehensive, university-wide review of the GE program; additionally there will be a separate library report. There remain some issues to be addressed with the GE program list.  
b. There was discussion about how to handle DCIE for both credit and non-credit programs.  
   i. There was general agreement that one report on all the noncredit programs was acceptable. There was discussion but not final agreement about whether all the credit courses could be addressed as one report, or whether there needed to be separate reports for each for-credit program in DCIE.

3. Review the program report template  
a. Criteria 3 – Program Quality  
   i. There were several suggestions for modification of language to the quality factors to ensure all disciplines would recognize/understand the request.  
   ii. There was discussion about the inclusion of FERP faculty and what contributions they might make to a department. It was agreed to remove FERP from the chart on lecturers and tenured/tenure-track faculty, but provide space for any comment a program might want to make about FERP faculty. Lack of any comment will not be counted against programs that do not provide any information on FERP faculty.  
   iii. There was discussion about using FTEF or headcount as the measure, and after voting the consensus was to use headcount.  
   iv. There was discussion about allowing programs to point to URLs with additional material in their responses and whether that violated the limit on the amount of information. No conclusion was reached.  
   v. There was discussion about the use and validity of the information from the recently completed survey of alumni. The response rate
was very low. The group favored using the alumni data only if there were more than 15 responses for a program. Programs may choose to comment on the responses or not.

b. Criteria 4 – Cost and Productivity
   i. Vice Chair Mangold told the group about her conversation with CFO Wells about available revenue and expenditure data. The result is that this criterion will consist of only two factors: SFR and CSR (instructional costs/FTES). The other three proposed data elements will be removed.
   ii. SFR will look at department SFR compared to the systemwide average over five years for undergraduates and graduates.
   iii. For CSR the department will look at faculty salaries divided by FTES over five years.
   iv. The name of the criterion is now “Cost and Productivity.”

c. As time had run out, discussion on the final criterion “Unique Issues and Future Directions” will be done next Friday. Discussion on rubrics will begin then as well.

* Two observers were present.