Planning for Distinction
Instructional Program Task Group
Meeting Notes
May 10, 2013

4. Review and approve meeting notes from May 3, 2013 meeting

2. Responses to Campus Feedback
   a. Any substantive changes made to criteria will require a vote of the group.
   b. Criterion #1 – Alignment with ILOs and SSCs
      i. No changes were presented by the subcommittee.
      ii. There was discussion last week about combining criterion #1 with
          #3 and putting ILO alignment and assessment together which
          would leave SSCs in criteria #1 alone.
      iii. **There was a motion to keep the criteria weighting the same as
           before but rearrange the criteria order: quality would be moved to be first position, followed by ILOs and SSCs. The motion did not pass.**
   c. Criterion #2 – Demand
      i. The comment the group received had to do with weighting within
         the criteria. (see item discussion below)
   d. Criterion #3 – Program Quality
      i. There was discussion about how many quarters of student
         evaluation data was available, and what data the department chairs
         have received. This discussion will be put on hold until it is
         determined what data will be available and when.
      ii. There was a section added (5b) for programs to comment on
          professional achievement contributions by IT and FERPs. They
          would be given 50 words to do this.
      iii. **There was a motion to increase the word limit for student success (#14) from 100 words to 150 words, which was passed.**
      iv. There was a recommendation that #13 be replaced with the annual
          report as an attachment.
             1. There was debate as to what CAPR wanted as far as using
                this template for the annual report.
             2. The group prefers not to allow attaching other documents to
                the report and plans to leave the maximum number of words
                at 150.
   e. Criterion #4 – Cost and Productivity
      i. There were no comments from the campus community regarding
         this criterion.
      ii. An issue regarding the use of SFR was presented. The problem is
          a mathematical one when comparing programs with a small base to
          those with a large base. Small increases on the small base inflate
the numbers giving an advantage to small programs when compared to the systemwide average. An alternative approach would be to use a benchmark based upon the mode of instruction that the Provost has developed. That would compare lecture to lecture across programs rather than the systemwide SFR. There was much discussion but no support for using this approach.

iii. In lieu of the benchmark SFR, there was a proposal to use the actual SFR for each program rather than percentage. **There was a motion to use actual SFR itself in addition to the system comparison, which was not passed.**

iv. There was a brief discussion for the rubric 1A to use the word “variance.” A word change will be made.

f. **Criterion #5 – Unique Issues**
   i. There was a comment to eliminate criterion #5 which is not recommended by the subcommittee.
   ii. The subcommittee does not recommend any changes based on the comments received.

3. **Weighting of Questions Within Each Criterion**
   a. **Criterion #2 – Demand**
      i. The demand criterion was given 25% of the overall score. The subcommittee had varying opinions about how to divide up that 25%.
         1. Option 1: internal and external demand should get 12.5% each.
         2. Option 2: Each question within demand should be weighted equally. There are 3 internal demand criteria and 1 external demand criteria which yields a weighting of 75% internal and 25% external.
         3. A third proposal was presented during the discussion whereby programs would be given a choice of three weighting profiles. One option would be geared toward programs with higher external demand, one would be for programs with higher internal demand and one would have them be equal. Programs would select the option that most clearly represents them.
         4. This discussion and vote will be held next week after the sub-committee comes up with some specific choices.

4. Other
   a. The Instructional Task Group will not meet on the May 24.