

To: Academic Planning Committee: J. Alam, D. Brown, E. Cobett, R. Crum, I. Khawaja, C. Psenicka, D. Robinson, T. Slawewski, G. Sutton, B. Yozwiak, B. Gillis, Greg Ball (c/o Student Government)

From: D. Brown 

Date: January 17, 1985

MINUTES

Fifth 1984-85 Meeting

January 15, 1985

Present: Alam, Brown, Cobett, Khawaja, Psenicka, Slawewski, Sutton

Absent: Crum (time conflict known to chairman when the meeting was scheduled), Robinson, Yozwiak (telephoned), Gillis, Ball.

A quorum was present.

1. A copy of the Third Draft Proposal has been sent by Dr. Gillis to the department chairpersons. It was agreed that Dr. Brown should send a memo to them asking for their reaction.
2. It was pointed out that approval of goals concerning graduate programs should be by the Graduate Council instead of the Senate. Procedure 5 needs a small revision to reflect this.
3. The main unfinished aspect of the proposal seems to be a document which would assist department chairpersons in preparing their first set of goals. Dr. Psenicka will prepare something for this for our next meeting (utilizing previous work of Dr. Khawaja and Dean Sutton).
4. The form of the proposed Senate motion to adopt this procedure and recommend its statement for inclusion in future Academic Master Plans was discussed briefly.
5. The timetable for goal setting, as in Third Draft Procedures 5, was discussed. In more detail, for the first year, it would look like this:

Sept. 85	-	March 86	Steps 1 - 4
March 86	-	June 86	Academic Planning Committee forms its recommendations.
Fall 86			Senate approval (or other action)

No changes were made in this.

Note: The date in Preface item 6 needs to be changed to "Fall 1986".

6. Next Meeting: Monday, January 28, 4:00
Engineering Conference Room

(As far as is known, all members are free at this time)

Business for the meeting:

1. Discuss any reactions received from department chairpersons.
2. Discuss Dr. Psenicka's proposal (item 3, above)
3. Next steps.

RECEIVED
JAN 10 1985
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

To: Academic Planning Committee, J. Alam, D. Brown, E. Coburn,
R. Crum, I. Khawaja, C. Psenicka, D. Robinson, T. Slaweki, C.
Sutton, B. Yozwiak, B. Gillis, Greg Ball (c/o Student Government)

From: D. Brown

Date: January 9, 1985

I. NEXT MEETING (based on responses sent to me of times not available): *There is no time everyone is available. There are a few times when all but one are available. I will try to rotate among these.*

TUESDAY, JAN 15, 4 PM Engrg. Conf. Rm.

II. I have revised the SECOND DRAFT PROPOSAL, Department-College Goal Setting according to the minutes of our December 3 meeting. The result is below.

Only some minor wording changes were made in the Preface.

While some minor wording changes were also made in the Procedures section, the main change concerns the role of the Senate and is contained in item 5. Old item 5 became new item 6. Old item 6 is new item 8. I added new item 7 dealing with another point which has not been discussed in the committee but which I do not expect to be controversial.

THIRD DRAFT PROPOSAL

Department-College Goal Setting

Preface

The purpose of the procedure described below is to provide a method for Academic Program Planning. The objective of the procedure is to establish for each department and college a list of ~~best~~ *goals* for its academic programs which have been arrived at in a through and responsive fashion by the faculty and the administration. These goals would be approved and recognized by both groups and would become the basis for further planning by each.

More specifically, the objectives for this academic goal setting procedure are as follows:

1. Academic program goals should be carefully, cooperatively, and rationally set.
2. All academic departments and colleges should have a list of goals which are recognized and approved by the administration. These should be used during subsequent planning, including budgetary and other considerations.

3. Ideally, goals as set should have the support of all concerned. Minimally, the goal setting process should give all concerned the assurance that each goal was reached fairly and all factors were considered.
4. Initiative for setting a goal might come from above, but would more often start at the department level. All parties concerned with a goal should interact and react as the goal is being set. The goal setting process should reach a conclusion in that each proposed goal would be accepted ~~some~~ ~~Set Goals~~, would be rejected, or would be deferred. Rejected goals should be retained as such (unless they are withdrawn) with the ~~Set~~ ^(approved) Goals for use in case of later reconsideration.
5. Once goals are set, plans should be made to reach them.
6. Goals should be periodically reviewed for progress toward realization and for possible revision.
7. Initial goal setting should be completed by June 1986.

Procedures

1. Generally an academic goal proposal would start at the department level. Academic goals proposed are approved by a majority vote of the faculty of the department of origin. The Department Chairman is responsible for this, but any faculty member may initiate a proposed goal.
2. The Dean and department will consult about proposed goals that have been approved by a department. This might result in the Dean approving the goal or in the department revising it. If the Dean and department disagree on a proposed goal, both views, with their support, would go to the Provost.
3. Some proposed goals require the Provost's approval, namely those which:
 - require resources beyond the capability of the department concerned,
 - impact on the operations of other departments or programs (unless intra-college and agreed at the Dean's level),
 - are not agreed upon by the department and the Dean, or
 - should be first seen by the Provost in the opinion of the Dean or the department.
4. The Provost will study these proposed goals, meet with all concerned separately and together as needed, and conclude one of the following: (a) goal approved, (b) goal approved in modified form, (c) goal rejected, (d) decision postponed. Even if the proposed goal were not approved, the proposed

goal and an supporting note from the Provost explaining the arguments and the reasons for the decision to not approve it would accompany the list of approved goals in a formal list of proposed but unapproved goals.

5. At the end of each winter quarter the Provost will provide the Academic Planning Committee lists of goals resulting from steps 2 and 4 above. The Academic Planning Committee will recommend priorities on approved goals and might make recommendations where there have been conflicts. It will report its actions to the Senate by the end of spring quarter for their approval or other action.
6. Proposed goals for Departments could be initiated from the Dean's or Provost's level but would be considered basically as above, with the first step being approval by the department concerned.
7. It is expected that goals will often be proposed and approved as packages in order to maintain their consistency.
8. Approved goals are to be reviewed at least every two years for progress toward realization and for possible revision, but proposed revisions might be considered at any time. Proposed revisions would be considered the same as proposed goals.

Form for Initial Goal Setting

(A draft of this is being prepared by Dr. Khawaja)

dl5gset3