

Minutes of the Academic Planning Committee meeting
held on May 15, 1987 in the Cardinal Room, K.C.
=====

Present: Professors Barger, Castronovo, Krishnan, Maraffa,
Slawewski and Deans Ruggles and Yozwiak.

Excused: Prof. Elias

Absent: Profs. Alam, Tribble and Provost Gillis.

1. Meeting was called to order at 1.00 p.m.
2. Minutes of May 1, 1987 was approved as presented.
3. The draft report on Department Goals submitted by the Chair was discussed. With some changes, the draft was approved for submission to the Senate.
4. Chair thanked the Members of the Committee for their contributions and cooperation during the year and congratulated them on the achievements of the Committee.

cc: Chair, Senate
Secretary, Senate
Circulation Desk, Maag Library.

May 11, 1987.

From:

R. Krishnan, Chair, APC



To:

Members, APC

Subject: Report on Department Goals-Planning.

A draft report on academic planning-department goals is attached herewith. You may like to review it and make necessary changes so that we can finalize the report in our next meeting on 15th.

Thanks.

Enc. 1

Report of the Academic Planning Committee on
Academic Planning

=====

The Academic Planning Committee has been spinning its wheels for the last two years without knowing exactly what its role in 'academic planning' is. The last year's committee felt that it should try to establish a procedure to obtain Department plans from the academic departments and review/evaluate them and set priorities. Based on this idea, they developed some guidelines for preparation of Department Goals and requested the Departments to submit their goals. Most of the Departments did submit some statements. However, many of them simply described what the Departments were doing on a day-to-day basis rather than future plans - goals/objectives they would like to achieve in the future years and how they plan to achieve them. Not only that. There was no uniformity in the type of information provided either. In addition, some of the Departments were either hesitant or not willing to submit any form of statement as to their plans.

The Committee this year, after completing the work on Scheduling Policy, took up the issue of academic planning. There were as many ideas as to how to deal with the Department Goals/objectives, as the number of members of the Committee. In other words, no consensus could be developed as to the process of review/evaluation of the plans -Department Goals- received. The Committee ended up deciding to summarize the Goals by School and submit it to the Senate to facilitate communication between the various parts of the academic community. These summaries are attached in Appendix A.

Some of the difficulties the Committee faced in undertaking a better process are:

1. The academic departments do not seem to be convinced as to the necessity of developing long range plans and/or they are not familiar with the process of planning.
2. The process of allocation of resources among academic departments till now has been through the administrative channels. The Department Chair will submit their resource requirements to the Dean, who in turn will make recommendations to the Provost. The Provost will then make the decision and submit it to the President/Budget Committee. The Senate had had no role in deciding the priorities or making recommendations in the past. Hence, the academic departments may not have considered the planning process initiated by the Academic Planning Committee as relevant or important.

3. It seems, the departments are not at all willing to submit their activities to the scrutiny of a University wide group based on on the feeling that each department is unique and no general group will have the knowledge/expertise to evaluate their activities and determine their future resource needs and/or priorities.
4. Under the present evaluation and recommendation procedures, the Departments do not have any incentive or necessity to submit their plans to a Senate Committee or the Senate itself.

Based on the above, the Academic Planning Committee strongly feels that, as it stands, the Committee has very little or no part in the academic planning process.

The Senate, or the Executive Committee of the Senate, may like to reevaluate the role of the Academic Planning Committee and decide what its mandate should be for the future.