

## ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 2 *all*

1. Meeting was called to order by Acting Chair Jim Zupanic.
2. (a) Present were: C. Anderson, V. Phillips, K. Kougl, J. Feist-Walles, H. Mettee, M. Beaubien, D. Hovey, P. Kasvensky.  
(b) Absent were: T. Beckett, K. Sebastian  
(c) Excused were: J. Scanlon, B. Brothers, D. Rost
3. Discussion points on APC's purpose included:
  - (a) Academic Standards and Events Committee is probably the appropriate venue for General Education requirements changes guidance.
  - (b) The Workload Policy Guidelines for YSU needs to be prepared by June. Departments will have to respond to these.
  - (c) The APC considered whether or not to express itself on the workload issue as in planning.
  - (d) Departments are reviewing their mission and goals, and then to develop workload policies in line with them and their college directives.
  - (e) One difficulty in "workload" is the definition from the B.O.R., which is expressed in terms of percentages of time devoted to teaching, research and service, contrasted with the 37 annual teaching workload hour maximum delineated by the agreement.
  - (f) It was ~~suggested~~ <sup>agreed</sup> that we draft a memo to the Provost asking for clarification on what departments need to be doing to develop a workload policy, and that this "framework" be communicated to the departments.
  - (g) A point that needs to be addressed in the memo is how department averages should be done to the B.O.R. suggested levels, but for individual faculty members considerable differences can be expected.
  - (h) Acting Chair Zupanic distributed a copy of a Vindicator article on Higher Ed in the future. It was suggested that we have a 20 year plan with revisions every 3 years, as a planning cycle! Possibly 10 years should be the upper limit.
  - (i) The revised mission and goals statements of the departments will be prepared by the end of March. College statements will likely be ready by the end of May.

- (j) Programs in the future will need to be supported by numbers and surveys. Funding will be decided on how closely each program is tied to the particular university mission and goals.
  - (k) The suggestion was made that we consider a more detailed charge for next week's meeting.
  - (l) It was pointed out that the timeline of phasing in various goals and objectives need to be taken into account, as well as the goals and objectives themselves.
4. Meeting was adjourned at 9:05 a.m.

Respectively submitted

Howard D. Mettee  
Temporary Secretary



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3012  
College of Engineering and Technology  
Department of Electrical Engineering  
(216) 742-3012

*Chair SEC*

June 11, 1993

To: Virginia Phillips, Chair, SEC

From: Duane Rost, Chair, APC

Re: Committee Issues

The issues the Academic Planning Committee have addressed cover a wide range.

The most important issue has been to look further into the future than just next quarter. While the longer-range planning is VERY important, it is difficult to remember you are trying to drain the swamp when you're up to your \_\_\_ in alligators. This seems to be the condition we often find ourselves.

The most obvious topic on the plate now is the University Mission Statement. This is crucial to the well-being of the University. This statement could be drafted by full-time administrative types, but it is MOST important the faculty (who are the only income-producing members of the staff) have inputs into the work. To that end, the APC has continued to press the point with the Administration. We have been successful there. NOW TO GET THE FACULTY TO RESPOND AND PARTICIPATE. (Emphasis added.)

The duplication with other committees is possible as there are several Administrative committees and councils that have various titles. These are appointed by the Administration and must respond solely to the Administration. Wherein the current Administration is indicating a desire for FACULTY input, the current situation may be successful. But if the wishes and inputs of the Faculty are to be forwarded, the APC MUST continue to function.

identifiable, short-term outcomes and gratifications that result. Thus there has been a tendency to not press ahead and make

progress. There is even much discussion about what is "progress".

Thus, should the Academic Planning Committee continue? Yes. Should its charge be changed? If more specific challenges are identifiable, yes, but it does not seem that the SEC would be able to peer into the future far enough to pin down those challenges. Thus I would recommend the APC continue with the same charge. Fresh, enthusiastic members should be selected each year by the SEC so that this Committee does not crash because of a few deadheads.

"SEC ... evaluate ... document the continued need..."

Wherein the Mission of the University is not obvious, wherein the short-term and long-term goals are not obvious, wherein the details of the strategies of how to get where we don't know we want to go, I would strongly recommend the continuation of the APC. We are just now gently touching the very tiny tip of a very large iceberg. Thus the "need".

Wherein the SEC has the responsibility to "evaluate", that will be up to you.



September 17, 1993

To: Virginia Phillips, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

From: Duane Rost, Chair, Academic Planning Committee

Re: Committee Charge and Topics of Activity

Enclosed is a copy of the memo of June 11, 1993. Evidently it was not detailed enough.

I will attempt to list the topics covered in reverse chronological order from the minutes.

This will Cover ONLY the period from January 1, 1993, to August 25, 1993. The request was for "... list of agenda items for the past two or three years ..." If this list is not sufficiently representative, I will address a request to continue back in the items. Absent that, I will assume the flavor of the Academic Planning Committee's work is portrayed here.

Mission & Goals Statement of the University.  
(Many Meetings)

Topics to be addressed by the APC in the Future, See minutes, 8-11-93 for details of suggestions.

Could Students be assigned to Senate Committees as a portion of their academic work.

Action to recommend a Coordinator of the Two-Year Programs.  
Motion to Senate, defeated at that time.

Discussion of the future of programs that do not receive State endorsement (fund).

Discussion of the subsidy formula and its impact on the academic life at YSU.

Consideration (briefly) of the Honors College and the meaning of the word "College" in that context. The Honors College/School is on the agenda for Fall 1993.

Discussion of the +10% workload statements from the State and the impact at YSU. What would this mean? How can we plan for this?

Mission and Goals from four colleges were passed out and not addressed specifically in the meetings.

Planning including the Workload and Contract hours and the implications into the future. Merit Pay??? Limitations on research when teaching 36 whs.

Interface of the K-12 situations and actions into the University setting.

Availability of classes, time of day, time of year, ever?

Summer program interface into the academic structure and framework.

What is the distinction between the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science? What should be the position of the University on this topic in the future?

Residential aspects of the "Honors College".

Mission statements to be included in the University Bulletin and the Graduate Catalog for 1993-1994.

"Night-School" portion of the University operation? Has it been, Is it being overlooked?

Should BiAnnual Reviews be made of the Strategic Plans that have been created previously.

Preparation to review the entire catalog for 1994-1995.

Extensive and exhaustive review of the Strategic Planning Team Report from 1990-1991.

Review the process and progress of follow-up to graduates from the University.

Restructuring.

Child Care Services.

Value-Added Testing.

Request for an "Index of Documents" related to planning, no action specifically followed.

Stressing the need for the APC to "... INPUT toward substantive changes."

Proposed a review of the Senate Committees to accompany the review of the Administrative Committees.

History of Two-Year Programs, here and state-wide.

APC to be proactive as well as reactive, including:

Planning and recommendations to the University, and to the Senate

Planning implications of actions by appointed committees.

Opportunities and challenges coming from outside the University.

Planning actions anticipated due to changes in any environmental entity/agency.

APC role in the new organizational structure of the BOT.

Mechanism to ensure ... measurable standards.

Extensive review of "Securing the Future of Higher Education in Ohio", and its impact at YSU.

Importance of standardized evaluation and reporting techniques".

Assessment needs and possible techniques and instruments.

3/3/94  
workload questions for Rost

Academic Planning Committee

The difficulties the committees seem to be having fall into the following areas;

1. How is this percentage to be calculated? The numbers
  - a) The numbers used in the Regents report seem to be based on the actual number of hours each faculty member spends during a week working on various activities. Even though these hours are the most difficult to calculate they are definitely an important consideration in determining how much effort is actually being put into delivering education to students.
  - b) Are we supposed to be looking at some kind of detailed proposal that lays out teaching hours TH plus specifically allocated Research hours RH activities for a list of activities plus specifically allocated SH service hours for a list of activities. Is the total supposed to come up to 36 or some higher number.
2. Assume a departments current allocation of workload hours results in teaching 35 to 37 workload hours per year and the department currently meets or exceeds the regents percentage level of effort devoted to undergraduate effort. Does the department have to prepare a new revised policy to increase teaching workload hours by 10%.
3. Should the policy go back and look at student credit hour production per faculty member and increase teaching workload hours so that an increase of 10% SCH is achieved.
4. A department might be justly charged with the responsibility of distributing its own workload. If it results in written statements that one faculty member working on a committee receives .5 "service hours" and a committee member from another department receives 2 "service hours" this could result in problems.
5. Is there any overall idea of how sabatticals, research professorships, current college awarded "release time hours, administrative hours for chairpersons or program coordinators and research release time funded by external grant money should fit into department policies?
6. The regents advisory report seems to logically address a real problem. What measurement tools will be used to determine if our policies are producing the desired result?