

NEASC - Fifth Meeting of Steering Committee

April 11, 2011

Mazzaferro Center

Minutes of the Meeting:

Attendees: *Cathy Canney, Diane Lucas, Matt Costello, Shirley Wagner, Paul Weizer, Sherry Horeanopoulos, Mel Govindan, Terry Carroll, Michael Shanley, Sheila Sykes, Linda McKay, Christine Dee, Jane Fiske, Patrice Gray, John Chetro-Szivos, Ann Howard,*

Excused: Rob Pontbriand, Bill Flynn, Eric Gregoire, Michael Fiorentino, Charles Sides

The meeting was called to order at 3:30pm

The agenda is as follows:

- 1) Review of first draft received from the subcommittee for standards 10 and 11.
- 2) Updates from the other subcommittees
- 3) Review of preliminary survey data
- 4) Discussion of clearly defined goals for the self study process
- 5) Meeting schedule going forward- We have only one more meeting scheduled at present and will need to add more. Our suggestion would be to meet the first three Mondays in May leading up to assessment day on the 23rd.

Agenda item 1 – First Draft of the Standards 10 and 11 Subcommittee

Comments on the Draft:

Mike Shanley spoke about the subcommittee's comments. First reaction was that the piece was well-written, concise and clear. Standard 10, third bullet (Program-specific handbooks), draft needs some examples. There are samples on the web...research where information can be found. While financial information exists at the cited place, the information will be moving and the document will need editing. Sheila will call and offer information. Mass Public Record Law is binding to FSU – needs to be clarified in draft. Appraisal section is a problem: A better mechanism to assess the course listings is needed (catalog relevancy). Make a recommendation as to where the LA&S should be placed on Website? Accuracy and timeliness of websites and suggest where these items may be less than accurate or timely. We are working on the organization of the website with the ongoing revamping. Some of the comments can be fixed way before NEASC reviews FSU.

Appraisal vs. Projection – clarify for the subcommittee before they finish Standard 11

Include relevant site references.

Read/Refer to Data first forms.

Organize the document consistently

No website was provided for the President's report – correct that.

Mike questioned public disclosure - policies, etc from HR. Police Department/Cleary Act – critical reporting requirements. Booklet is on the website. Collective Bargaining documents are comprehensive.

Live links on the document would be helpful. (Don't list the website)

Problem with Projections – 10 is brief (not clear), 11 not done yet.

Reference "Notice of Availability" - DOE requires disclosure information for current/prospective students

Should the subcommittee meet with the website committee for additional clarity? Basing draft on current website may be misleading – problems may not be consistent with the current website.

Mentioned that the standard, as described, is vague

Most of the issues the reviewing subcommittee had relates to Standard 11.

Description – great lengths to identify weblinks – attempt to be comprehensive.

Appraisal – Nothing inaccurate... however, first paragraph is not at all clear.

Most offending sentence starts with regarding academic integrity – (“Grievance” has a union-related definition – not appropriate in context?). Strict set of procedures are outlined – not public information – is contractual and must be negotiated. Not clear if “grievance” means “concern”. Reader cannot decipher meaning of statements in this draft. Paragraph needs to be redrafted.

Statements are vague – need details and clear interpretation.

Divisions set goals for the departments....etc...need specifics of which “divisions” and what/where are the goals?

Agenda item 2 – Other Subcommittee Updates

Shirley and Paul met with all of the chairs of the subcommittees, many are close to reporting back. One is yet to begin writing the report. Paul expects to see written drafts from all of the subcommittees by next meeting.

Agenda item 3 – Preliminary Survey Data

1258 people have responded – 765 are undergrads, 70 grad students. It shows a good representation of the campus population. The survey will end on Friday, the 15th.

Agenda item 4 – Clearly Defined Goals for the Self-Study Process

Paul handed out Goals for the Self-Study as follows:

- All campus constituencies will be engaged in dialogue regarding current challenges and future opportunities for the University
- The study will be conducted honestly, collaboratively, objectively and with candor
- Data will be used to create a thoughtful and accurate analysis of our strengths and challenges
- Findings will be used to inform decision-making related to our current strategic plan. (edited at the meeting)

Agenda item 4 – Meeting Schedule going forward

Schedule through the end of May – we will use the current time slot (Mondays through May) We will plan after the May 23rd assessment day for subsequent June meetings.

Peter Hogan stepped down from the NEASC Steering Committee to serve on the VP Academic Affairs. John Chetro-Szivos has stepped in to replace him.

Reminder of the Subcommittee Membership

Subcommittees

(Subcom Leaders):

Mission and Purposes – John CS, Bill F, Eric G

(Bill)

Academic Programs – Mike Fiorentino, Jane F, Patrice G, Rob P

(Patrice)

Students – Matt C, Mel G,

(Mel)

Library, Information Services – Sheila S, Sherry H, Diane L, Ann H

(Sheila)

Public Disclosure and Integrity – Mike S, Terry C, Linda

(Mike)

Super-Subcommittee - Cathy C, Christine D, Charles S, Shirley W, Paul W

(Paul/Shirley)

Next Meeting: Monday, May 9th

Respectfully submitted,
Sherry Horeanopoulos