

**Presidential Task Force:
Sustaining the Academic Priorities at StFX
April 17, 2014
Coady 150, 1:00pm-4:00pm**

In attendance: Leslie MacLaren (Chair), Jeff Orr, Tara Callaghan, Dave Risk, Lisa Lunney Borden, Charmaine McPherson, Will Sweet, Peter Poole, Helen MacGregor, Yvon Grenier, Bob Hale, Janice Landry, Tim Hynes, Jacques Boucher, Shannon Morrell, Richard Nemesvari, Rachel Hurst, Denton Anthony, Lynne Murphy, Robert VandenHoogen

Staff: Candice Finbow, Gina Sampson

1. Approval of notes from last meeting

Notes from the March 25 meeting were approved as submitted and will be posted on the website.

2. Updates from staff:

Reviewed activity since last meeting. See accompanying PowerPoint (April 17).

3. Feedback from campus:

- 3.1 While there is support for the process in concept, the timing of report writing in April-May is a concern.
- 3.2 People are skeptical about what will happen with the report as there is a history of recommendations not being enacted.
- 3.3 People see the process is necessary, but regular review will need to be done to measure progress.
- 3.4 There is concern that this is exclusively a budget cutting exercise. Members need to emphasize that the report will provide a micro to mid-level view of campus. It will be used, along with other evidence, to provide information to inform planning.
- 3.5 Some people are having minor technical issues with the online reporting. Members need to advise people to contact staff with problems.
- 3.6 Members agreed that academic groups should be able to access printed versions of data tables through the bookstore at no cost to departments.

4. Scoring decisions:

- 4.1. Members discussed options for organizing the scoring phase. A number of alternatives were discussed.
- 4.2 Members indicated a preference for the following model:
 - Two 12 member teams: one to read the academic program reports and one to read academic support and administrative program (ASAP) reports.
 - Team membership as follows, in the interest of transparency:
 - The Academic program review team: 9 faculty members and 3 representative of academic support and administrative programs

- The ASAP review team: 3 faculty members and 9 administrative/academic support members. Deans and the AVP(R) will serve on the ASAP review team.
 - Scoring through a multi-phase review process: Review begins in 3 small teams of 4 per side and then moves to large group reviews.
 - Goal of consistency in membership at the small team level.
 - Members read a percentage of the program reports at the small group phase.
 - Consensus to invite new members from academic support and administrative areas to join the Task Force for the scoring phase. Some should work directly with students; one should be from FM. Task Force members will forward nominations to the AVP who will invite candidates.
 - Consensus to explore inviting more students to join the scoring phase as observers.
- 4.3 Staff will poll members to determine availability and present a scoring model at the next meeting.

5. Communications

- 5.1 Members reviewed summary meeting notes from the September 26th meeting re: opportunities from and concerns about this process.
- 5.2 Consensus on the key message to communicate: Creating a culture where evidence, collaboration, and transparency inform planning and guide decision making.
- 5.3 Consensus that this process has demonstrated a commitment to collaboration, evidence and transparency (e.g., having representatives of both program areas on all scoring teams; centralized data).
- 5.4 Members agreed that centralized data for Academic programs should be made available to ASAP programs.
- 5.3 Members will brainstorm strategies for communication to each stakeholder group at next meeting.

6. Next steps:

- Next meeting Monday, April 28th 1-4pm
- Staff will prepare scoring model for review
- Continue discussion about communications