

Task Force Meeting #2- October 9, 2013

Review of Meeting Notes:

A review of the meeting notes from the September 26, 2013 meeting raised the following:

- 1) The need for balancing the qualitative elements with the quantitative elements. Acknowledge that the qualitative elements should be valued.
- 2) Keep an evidence based approach with this review.
- 3) The process of creating criteria will be that after the Task Force establishes some initial criteria, the wider campus community will be consulted, and then the task force will finalize the criteria to be used.
- 4) It was suggested that we arrange a time to speak with some of the universities that have carried out this process for lessons learned, such as the University of Regina.
- 5) It was noted that although there are many ways to conduct the analysis of programs for prioritization, the most common is to rank programs according to the quintile approach.
- 6) Rubrics will be shared that will help us to determine potential criteria. Then we will communicate that to the wider community.

Review of Programs at StFX:

- A preliminary review of the programs as captured in Banner yielded a long list, with a number of programs that are no longer in existence. The goal is to have a definitive list on all of the programs on campus to be prioritized.
- Once the list is updated by the Deans, then the Task Force, it can be presented to the Chairs and Program Coordinator for their input.
- The university calendar provides a good chart of what programs we now offer. It was recommended that we use the chart from the calendar as a guide. From this it can be determined that across the four Faculties departments and interdisciplinary programs may have a) majors, b) joint majors, c) joint advanced majors, d) advanced majors, e) honours, f) honours with subsidiary, g) joint honors, h) minors, i) masters degrees, j) joint-phd, k) general degrees, l) certificates, m) diplomas.
- When considering all other programs that are not academic, it is recommended that they be called academic support: athletics, admin services – Jeff to share best practices with academic support working group and Task Force.
- As required a meeting will be scheduled with the Directors and Managers to provide an update and seek their input. Ramsay will work with his Directors to review and revise the list of academic support programs. The Directors Forum is an existing structure that might be suited to address the Task Force. There are preexisting documents with BOG – Ramsay will provide an example. These forms are for members to provide program accountability. ie. President's office – communicate the accountability of the President's office on the form.
- The University Library – what level of detail should be presented for the review process?

- Do we consider the Student's Union? They can be asked and they will decide if they want to participate in the review as they are not legally bound to do so.
- Continuing Education, like the library is a hybrid between academic offerings and support services to these programs.

Analysis and Recommendations Stages:

- We need to determine if we are using the same criteria to review academic and academic support programs. The criteria may need to be modified. Most places work on this separately.
- Our job is to prioritize the recommendations to the President. After the President accepts the recommendations, the next step is delivery of recommendations to their appropriate place within the University governance structure. In some cases this is Senate and its committees, and in others it is the Board of Governors, and in others it may be a Vice-President

Communication Issues:

- It noted in the literature as a key challenge of prioritizations processes. Discussion about how we might consult with campus to build trust in the process.
- The communication process will be transparent and we will be consistent and clear in our messages.
- It was suggested that Task Force members are best positioned to go to meetings of their constituents and engage with campus members on a personal level.
- Connecting with Students - What is the best approach... student engagement is a challenge. SU can share information as an update or perhaps they should have a meeting with students. We need to be proactive... go to house meetings, be in their lounges.

Establishing Working Groups:

- The Task Force is an executive decision making body. We discussed whether we wish to have full committee participation for all deliberations, or divide into working groups and assign each group a task. For tasks we can break up to discuss and then bring back the larger group.
- We will have separate working groups around academics and support, however the literature recommends that faculty need to be a part of the academic support working group in order to be informed of and informing to the process.
- We have fewer faculty members on this task force than what is typical in other places. It was suggested that we need more faculty imprint on this process.
- It was decided that we will keep within the current composition of the Task Force group for now and then ask people to join as needed where there appears to be a need for more information and expertise.

- Look to Chairs of Faculties for groups who are not represented in our current composition and consult when needed. Our Task Force could meet with the Academic Chairs group

Future Directions:

- 1) We will provide Task Force members with an updated list of programs after it has been reviewed by the Deans and Directors. Once the list has been vetted with these groups and again by the Task Force - put it on the new website with a statement asking for further input.
- 2) Communication Strategy/ Plan will be developed along with a web site design
- 3) Task Force sessions will be held to work on criteria and associated templates.
- 4) It was recommended that we all read the University of Guelph Document.
- 5) Mission statement is crucial before we work on the criteria. We need to discuss and review our mission at our next meeting. The APP Document of 2010 includes our Mission Statement but it is listed as more of a strategic list - 5 points.
- 6) Question about creating guided questions for each group to use in their discussions.
- 7) Other topics to discuss are cautionary tales from other organizations that have engaged in program prioritization and looking at what we can learn from benchmarking with other universities (eg. CAUBO)