Minutes of IE Team  
October 12, 2009, 1:30-2:30 PM

Present: Mark Workman, Shawn Brayton, David Jaffee, Judy Miller, Kathy Robinson, Bob Wood, Barbara Hetrick, Marianne Jaffee, Lance Taylor, Lucy Croft, Annabel Brooks, Pam Chally, Marsha Lupi, Peter Braza, John McAllister, Mark Falbo, Tom Serwatka, David Fenner

Agenda:

• Judy Miller reported on the progress of the Assessment Software Evaluation Team (ASSET).
  o The committee consists of Shawn Brayton, Lucy Croft, Mark Falbo, Marianne Jaffee, Marnie Jones, Bruce Kavan, Judy Miller (chair), Rick Powell, Lance Taylor, and Claribel Torres-Lugo.
  o The committee has developed its purpose as follows: “To develop functional requirements for an assessment management software package; to select a homegrown or commercial package that meets the identified requirements for implementation in AY10-11.”
  o The committee has “kicked the tires” of ECATS (the College of Education’s homegrown package), WAVEOnline, and TracDat (scheduled for tomorrow). Upcoming short demos are Tk20 and TaskStream. After the short demos are completed, we will have longer, more closely scripted demos of a smaller number of top contenders.
  o In order to implement a new package in AY10-11, our goal is to have some idea of a budget requirement by January or February of 2010. The commercial packages cost between about $15K and $100K, depending on functionality. We have not excluded the possibility of “building out” the existing ECATS system for campus wide use, though of course there would be significant staff costs.

• Shawn Brayton reported on her scan of unit strategic plans for 2008-09.
  o In general, the posted plans are good.
  o Generally all posted plans have mission, goals, and actions identified. A deadline for the completion of the plans has yet to be established, so it was no surprise to find the Continuous improvement sections incomplete.
  o Areas for improvement in some plans are as follows:
    ▪ Some are missing information in the outcomes and evaluation components.
    ▪ Some are written in the future tense.
    ▪ Some are written as checklists.
    ▪ Some are attempting to retrofit 08-09 strategic plans to new university goals (which was decided at the meeting to be acceptable and optional).
    ▪ The evaluation and continuous improvement sections don’t all address the “so what” factor, i.e. what are the implications of the evaluation?
    ▪ Some need more detail in order to communicate clearly with an audience external to the unit or to someone writing future plans for that unit.
  o Shawn identified 3 exemplar plans (Alumni Services, BCH college level, and the English department) and will circulate them to the group as PDF files.
  o Units are asked to complete their 08-09 strategic plans and to roll missions, goals, and actions forward to 09-10. As units develop 09-10 strategic plans, they are asked to align their goals and actions to the university strategic plan. The reporting software will be modified to enable this linkage.
  o The 2008-09 strategic plans should be completed by Friday, November 13th.

• Mark Falbo reported on the progress of the QEP.
  o A Management team has been convened and is meeting regularly.
Working groups are being organized, the first two (and most urgent) being Risk Management and Awards & Recognitions.

Mark has been meeting with department chairs and will continue to do so.

Necessary structural pieces are under development, most urgently the Community Scholars Program and the Curriculum Grant program.

The QEP targets are ambitious—i.e. all students have the opportunity to participate in CBTL, and 95% of departments have a CBTL component.

Mark plans to seek optional Carnegie status as a Community-Engaged University. He reviewed the documentation, both core and supplemental, that is needed to apply. Sample elements include some things that have to be done for QEP project development in any case, such as a tracking system and systematic assessment; and others that we might not have considered such as the embedding of community engagement in search and recruitment policies, promotion and tenure policies, student transcripts, and a dedicated faculty governance committee.

Discussion ensued about the appropriate timing for the Carnegie classification application vis a vis the SACS interim report.
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