MINUTES

Present: Marylou Gelfer, Laura Pedrick, Alan Horowitz (guest).

The meeting was called to order at 8:35 by M. Gelfer.

1. In the absence of quorum, no official business of the committee could be conducted. Thus, the minutes of 12/13/07 and the agenda for 2/16/08 were not approved. However, those present heard the report of A. Horowitz, who described the approach to data analysis for the academic planning questionnaires adopted by the Engineering and Basic Sciences subcommittee and the Liberal Arts and Professions subcommittee.

2. According to A. Horowitz, the analysis process as currently conceptualized consists of a first stage in which the questionnaire responses of individual departments (or colleges or centers) will be summarized, and a second stage in which themes, trends and affinities across departments will be described.

   Stage 1 was described as a condensing process, to be done on a department by department basis. In this stage, the most salient plans of each department in each of several categories (such as, possibly, research, graduate programmatic growth and so on) would be noted.

   According to A. Horowitz, the other subcommittees have agreed that each member of the subcommittee will review five departments (with the exception of the support members of the subcommittee). Assignments will be randomized. At least two subcommittee members will reach each department’s or center’s questionnaire responses, for reliability purposes.

   According to A. Horowitz, it was also decided that if a department’s response was considered insufficient by the reviewer, the reviewer would inform the subcommittee chair, who would then immediately contact the department chair and ask for clarification and additional detail.

   Stage 2 was described as a process of identifying commonalities and themes across department, trying to develop a better picture of linkages and collaborations, and incorporating the input of Deans into the process. It was also suggested that reviewers in this stage would revisit their assigned departments’ questionnaires to look for smaller ideas overlooked in the first pass which may have been mentioned by numerous departments and thus would have a cumulative effect.
3. Ideas for a data collection form were then suggested by those present. A spreadsheet with codes for department, and codes for research, teaching and service was proposed, along with the possibility of text boxes for more specific notations and links to related information and websites. A. Horowitz agreed to produce a draft spreadsheet for the next meeting of the subcommittee chairs, who would then try to analyze a department or two together using the draft.

4. The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 AM. Future meeting dates will need to be identified. At the next meeting, it is hoped that the draft spreadsheet can be presented, and that the subcommittee can go through the analysis process together. Three additional meetings will be needed to review the data and members’ results.

Respectfully submitted,

Marylou Pausewang Gelfer