

ADMINISTRATIVE & ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES
Wednesday, September 7, 2016, 9:00 – 11 a.m.
Wisconsin Idea Room

Present:

Deans: Diana Hess, Melissa Amos-Landgraf, Aaron Bird Bear, Dawn Crim, Teri Engelke, Jim Escalante, Barb Gerloff, Jeff Hamm

Department Representatives: Brad Brown, Eric Camburn, Gary Diffie, Erica Halverson, Ann Archbold for Dan Lisowski, Adam Nelson, Jim Escalante for Doug Rosenberg, Jin-Wen Yu

Directors: Kathy Cramer, Beth Giles, KT Horning, Anna Lewis, Jack Jorgensen, Sona Pastel-Daneshgar for Paula Panczenko, Noel Radomski, Cigdem Unal, Charlene Walker, Jim Wollack

Academic Staff Representative: Ann Fillback Watt

Auxiliary: Betsy Burns, Molly Carroll, Beth Janetski, Shannon Vakil, Adam Weisenfarth

Administrative Council

The Administrative Council was called to order by Dean Diana Hess at 9:07 a.m.

People introduced themselves, since the group's composition has changed since the last meeting.

Dean Hess noted two Administrative Council agenda items:

1. Hear about new performance review system (Teri Engelke)
2. Look collaboratively at a draft set of School of Education goals for next year

9:14: Teri presented the new performance management review system (see handout). It will involve goal setting, informal conversations throughout the year, mid-point check-in, annual evaluation. There are forms for each step, and suggested timelines on the Office of Human Resources website. The program has built-in flexibility so that it will work well for a variety of departments and units, all of which have different needs. There are also resources and sessions and webinars for people who need more tools. They will be setting up meetings; seeking feedback; holding forums; trying to identify the needs of each department and unit; and creating supplemental trainings, as needed. Make sure the Business Office is copied in the final step of each performance review, so it can be retained for permanent record.

9:33: Dean Hess made two announcements:

1. Carolyn Kelley is out of town at the moment, but will be at the next meeting, Please welcome her into her new role as Senior Associate Dean.
2. We just received some Block Grants, so the School has three new pots of money: one block of money for faculty salary increases, one block of money for staff increases, and one pot for one-time bonuses for faculty and staff. This money needs to be allocated in the next several months (much of it by December). Unfortunately, we cannot retain any of it for next year, so we will have to start making decisions soon about how to allocate it. Also, completing the new performance management process will be very important, since if someone does not complete their reviews, their raises cannot take effect.

9:40: Goal setting for the School of Education. Attendees talked in small groups about what they think should be the major goals for the School, writ large. Dean Hess passed out a draft set of goals, and asked everyone to make notes on:

1. What are the goals you think are important? Add some or remove some.
2. What are concrete things related to these goals that we should attend to?

The notes on goals were collected for aggregation in the Dean's Office.

9:55 Administrative Council was adjourned

Academic Planning Council

Academic Planning Council was called to order by Dean Hess at 10:00

Present:

Ann Archbold, Brad Brown, Eric Camburn, Molly Carroll, Catherine Compton-Lily, Gary Diffe, Jim Escalante, Ann Fillback-Watt, Erica Halverson, Diana Hess, Adam Nelson, Shannon Vakil, Jin-Wen Yu

People introduced themselves, since the group's composition has changed since the last meeting.

Dean Hess noted two Academic Planning Council agenda items:

1. Molly Carroll will talk about a review of the Partner School Network. A review of this program is not required, but Molly thought it would be helpful.
2. Cathy Compton-Lilly will report on the Elementary Teacher Education review.

In the past, with required program reviews, APC has approved a plan, then the review has occurred, then the program responds to it, then it has come to APC, and APC has voted to approve it. We are actually not required to do all of these steps, and because it is so time-consuming, we have had trouble meeting our deadlines. Therefore, we have been thinking about different ways of doing this. We need to decide, ideally today or in the next meeting, how we want this process to look. But first we are going to look at both of these reviews.

10:10: Molly Carroll's report (see handout): 7 recommendations came out of this review. She agrees with these recommendations, it was good to see what the Partner School Network has accomplished, and it was good to be re-focused on goals moving forward.

10:27 Cathy's report on major themes of the Elementary Teacher Education review:

1. Program consistency (how do the different pieces of the program fit together?)
2. Roles and responsibilities (they should create an org chart, delineate supervisor responsibilities, etc.)
3. Partnerships and placement (how are partnerships and field placements identified, what is the vision for them, etc.)
4. Capacity (consider aligning the strands, how can TAs be mentored, are they using our resources in the best possible way, are some things too expensive, etc.)

Dean Hess asked: What should be the role of APC with respect to program reviews? (see handout) It should be substantive, not rubber-stamp. This is the major way we do shared governance around academic programs.

Option 1: A 1-step process: APC hears the review, we ask questions, we provide advice or share concerns; then whomever presented the review to APC takes all that back to his/her department to think about, then the department can report to Bascom (APC does not need to be involved any further).

Option 2: A 2-step process: The department responds to the review first, before it is presented to APC. A good thing about this option is that the presenter could say “The department has responded well to this,” or “That doesn’t have much support,” etc. It can be helpful to know how departments are thinking about the topics in the review. But the reverse could also be true: It could be helpful for departments to know how APC was thinking about it, this can help frame their department discussions.

Group discussion yielded a third option: A 1.5-step process: The presenter of the review could come in to APC with feedback from a few well-placed department members/stakeholders, so that APC knows what people in the departments are thinking about the review, and can ask the presenter how the review is impacting the department, and how the department is responding to the review.

The Dean’s Office will draft what this might look like, and then finish talking about this at the next meeting.

Academic Planning Council meeting was adjourned at 11:05

Minutes respectfully submitted by Shannon Vakil

Minutes approved by Dean Diana Hess: September 28, 2016

Minutes approved by APC: November 2, 2016