

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

October 8th, 2013
West Commons Community Center
8:30 am – 10:00 am

Agenda

1. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes – Andy Karafa (3 min.)
2. Indicators of Program Success – Matt Wagenheim (30 min.)
3. Vision Research Institute – Bob Buckingham (20 min.)
4. Open Forum
5. Updates from Colleges, Schools, & Departments

Future ALC agenda items:

- Accessibility – Deb Cox (?)

Next meeting: 10/22/13

ALC MEETING MINUTES

October 8, 2013

Membership: Andrea Wirgau, Anne Marie Gillespie, Brian Bouwman, Brian Craig, Cambria DeHoag, Cheryl Cluchey, David Darrow, David Frank, Debra Curtiss, Deborah Dawson, Deborah Thalner, Debra Cox, DeeDee Stakley, Glen Okonoski, Gregory Zimmerman, Helen Woodman, James Powell, Janelle Hemingway, Jeffrey Ek, Jim Woolen, John Schmidt, Jon Sprague, Joseph Karafa, Joseph Lipar, Julie Coon, Kim Hancock, Kirk Weller, Larry L Schult, Leah Monger, Lianne Briggs, Lucian Leone, Michael Ropele, Michael Bouthillier, Peter Bradley, Piram Prakasam, Robert Buckingham, Ron McKean, Sharon George, Shelly VandePanne, Steven Reifert, Susan Owens, Tami Wolverton, Theresa Raglin, Todd A Stanislav, Tracy Powers, Trinity Williams, William Smith

Regular Guests: Paul Blake, William Potter, Robbie Teahen

Guests: Matt Wagenheim

AGENDA

1. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes – Andy Karafa
2. Indicators of Program Success – Matt Wagenheim
3. Vision Research Institute – Bob Buckingham
4. Open Forum
5. Updates from Colleges/Schools/Departments

HANDOUTS

1. Vision Research Institute

MINUTES

1. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes

❖ Minutes from 09-24-13 meeting approved.

2. Indicators of Program Success

❖ Matt Wagenheim reported as Chair of Academic Program Review, which is in process. Specifically, he would like to gain feedback from the ALC toward his charge of reimagining the APR process. They have set a new priority to make productive changes to the process and one question being asked is: what is and what isn't a successful program? Is it realistic at the administrative level to try to arrive at some sort of matrix? With 20 programs under review this year Matt is asking for feedback and thoughts, both during the meeting and by sending him ideas/concerns that may come up after today's meeting as well. He welcomes any thoughtful feedback. Items for consideration and discussion: What defines a successful academic program? Adequate faculty, program costs, etc. As we look at our programs, what are 2-3 things that make each a good program? What is administration (Provost, President, Academic Affairs, etc.) looking for and is that in alignment with what those at the program level are looking for to consider a program successful. Many thoughtful comments were shared:

- a. Consideration to audience – what constitutes success? Do students get hired, do employers come back, are faculty in demand?
- b. How do we value programs that do not have large numbers, can be expensive, yet have great value to the university?
- c. High cost programs vs industry support: dollars expended vs dollars generated. Political implications.
- d. Successful program cannot simply allow more applicants due to internship placement limitations.
- e. Feeder programs need to be valued as they are needed to fill major programs.
- f. Hopefully those programs that also serve clients are valued as much by admin as clients and program support is forthcoming.
- g. For programs with accreditation bodies – does admin criteria and what those agencies consider successful align? Matt shared that this APR year seems to reflect the high values placed on programs from outside agencies. But then how are programs without accrediting boards judged? There are instances of programs closed despite high praise from outside review.
- h. There is not always a clear understanding of what programs are being judged on – are efforts being put into programs valued by admin? Examples of programs at other institutions that are always safe despite low revenue vs cost ratio.

- i. Group feels it should be an academic integrity progress. Judge by faculty keeping current, innovation being added to programs, academic integrity.
- j. Ultimately this is a business and we answer to trustees, government, state. Ultimately Ferris must see bang for bucks? External view, program reputation seems important. Since external benchmarks are brought to bear can those be shared?

❖ At end of informative discussion Matt summarized: Role of APR is not to place in front of admin a report showing a program is or is not valid program. Rather to point out value and integrity of program. Has been an eye opening experience since APR is only part of much bigger process. Matt thanked audience for feedback and welcomes ongoing comments.

3. Vision Research Institute

❖ Bob Buckingham shares overview of the VRI which began in February. With lack of an evaluator in industry to look at products in an unbiased fashion and provide seal of approval companies were willing to pay for this service. Funding for 3 years was obtained and Michigan College of Optometry accepted. A clinical research fellow was hired. Industry collaboration formed. Many companies are working with Ferris. Handout developed for all MI doctors providing comparison data on contact lenses, which solutions go with which lenses, etc. As a result proprietary items are being developed as well and will be marketed under an FSU label. Research and development in progress, some of which includes working with industry on dry eye problems, lenses and glasses designed for specific wearers – head turners vs scanners. Google glass is another exciting program getting national attention. Since funding will not be ongoing revenue funding is a priority for continuing the VRI. Bob shared they are always looking for volunteers for their studies.

4. Open Forum

❖ Shelly VandePanne shares information obtained from Mapworks surveys of all fulltime degree seeking students. The survey shows students are doing better this year compared to previous survey. The top 5 issues were identified with finances heading the list. An immediate response will be to offer more info during the FSUS sessions on finance. If members would like more in depth information Shelly is happy to provide. Results of each survey is used to make additional improvements in the process.

8. Updates from Colleges/Departments

❖ Please email Andy if you have a topic of interest.

Adjourn: 9:25 am