Key Indicators Group (KIG) Meeting Minutes, 11/17/09

Present:
John Schorr, chair – by Skype for introductory remarks
Erich Friedman
Ted Surynt
Sue Ryan
Tandy Grubbs
Laura Glander
Jan Kindred
Dan Hale
John Tichenor
Beth Paul – at the very end

John Schorr gave introductory remarks:
• Thanks for efforts
• Charge: to propose policy relevant indicators which cover net revenue, student load, faculty load, and quality issues; to determine what we think are the best indicators for the administration to use as they make decisions
• Our work needs to be integrated – to be a system to be used; we are to come up with the elements of that system; KIG needs to work to integrate all our sub topics into a whole system
• Outside resources are scarce and not always on point, but Beth Paul’s working draft is exactly on point for the directions we need to be going
• John signed off because technical difficulties meant he could not hear our side of the Skype conversation

Question: are we thinking of the university as a whole? Or are we at the department/programs/school level?
• John Tichenor indicated that we should look at the department/programs/school level, that the university level is not the job of KIG
• Observation: interdisciplinary issues make it hard to look at the departmental/program level

Observation regarding net revenue: subgroup is trying to come up with several models as no one model is valid on it’s own but several models will show themes and patterns. They are currently using some (limited) data, but real data will probably give more insight as to whether these working and the subgroup wanted to make sure that real data, not estimates, are used in the final end.

Question/observation regarding faculty load: measures should be valid for all schools/programs/departments, but is essentially impossible across schools. John Tichenor said that the new concept of Faculty Weighted Hours (new concept being proposed and worked on by Karen’s PWG group) should take care of discrepancies. FWH accounts for more than just teaching
• John recommended going to TCNJ web site and searching on “MOA 62” as this is the document that discusses faculty load at TCNJ.
• Clearly, administrative duties have to be included as part of faculty load.
  o Sally Dowling/Finance have done analysis (still a work in progress) which shows percentages of how administrative costs are distributed across the different schools/campuses
  o On-line courses and other campuses’ issues add to the complexity of faculty load as they are very different than traditional loads

Question raised for John Schorr and Beth Paul: At what point do we put real data on the indicators we develop to see how they are working

Observation: No one formula has to necessarily look at all issues; an area which is hurt in one way (ex: net revenue) might come out very strong in another area (ex: prestige).
• John Tichenor said our goal should be to create as parsimonious a set of indicators as possible, as if we get too broad, it becomes impossible to work with
• Suggestion: we should determine a list of KEY indicators, but perhaps also come up with a list of secondary, important but not key, indicators as well
• We need to be mindful of the biases that certain indicators might cause

Question for prestige subgroup:
• How do we measure the prestige, success of a department/program/school?
  Answer: indicators being looked at include ones we currently use, ones we could use, and ones which might sound good but practically speaking are difficult/impossible to use. Erich is discussing with John Tichenor
• How do we evaluate retention across schools (leave one to join another) and account for double majors, etc.?
• Discussion about student evaluations:
  o Concerns raised about the reliability of student evaluations; in the abstract they are fine, but they have their limitations
  o Should student evaluations have more objective questions?

Future meetings of KIG as a group:
• Wednesday, November 25, 9:00am (DeLand time)
• Tuesday, December 1, 8:00am (DeLand time)
• Tuesday, December 8, time TBA (depending upon final exam conflicts)

Closing: Beth Paul wanted to express thanks. She finds our circulating emails informative and is glad to get them. She offered her assistance as a resource.