

SALISBURY STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes

SECOND MEETING OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT TASK FORCE

August 17, 2000

In Attendance:

Mr. Bryan Price, Director of Institutional Assessment, Research & Accountability, *Presiding*
Dr. Beth Barnett, Dean of Seidel School of Education & Professional Studies
Mr. John Fields, Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs
Dr. Frederick Kundell, Professor of Chemistry
Mr. Ross Leisten, Associate Registrar, Representative to Staff Senate
Dr. Peter Lade, Professor of Anthropology, Representative to Faculty Senate
Mr. Charles Moore, Representative of Student Government Association

Absent:

Ms. Betty Crockett, Associate Vice President, Administration & Finance
Ms. Jane Dané, Dean of Enrollment Management
Dr. Kent Kimmel, Associate Provost

A. Call to Order and Previous Minutes.

The second meeting of the Periodic Review Report Taskforce was brought to order at 2:00 p.m. on August 17, 2000 in the President's Conference Room. Bryan reviewed the previous minutes and timeline and cleared any confusion regarding the June 7, 2000 memorandum.

B. Processing and Sharing Information.

1. Drive 'T'. Discussed that drive 'T' was to be used for PRR members to share information that will not be published on the website. Drive 'T' has folders that pertain to each of the issues to be addressed.
2. Website. The minutes of each meeting, timeline and member information would be available via the Web. (Web address: <http://www.ssu.edu/iara/prr.htm>).
3. Focus of Units or Unit Heads for Addressing Issues.
 - a. Provide a general report of the unit's current accomplishments or issues.
 - b. Identify the previous self-study/visiting team report.
 - c. Identify an assessment of our progress.
 - d. Identify areas requiring additional energy to be focused.
 - e. Present a thoughtful, professional report.
4. Receiving Information from the Unit—interaction with the coordinator, or present a report. Fred Kundell suggested that the reports should be presented and then interactions with the coordinator follow, if needed.

Discussion took place about the two types of reports that are likely to be received.

 - a. One-issue focus (from a committee)
 - b. Comprehensive summary

RESOLVED, that both types of report are acceptable, that units may present their issue in appendix or exhibit form and that the unit reports will be broader than the coordinator's report. The coordinators report will support the issue.

C. Faculty Involvement.

Discussion took place regarding faculty involvement. Bryan asked the committee for suggestions to receive the best response from faculty in a way that they are part of the process.

1. Fred Kundell suggested keeping the faculty informed and involved in the process.
2. Peter Lade suggested, using the USM Mission statement as an example, placing drafts on the web.
3. Beth Barnett responded that unit reports may have conflict with one another and suggested that there be a feedback process in place.

ACTION.

Memorandum. Bryan will send a memo to the unit heads to remind them of gathering information and address their issues for unit reports due on September 29. He will highlight the involvement of key players, professional development of reports, timeframe and the format in which reports should be presented.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Recorder: Deana Karpavage