PRESENT: Professors, S. Grossman, C. Staecher, S. Bachelor, M. Pagano, J. Yarrington (Chair), C. Gannett and Dean N. Solomon
Visiting: Professor Joan Van Hise, Accounting

REGRETS: Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs P. Fitzgerald, Professors C. Scheraga, W. Kohli, and S. Phelan

1. Approval of Revised minutes from 2/17/11
   Simple editorial corrections made by Professor J. Yarrington.
   Professor S. Grossman moved to accept as amended. Approved unanimously.

2. Presentation cancelled for Masters in Early Childhood Education with Initial Certification.

3. Budget Committee Report from Professors S. Phelan and C. Scheraga. (Deferred as neither Phelan nor Scheraga were present.)
   There was some discussion of another joint meeting with the Budget Committee in the near future. Dean N. Solomon was asked by Chair J. Yarrington to provide a summary of the current budget status as presented at the last Deans and Directors Meeting. Dean Solomon stated that there is the prospect of moving from a possible deficit of 2 million for the next fiscal year to being in the black if the projection of 950 first-year students for next year is actualized. Parking fees will be more strictly enforced and some parking fees will be higher. There are proposed cuts of approximately $225,000 in divisional costs, including cuts in stipends. All of the proposed elements of the budget were reviewed by Board of Trustees last week.

   Also, the Endowment assumed payout of 5% in the past. Now the budget will assume 4.75% for next year to be safe. In the future, it will assume only 4% --which should provide more revenue for investment back into the Endowment for future growth.

   Dean Solomon also noted that VPAA P. Fitzgerald reported Financial Aid would be re-apportioned from 90% need and 10% merit to 80% need and 20% merit. An econometric model will be utilized to provide for more students for same amount.
4. EPC record keeping and review of Programs – S. Grossman

Professor S. Grossman raised the matter of the EPC’s role in program review and ongoing documentation. She used the example of the meeting in December for New Media Review, asking whether the EPC has a direct role in evaluating the new program, once it is in place. She would like to know whether anyone is reviewing new programs in any systematic way to ensure their vitality. She reminded the members present that the Faculty Handbook identifies one of the roles of the EPC is “To evaluate the present status and viability of schools and institutes.”

Professor Grossman checked with the School of Nursing on their new programs, and is wondering if regular reports need to be made? Professor Yarrington noted from the Dean’s Council Meeting Minutes (March 2) that Dean Crabtree wants to revive program review queue system noting that many programs have not been reviewed since their conception and the College of Arts and Sciences need to undertake programmatic review on a more regular cycle.

During a general discussion, questions were asked about whether different schools do reviews differently because they are subject to other kinds of accreditation? Is the program review question just a CAS thing? Do we have to review programs? How often? What do the reviews look like? Whose responsibility should it be? What is its purpose? Is it to ensure vitality?

Professor C. Staeckler, a math department faculty member, reported that, prompted by the CAS Dean’s Office, the Math Department underwent external review just last week for its undergraduate programs.

It was shared that Interdisciplinary Programs will be the first to be reviewed. Latin American Studies External Consultants will come in the fall. Programs are interested in defining what are “the deliverables.” Indeed, The Dean’s Office has requested a clear set of educational goals and methods of assessment for all departments.

The Committee agreed that we need to check in with the Dean’s Office about the list of programs up for review and make sure we have any guidelines on the review process. Perhaps we need to check with all of the Deans? Members of the Committee also suggested that the EPC could just read the final review reports, while others noted that EPC is the place to consider the future/planning before the review heads to Academic Council. Thus, our charge would be only advisory/consultative about planning – not periodic evaluation. Whatever the role of the EPC, some committee needs to review the outcomes of the new programs. Professor Yarrington will meet with SVPAA P. Fitzgerald to go over the program review issues and report back.
5. Closing of the MS-Taxation Program

Visiting: Professor Joan Van Hise, Department Chair, Accounting
Packet (sent as attachments):

Professor Van Hise stated that the MST Program requires an academically qualified TAX faculty to be accredited but the department could not find one to hire. The program has instructors to teach in it, but not someone to run it. Therefore, the Department has decided to focus on the MSA—there is strong enrollment and better use of resources. Students can do several tax courses if they like. Also, the MSA has shown greater growth than the MST. Both the department and graduate faculty agree this is a good choice.

Accreditation metrics that AASCB uses requires a certain percentage of participating (full-time) and supporting (part-time) faculty: we are clearly not meeting the standards. They have only 22% full time faculty.

Dean Solomon explained how difficult it is to get the right kind of person and confirms that we are not competitive in this area. It is better to wind it down over three years. For the current students, we have already offered applicants the opportunity to change their degree to the new program. Professor Yarrington noted that everyone is heading in this direction any way.

Professor Van Hise mentioned that students also can get a Certificate of Advanced Study in Taxation. The program used to be for the mid-level business student, but firms are now telling students to do MBA or the MSA. Also, the MSA program has a very high exam pass rate for the CPA EXAM. We have talked to all the students about these changes, as well as big four firms, and several regional firms. All are supportive of this change, even if they might want the MST name.

Professor Yarrington stated that it was a good idea to check with all the firms. Dean Solomon mentioned that the MS TAX Programs tend to be rare. Most schools our size would not offer one. Professor Van Hise mentioned that they wanted more integration: most tax people are too specialized, too narrow in their orientation to teach other kinds of courses. This is a niche or boutique program: if you hire someone just for that—doesn’t make sense. There was
a unanimous affirmative vote. The minutes, once approved, will be sent on to Academic Council with a cc to Professor Hise.

7. Topics for April 14 meeting

1) Report from March 31st Board Meeting
2) Vote on CUC motion(s) concerning the status of and recommendations for University College (pending outcome of CUC April 5th and UCC meetings)
3) First Year Residential and Sophomore Living and Learning Update Visiting – Dean Boquet and Joe DeFeo They will make a status report on both initiatives.
4) Masters in Early Childhood Education with Initial Certification Proposal - Emily Smith, Chair, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, GSEAP

8. Possible Future Topics –

Development of MA hybrid programs (English, Philosophy) – P. Bayers
Course fees – E. Petrino
MML discussion – R. Crabtree

Note: There is a contingency for a meeting in May. The date is not set yet. It may be after the semester ends and before graduation.

Professor M. Pagano moved to adjourn. Professor Staeckler seconded. Adjourned 4:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Professor Cinthia Gannett, Recording Secretary