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ASC Meeting

Date: Monday, 26 January, 4:00 pm
Location: Vice Chancellor’s Conference Room
Meeting called by: Academic Services Committee (ASC)
Attendees: Bill Pirkle, Carla Coleman, Tieling Chen, Lloyd Dawe, Robert Leach, Gary Senn, Rayito Calderon, Lloyd Dawe, Stephanie Foote, Mike Lemons, Lisa Simmons
Secretary: Carla Coleman

I. The meeting was called to order at 4:00.

II. Minutes from the November 24 meeting were reviewed and approved—with editorial with several changes—by acclamation. A revised version of the minutes will be sent around with the minutes from this meeting.

III. Discussion of bookstore textbook ordering issues as brought up in an email from Steve Millies.

   a. Most members had read the original email from Steve Millies, as well as Heidi’s response. Bill was going to try to schedule a meeting with Heidi and Ginger.

   b. Based on our discussion within the committee, Dr. Millies’ problem (with the number of textbooks ordered) was only one of many concerns. Overall, areas of concern seemed to be:

      i. Wrong editions/editions not requested by instructors being ordered.

      ii. Inadequate numbers being ordered. (The bookstore bases its numbers on previous enrollments, but those are not always accurate, particularly given that fewer classes are now being offered with larger caps. There is also the problem that departments like nursing always know exactly how many students will be in a class each semester, but that may radically change from semester to semester. Thus, past enrollment numbers are not valid.)

      iii. Coursepacks with missing pages.

      iv. A more general problem seems to be that faculty feel as if they are being ignored and their requests are being trumped by bookstore policies and choices. Whether or not it is the reality, that seems to be the perception.
c. Several possible remedies are already in the works:
   
   i. Bill got a response from Ginger that the bookstore is going to try to address these problems, in part, by reviewing enrollments the day after early registration closes and adjusting numbers ordered.

   ii. The bookstore will also check enrollments in the days immediately prior to classes and have additional books over-nighted, if necessary.

   d. We were reminded by Stephanie that some of these problems are the result of the expense the bookstore incurs sending extra books back to publishers. The question was then raised as to which costs more—over-nighting or sending extras back?

   e. This discussion ended with Bill saying that he would schedule a meeting with Heidi and Ginger. All committee members were also supposed to return to their departments and research whether there were other problems, as well.

IV. Discussion of the Review of Computer Services Division

   a. Lloyd took the lead, providing an overview of the rubric now being used in conjunction with the TracDat program and how Mike’s report (which was written according to the “old format”) did and did not conform to that new rubric. He noted that what the faculty on the ASC committee need to do is look at the “Strategies” and “Obstacle” portions of the report and see if we can make any suggestions to Mike.

   b. Many of the issues Lloyd had with the report were more a matter of how things were presented as opposed to actual content. The goal is to eventually make all the reports easily understandable by outside evaluating agencies. For example:

   i. Client Services (Jamie Fields)
      1. “Goals” are written as “Outcomes.”
      2. What’s written as “Objectives” are actually “Strategies” (“Actions Taken”)
      3. What’s not readily identifiable is actual data to support the findings.

   ii. Communications and Hardware Division (Bob Weisner)
      1. Same need to “tweak” terminology and labeling.
      2. Be sure to tie assessment and outcomes more closely and add more specific supporting data.

   iii. Network Systems, Architecture and Infrastructure Division (Michael Casdorph)
      1. Lots of good data included.
      2. Seven “Goals” stated need to be rewritten as “Outcomes.”
      3. “Objectives” need to be relabeled as “Strategies,” “Assessment Measure,” and “Identification of Targets.”
4. All goals on page 3 relate to Compliance—do they need to be separated out? All objectives need assessment measures, so it may be easier to combine objectives rather than try to come up with assessment measures for all existing ones.

c. Mike Lemons’ response to Lloyd’s feedback on the presentation/organization of the report is that the divisions just started doing this current format 2-3 years ago and they keep having the form changed! This makes things rather difficult from his perspective. They do, however, have much of the data needed to support findings and can include it to help with TrackDat.

d. Bill inquired as to the timeline for full implementation of the Trackdat format.

   i. Lloyd said it will be used in full by October 2009 by all administrative and academic units. This year is a transition year, though most administration units have had a workshop on it.

   ii. Mike responded that he doesn’t want to go back and redo his report completely, but will modify it for next year.

   iii. Lloyd’s office will help by pulling info out and highlighting for Mike areas that may need clarification/reworking.

e. Bill noted that he wants us to look at the division’s overall goals (i.e. what, how, how effective). But he’s having a hard time bringing those things out of the current reports. He wondered if the new format would help.

   i. Lloyd’s answer? Yes.

   ii. Mike’s response? His division tends to respond to other program review’s needs, something that doesn’t show up in HIS program review. It tends, instead, to show up on CTC’s reports. In fact, CTC and the Senior Administration (Suzanne Ozment) work on things like “life cycle replacement” of technology. Also, the Monday Group provided input.

f. Bill asked where PacerPrint fits into all of this.

   i. Mike noted that it is not reflected in this report because of timing—it’s too new.

   ii. However, he did provide the update that it seems to be effective in cutting down on the amount of printing being done on campus.

   iii. Some of the problems they’re still trying to resolve relate to student complaints about running out of “free prints,” and the fact that some of the most used printers (like those in the Writing Room) can’t duplex—something students want to do since it saves money.
g. In a related issue, Gary Senn asked about potential concerns at the Help Desk; he wonders whether the division is capturing how students are responding. This was brought about because some people are hearing about a lack of response by student employees.

   i. The potential obstacle in getting more accurate evaluations is a concern over anonymity. Current complaints are associated with specific requests for help, which means that the identity of the complainant may be known.

   ii. Lloyd said that they could set up an anonymous survey.

V. Upcoming meetings (tentatively scheduled, pending confirmation with the parties involved).

   a. Monday, 9 February (focus on the bookstore) at 2:30 in the afternoon (a change from previous meetings).

   b. Monday, 2 March (focus on CSD) at 2:30 in the afternoon (a change from previous meetings).

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm
I. The meeting was called to order at 2:30.

II. Because of the focus on this meeting (the bookstore), discussion of the minutes from the January meeting (which focused on Mike Lemons’ program review) was delayed until our March meeting.

III. Bookstore discussion Overview.

   a. Bill began by stating that there seemed to be two main issues. First was the problem of sufficient copies of textbooks being on the shelves by the first day of class. Second was problems with book ordering, such as correct editions and publishers. (This discussion was focused, in this meeting, on Education and English, though was clearly not restricted to these programs.)

   b. Heidi began with some general comments

      i. Some problems with shortages result from students purchasing from the wrong classes’ books, and in one instance, even with a professor telling students to buy books ordered for another professor’s class.

      ii. The bookstore does its best to notify professors of new editions, difficulty getting the books ordered, switches between publishers, etc.. Sometimes people do fall through the cracks, but other times, the problem may lie in professors not paying attention to email communications from the bookstore (such as the auto returns that are sent when books are first ordered.)

   c. Ginger added that the bookstore has to mediate between student needs and professor needs, and that sometimes professors are not able to see the students’ point of view, but also visa versa.
IV. Elaboration on Bookstore concerns and solutions/actions.

a. In the past the bookstore has based its ordering numbers on two things: the enrollment at the end of pre-registration and historical enrollment numbers. This generally works, but (clearly) not always. As of the Fall 2009 semester, it is going to institute a new protocol: it is going to check enrollment numbers on the last day of regular registration (that which happens just prior to the start of semester) and order books overnight on the next business day. This may not mean books will be on the shelves by the first day of class, but they will generally be there by the end of the first week, if not earlier.

b. Heidi also requested that the Admins of departments be proactive in giving the bookstore a “heads up” if a particular class is expected to have an enrollment significantly different (higher or lower) than it historically has. This is particularly important for the professional schools, like Nursing, which tend to know the exact numbers of students who will be enrolled (numbers dependent upon admissions).

c. Heidi also asked that individual instructors tell her if they would like her to stock texts to which they frequently refer students in the reference section, rather than send them to the textbook section to purchase books ordered for other classes.

d. At the end of this portion of the meeting, Bill summarized actions that the bookstore agreed to take to help ameliorate the textbook situation:

   i. Ginger and Heidi will put out notices to all faculty mid-semester (prior to the ordering period) reminding them of protocol (including the HEOA requirement), expected communications, and ways to avoid potential problems.

   ii. When professors check “most recent edition” but the edition has changed from the previous time ordered, the bookstore staff is going to try to send individual notices to professors, so that they are aware of that change and expected arrival date and can, if necessary, get new instructor editions.

   iii. As discussed earlier, the bookstore is going to check registrations immediately after the last day of registration (prior to the start of the semester) and place additional expedited book orders, when necessary. [Note: Heidi and Ginger wanted to make it clear that they will NOT be ordering books for 100% of enrollment, because a significant number of students are not purchasing from the bookstore. They have records of the past percentages of enrollment that does use the bookstore, and will work from those numbers in order to be cost-effective.]

   iv. The bookstore will attempt to notify professors when insufficient numbers of texts are on the shelves at the start of the semester so that they may adjust their class plans and so that they know that additional texts have been ordered.
V. Comments on overall Pacer Shoppe—Faculty relations

a. Heidi specifically stated, for the record, that “We want to partner with faculty, to be a part of their success.” She lamented the fact that the bookstore does have a difficult relationship with some individual professors, and that some of this ‘bad blood’ predates her involvement. She is doing everything she can to mend relationships and feels that she is making progress. It is an ongoing endeavor, however.

b. She would also like faculty to realize that the Pacer Shop is owned by the university; it is not attempting to gouge students in its mark-up of textbooks, and the store makes every effort to be “diligent” with its monies.

i. Some professors insist that the bookstore should sell books to the students “at cost.” But, this is truly an impossibility.

ii. Money charged for textbooks goes towards paying for the books themselves, for the salaries of essential bookstore employees, for facility maintenance (and recently, renovations), and student scholarships. Thus, they must perform a balancing act of holding costs down for individual students while making their overhead goals.

iii. Heidi equated purchasing from the bookstore as the equivalent of “buying locally,” something that many of the Pacer Shop critics probably make a point of doing.

VI. The newly enacted Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA), book orders and buyback.

a. The HEOA is a Federal law mandating that all adoptions of textbooks be in prior to the beginning of early registration so that students may take textbook costs into account in the registration process, as well as look for less expensive sources for their texts.

b. While 100% compliance is going to be impossible (due to the offering of new courses and the hiring of new professors and instructors), Heidi is not yet sure what the threshold for compliance will be. It will be high, however—probably in the 70%+ range. This means that professors need to take the book order deadline seriously!

c. This deadline is also important because the price students get for their books is based on whether they’ve been re-adopted. When a book is readopted, the bookstore tries to offer students 50% of what they initially paid. When a book is no readopted, that amount is lower. Thus, timely textbooks adoptions help students as well as ensure HEOA compliance.

VII. The next meeting, which will focus on the CSD annual review, is scheduled for Monday, 2 March at 2:30 in the afternoon.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 pm
ASC Meeting

Date: Monday, 2 March, 2009, 2:30 pm

Location: Vice Chancellor’s Conference Room

Meeting called by: Academic Services Committee (ASC)

Attendees: Bill Pirkle, Lisa Simmons, Carla Coleman, Tieling Chen, Robert Leach, Gary Senn, Rayito Calderon, Mike Lemons, Lloyd Dawe, Stephanie Foote

Secretary: Carla Coleman

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:30.

II. Minutes from the January and February meetings were approved, with corrections.

III. The committee continued with a review of Mike Lemon’s unit.
   a. Lloyd prepared a draft letter, which we went over for content (which was fine), grammar and consistency.
   b. Lloyd will correct that letter and forward it on to Mike.

IV. Lloyd questions whether the committee would be interested in a meeting in which he gave us a demo of the new TracDat system. It was decided to wait until the fall, when newly elected members can be included.

V. We set up a date for an end-of-semester April planning meeting, to set an agenda for next year. The date is Monday, 20 April at 2:30.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15.