

Faculty Advisory Council

May Minutes

Date: 10 May 2005

Time: 8:30 – 9:45

Place: Horovitz Building, La Bonte Board Room

Present: Jean-Mathieu Essis (SHSS), Frank De Piano (Academic Affairs), Morton Diamond (HPD/CAHN), Jan Faust (CPS), Stan Hannah (FSEHS), Wendy Hupp (HPD/CDM), and Leanne Lai (HPD/COP).

Absent: Donald Antonson* (HPD/CDM), Robert Casady (HPD/CMS), Jonathan Coffman (HPD/MED), Melanie Crandall (HPD/OPT), Veljko Dragojlovic (OSC), Alexandra Espejo (HPD/Optometry), Joshua Feingold (FCAS), George Fornshell (GSCIS), Mark Glover (HPD/COP), Marliese Hogan (FSEHS), Sean Kennan (OC), Mike Masinter (Law), Michael Patterson (HPD/COM), Bob Preziosi (Huizenga), Anne Rambo (SHSS), Marlisa Santos (FCAS), Ken Seger (HPD/OPT), Fran Tetunic (Law), Lenore Walker (CPS), and Pan Yatrakis (Huizenga).

* Emailed to report scheduling conflict

1. Approval of 10 May Minutes

2. Faculty Club—Jan Faust, Wendy Hupp, and Frank De Piano

Dr. Jan Faust met with the Executive Director of OHR, Sharon Fredda, to discuss the Faculty Club survey. It was decided that the survey would be distributed to approximately 600 full time faculty to determine their interest in a faculty club.

3. Faculty Symposium—Morton Diamond

Dr. Diamond announced that the Spring Faculty Symposium will be held on 19 May at the Alvin Sherman Library. Professor Johnny C. Burris will speak on the “The Supreme Court: Reality and Myth in Law, Politics, and American Culture.”

4. FAC Web Site Modifications—Stan Hannah

Ms. Melisa Haggerty has been asked to modify the web site so that it will be easier for faculty members to submit their questions, comments, or suggestions. No changes to the web site will be made until the council reviews the modified web pages.

5. Changing Role of the FAC—Frank De Piano

Dr. De Piano provided a succinct overview of the current procedures, practices, and goals of the Academic Review Committee which are summarized below:

- a. An Internal Review Committee, consisting of internal and external faculty members, is recommended by the program and appointed by the ARC.
- b. The data collected by the program's self-study will be reviewed by the Internal Review Committee to evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, and needs of the program.
- c. An external consultant will be brought in to critique the review of the majors and the IRC reports; the external consultant then summarizes his findings in a report to the President.
- d. The Academic Review Committee reviews the information and focuses on the three key issues that must be present in a quality program: the design of the curriculum, the quality of the faculty, and the quality of the students.
- e. The Academic Review Committee prepares an action-oriented document for the President.
- f. The President then discusses with the respective Dean the strengths and weaknesses of the program; the President then asks the Dean to prepare an action plan that will address how the program can be improved.
- g. The Academic Review Committee reviews the action plan and reports back to the President.

At present 24 programs have either been reviewed or are being reviewed. As a result, there is a large and growing pool of information being generated about the overall quality of NSU's academic programs. However, the analysis of this information has focused solely on individual programs. Dr. De Piano suggested that it was time to go beyond program evaluation by looking at the strengths and weaknesses across the university. Such a meta-analysis would provide a powerful tool for detecting common themes and key issues that affect the entire university.

Since the Faculty Advisory Committee represents the academic interests of all of the academic units, the FAC is in an ideal position to carry out the meta-analysis. This analysis would consider key issues such as: a. Where do we invest our money? b. What needs to be improved? and c. What are NSU's

academic priorities? The information generated by the ARC on the individual programs would be analyzed by the council members and then the FAC would develop university-wide recommendations for improving the academic quality of all NSU programs.

The second role of the FAC would be to review the data collection and analysis and seek ways to improve the process. Because the university is undergoing major changes, it seems likely that the evaluation procedures will need to undergo continuous improvement.

Most of all, the FAC would be able to make sure that the faculty perspective is represented in the review process. The expertise of the FAC makes it the logical group to advise the President about where the university should focus its efforts to improve academic quality and what areas should receive high priorities.

In effect, this new and challenging role will allow the FAC to utilize the expertise of its members to provide a balanced and pragmatic advice on NSU's long-term commitment to academic excellence.

The main topic of the June meeting will be to discuss practical steps that the council needs to take to achieve this new role. Given the importance of this new mission, all FAC members are encouraged to bring their ideas and expertise to the June meeting.

6. Since the time limit for the meeting had expired, the following topics were deferred until the June meeting:

- a. Role of the FAC in Scholarship Awards;
- b. Copyright Procedures;
- c. Liaison with University Research Committee; and
- d. FAC Attendance/Meeting Day Conflicts.