

## **MFA Committees Evaluation Survey Oct 2006**

Compiled by M Dosch

Average Response for each MFA Committee (1=Strongly Agree, 3 = Neutral, 5=Strongly Disagree)

	q1							
	Student Retention	UG Standards	UG Pgm Review	Grad Stds and retention	Grad Pgm Review	Univ Core Curric	Total	
q2	1.86	1.80	1.75	1.50	1.75	1.33	1.70	
q3	2.29	1.40	1.25	1.50	1.25	1.33	1.59	
q4	2.29	2.00	1.50	2.50	1.50	2.00	2.00	
q5	2.43	1.80	1.25	1.50	1.25	2.00	1.78	
q6	2.29	1.80	2.25	1.75	1.50	1.67	1.93	
q7	2.14	1.60	1.25	1.75	2.00	1.67	1.78	
q8	1.86	1.60	1.50	1.75	1.50	1.33	1.63	
q9	1.86	1.40	1.75	1.50	1.25	1.33	1.56	
q10	2.57	2.20	2.00	3.25	1.75	3.00	2.44	
q11	2.29	1.20	1.00	1.25	1.25	1.33	1.48	
q12	2.43	1.20	1.25	2.00	1.25	1.67	1.70	
q13	2.14	1.40	1.75	1.50	1.25	2.33	1.74	
q14	2.14	1.40	1.50	2.75	1.50	1.33	1.81	
q15	1.86	1.40	1.75	2.75	1.25	1.67	1.78	

2. The meeting frequency was appropriate.
3. The meetings were well-conducted and productive (agenda, minutes, assignments).
4. There were clear committee goals, mission, and purpose.
5. The committee met its goals or set new goals.
6. Members came to the meetings prepared.
7. The committee used data to drive decisions or recommendations.
8. The committee discussed all perspectives openly and looked for creative solutions.
9. The committee was generally able to achieve consensus.
10. The committee and the Faculty Assembly had good communications.
11. The committee chair did an effective job.
12. The committee accomplished something useful to the university community
13. The committee established meaningful deadlines which it lived up to
14. My time spent on this committee was productive
15. The structure of team membership included representation of all relevant groups.

### **Question 16 The one thing the committee did best was:**

#### **Student Retention**

- Write a report that Fr. Stockhausen dropped in our committee's charge in a very short time.
- Tried to find meeting times when most participants could attend. Even with that effort however, regular attendance was rarely achieved so that the continuity of topics of discussion were difficult to maintain from meeting to meeting.
- Define the source of one of the problems it faced.

- The Chair is great. He knows how to run a meeting, keeping the committee on track, and how to build consensus while allowing all views to be heard.

### **Undergrad Standards**

- Standards for Certificates
- Standards for Minors
- Learned (quickly) to work on a variety of proposals set before the committee
- benchmark other typical institutions regarding "the norm" when establishing guidelines for UDM
- The committee was able to adapt to changes of its charge and re-established its priorities
- Developed a large number of significant documents.

### **Undergrad Program Review**

- The committee was very productive.
- Program Review schedule and guidelines.
- to move on some matters that have been talked about for years (ex. creation of minors).
- Researching other university assessment methods and collating these into a working format for UDM

### **Grad Standards and Retention**

- Coordinate effectively with USC.
- Standards/Criteria for Certificates
- Bring in many perspectives in the development of standards and recommendations in a collegial and productive manner.
- Quickly and efficiently develop a structure that allowed for productive use of talent and time.

### **Grad Program Review**

- The GPRC worked well with the UPRC; the committees met jointly for most of last year. This process was quite productive.
- Accomplish its task.
- Program review process and self-study guidelines
- worked together

### **Adjunct**

- *No responses*

## **University Core Curriculum**

- Listen to one another's opinions and viewpoints
- Persistently pursued progress
- To date every member has significantly contributed to the committee. The generation of criteria for subject areas occurred within a relatively short timeframe due to the accumulation and processing data, formatting it, and presenting it in a cognitive manner.

## **Question 17 One thing that needed improvement on this committee was:**

### **Student Retention**

- clearer goals. We spent a great deal of time just getting a basic understanding of student retention.
- The committee never seemed to have a clear direction and understanding of what its role was supposed to be. The committee chair did not really facilitate the development of clear goals for the committee to research and respond to.
- NA
- I felt we met too often, especially during the summer, my off-term. It appeared to me as though we were trying to make-up for lost time because the UDM administration dragged its feet on Governance for 10 years.

### **Undergrad Standards**

- Meetings weren't always long enough. One hour, once a month doesn't always accomplish a lot.
- Perhaps, one or two more faculty members to augment the breadth of discussions
- Some of the committee's charge overlaps with the graduate standards committee, and we worked to minimize redundancy and be informed of what the other group was doing, but perhaps more could be done in this regard.
- With the clearing house established, the confusion over the committee's duties is resolved
- Really can't think of anything--perhaps spreading the work load around a little more???

### **Undergrad Program Review**

- Much of our work was done jointly with the Graduate Program Review Committee (e.g. deciding on the process for program review). It would be

more effective to have one committee with undergraduate and graduate representation.

- The number of meetings.
- Some members are continuously absent.

### **Grad Standards and Retention**

- Feedback from MFA re status of proposals submitted.
- It took at least half the year to figure out the name of the committee and what the charges were. There was confusion about the "retention" part and which committee it belonged to
- Clearer specification by the MFA of the range of the committee's actual responsibilities.
- Better communication from the Clearinghouse, MFA, and administration would have allowed the committee to be informed of actions in a timely manner.

### **Grad Program Review**

- There was -- and will continue to be -- a tremendous amount of work for both committees to accomplish. I think that there should be some formal provision for their continuing cooperation through MFA.

### **Adjunct**

- *No responses*

### **University Core Curriculum**

- Perhaps more structure
- Central meeting place with access to internet and copier
- The committee has re-established a better timeline scenario that is based on last semester's productivity.

## **Question 18. Please provide any other comments on your committee.**

### **Student Retention**

- We need to continue to work with more members participating.
- Few members attended on a regular basis or frequently enough to understand all the committee's work.
- It may have been helpful to have a wider representation of faculty from various colleges, the majority of faculty came from the science curriculums, 3 out of 4 I believe. There was no representation from CHP or College of Business

- I have a cynical view after seeing the workings of shared Governance at UDM. I feel that I am spending a lot of time on Governance, but my input is not important to the decision making process. For example, the faculty of the College of Engineering and Science were told that they had approved laptop computers for everyone. When I asked my dean how was this possible since there was not faculty deliberation of voting, I was informed that the department Chairs (which are appointed by the dean) had voted on our behalf. If this is governance, then why am I spending my time on Governance when I could be writing instructional materials, conducting scholarly research, or writing grant proposals?

### **Undergrad Standards**

- As a committee member in a non-leadership role on the committee it seemed like there wasn't a lot of communication back to the committee on issues that had been proposed. Some people knew things and others didn't about the status of items and how they had been modified.
- The Chair did a brilliant job
- I continue to be impressed by our productivity--we accomplished a lot!

### **Undergrad Program Review**

- The Chair has kept the Committee focused.
- The workload for this Committee is huge and promises to get worse when Program Review reports start to come in

### **Grad Standards and Retention**

- Every college/school with a graduate program should be represented. Out of 5 elected faculty, 3 were from CLAE, as was Dean Marske (ex officio).
- There has never been any feedback from the MFA on student satisfaction issues that were sent forward
- The committee worked very well together and was very efficient in their work. The committee has recommended that an online tracking system be implemented so all constituencies can follow the progress of policies etc through the review process. Something similar to the system used by the ITS helpdesk might be considered.

### **Grad Program Review**

- Both Marie-Lise and Liz provided excellent leadership to the committees.

### **Adjunct**

- *No responses*

## **University Core Curriculum**

- We have a committee comprised of dedicated faculty members who are working hard to improve the quality of education for our students.