COBA Steering Committee Meeting
November 12, 2004

Minutes

Present:  Swaminathan Badrinath
          Jim Beatty
          Chee Chow
          Fred Raafat
          Massoud Saghafi
          Howard Toole
          Bob Wilbur

Excused:  Gail Naughton

1. Jim Beatty, Chair, called the meeting of the Steering Committee to order at 1:10pm on November 12, 2004, in the Dean’s Conference Room.

2. The minutes of the October 22, 2004, meeting were moved, seconded, and approved (unanimous) with minor editorial changes.

3. The meeting agenda for November 12, 2004 was reviewed and approved.

4. The Committee evaluated four curriculum proposals from the Marketing Department, and 16 curriculum proposals from the HTM program. In the ensuing discussion, it was noted that there seems to be a lack of CBA oversight or active involvement in the management of the HTM program, despite its being a joint program between the CBA and the College of Professional Studies. Since curriculum proposals submitted to the Steering Committee had already been approved by the HTM administrators and faculty, the Steering Committee felt that it had little grounds for denying them. All 20 proposals were subsequently approved.

5. The Committee then noted the desirability of more pro-active engagement by the CBA administration and faculty in its joint programs, such as HTM and the IB program. The Committee noted that there may be many developmental opportunities in these joint programs.

6. The Committee further noted the desirability of having selected Strategic Planning task forces examine the proper role of the CBA’s joint programs, including their roles in the overall CBA structure and their relations with the CBA. It was suggested that the undergraduate programs task force and the structure/governance task force may be especially appropriate for this undertaking.

7. The Committee discussed the journal ranking project.
(a) It was noted that the finance department had expressed concern about how to deal with faculty publications in journals that are not on the list. The suggestion was made that the Executive Committee pay attention to this matter, and that one approach is to establish some type of objective jury process to handle such cases when they arise.

(b) Bob Wilbur reported that the Chairs have completed their part of the process. Their current set of rankings/ratings will be sent to all faculty members for their reaction and feedback. After finalizing the rankings, the Chairs will draft a proposal regarding use of the rankings/ratings. There will be opportunities for discussion as it is deemed very important to develop consensus on this matter.

(c) Fred Raafat expressed the sentiment that a lot of time and effort have been expanded on the rating/ranking of journals, and the benefits may not justify the costs. Bob Wilbur explained the motivation for the project. He noted that the initial set of intellectual contributions standards was very much driven by the impending AACSB accreditation. With that behind us, the standards are becoming part of the basis for decision making, such as the allocation of assigned time. In the process of evaluating individual faculty members’ intellectual contributions, it became obvious that there was considerable variation among individuals in how they rated given journals. There also was the issue of ensuring comparability and equity across departments, as well as for credible communication outside of the CBA, such as in the retention and promotion process. Bob emphasized that use of the journal ratings in resource allocation is far from being a rigid formula, with adequate room being allowed for different mixes of activities and aspirations.

(d) Badri Swaminathan acknowledged the list’s potential usefulness for communications with the College. But he also admonished that there may be a down side to a CBA approved journal ranking/rating list for communications with entities outside the College. In particular, he suggested that CBA faculty may be disadvantaged if they are seen by members of the University Retention and Promotion Committee as only publishing in “B” journals. He stressed the importance of developing faculty buy-in to the journal rankings/ratings.

8) The Committee noted that if journal ratings are formally done as an input into resource allocation and other College decisions, then a system should also be developed for formally rating teaching and
service contributions as well. It was noted that these issues be suggested to the Strategic Planning task forces.

9) Badri Swaminathan reported that he is continuing to work with Bob Capettini to prepare for a meeting with the President. They already have collected a lot of information on such topics as student/faculty ratios across departments and colleges of the University, and will seek similar data from our peer and aspirant schools. They will seek further inputs from the faculty either towards the end of the current semester or at the beginning of the next semester to finalize the contents of their presentation.

10) Committee members reported on the activities of the Strategic Planning task forces that they have been asked to “shepherd.” There was considerable variation among the task forces, with one having already met four times and one having met only once. In particular:

(a) Fred Raafat reported that the structure/governance task force had serious reservations about the feasibility and desirability of designing these aspects of the College without guidance from a strategic plan. Members of the Steering Committee acknowledged the desirability of having structure be guided by strategy, but noted that regardless of the strategy finally adopted, a high proportion of the faculty and governance issues will likely be the same. Thus, the structure and governance task force might first work on these issues. Then, as the other task forces make progress, the structure and governance task force might build on this foundation.

(b) Badri Swaminathan reported that some members of the undergraduate programs task force considered it unrealistic to ask for a SWOT analysis and the rest of the “deliverables” in the Steering Committee’s charges to each task force. The Committee acknowledged the very tight time line, but suggested the possibility of adjusting the depth of one’s analysis to the amount of time available. The Committee also discussed the importance of completing a College strategic plan by May of 2005. This is due to President Weber’s plan to initiate a university-level development effort at that time. The College can be very much disadvantaged by the lack of such a plan.

11) Fred Raafat reported that Professor Kotaro Nakamura of our architecture faculty, who is working for us pro bono, has produced a set of final drawings for our proposed room for retired faculty. The next step is to have Bob Wilbur meet with Tony Fulton to obtain cost and
time estimates. The Committee again affirmed the desirability of the room for both retired and current faculty as a place for collegial interaction.

12) The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.