

## Academic Program Review Council

Minutes of Feb. 23, 2012. 2:30-4:30 pm, Swenson 1007

**Members Present:** Kropid, Li; Stocker; Tucker; Jacobs

**Approval of minutes of Feb 16:** (Kropid/Li)

### **Announcements:**

1. Jacobs noted senate did not receive the timeline. They asked for clarification and modification including next dates for the departments currently under review, and that it be brought forward again in March.
2. Jacobs will communicate with the Chair of senate regarding questions on our role, specifically from our bylaws:
  - a. *The Council shall **review the procedure and policies** in the program audit and review the process. The Council shall **conduct and supervise** the program audit and review process. The Council shall audit all University programs **on a regular basis**. The Council shall **forward its findings, stipulations, suggestions, and observations** to the Faculty Senate for approval. The final recommendation of the Faculty Senate will be transmitted to the vice-chancellor of the university by the chair of the Faculty Senate.*
  - b. *The Council shall receive and react to communications from the Faculty Senate or the Senate Executive Committee.*

At this point, does APRC merely accept the document as is, and report our findings on to Senate, or is our role more editorial, where we give specific direction to the department and ask them to rewrite and resubmit (especially keeping in mind this is already 1+ year over date). This goes back to the nub: What is the real purpose of the review, and where does the council fit into the decision-making process?

**Review:** Discussion of Comm Arts 1&2

**Other:**