

## Academic Program Review Council

Minutes of April 26, 2012. 2:30-4:30 pm, Swenson 1007

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

**Guests:** Communicating Arts – Martha Einerson; Brent Notbohm; Keith Berry; Ephraim Nicoli; Sharon Chuzles

The first hour was discussion with Communicating Arts members about APRC's response, and how they will frame their reply. The Chair of Comm Arts expressed a desire for explicit recommendations from APRC, which she felt were lacking. APRC responded that the Council felt handicapped in our ability to assess because many prompts had been either only partially addressed or left the council to 'guess'. Comm Arts indicated they had expected guidance for the future, such as the recommendations from 2003, detailed in the section 1 E, 'Response to the Recommendations Made in the Previous Review'.

Comm Arts then went through APRC's response and sought detailed examples to guide them in their reply to APRC.

Comm Arts asked whether APRC would provide administration with any explanation of the Reviews and what happened during the process as a 'cover letter'. APRC felt this was a good recommendation for all reviews for this period, but indicated again that it is not APRC's role to advise administration, but to forward "*findings, stipulations, suggestions, and observations to the Faculty Senate.*"

Comm Arts indicated they would return their reply by May 7. APRC will make a strong effort to assure their review goes forward to the Faculty Senate on May 15.

### **Review:**

Hour 2 was spent discussing the 'draft' of sections 1 & 2 sent forwarded by Natural Science.

APRC was overall very pleased with the transformation of the document, both in format approach and readability. Specific points:

- The inclusion (not in the SSCI, but derived from old "6-question" format) of a departmental history was helpful in setting the context of the newly merged programs into a single department.
- The 'summary' at the end of the sections is also most helpful
- APRC noted that perhaps too much detail was included, which tended to obscure the question and lull the reader. APRC would prefer (aside from the history) that the department reference only the review period, rather than delving back beyond 10 years.
- The department/programs may want to shorten or tighten their responses. No need to keep including elements of the history.
- APRC noted that some of the responses in sections 1&2 could actually be edited out and placed instead in later sections (such as 'Understanding students and other Stakeholders needs', 'Valuing people' and 'Accomplishing other distinctive objectives').