Academic Program Review Council

Minutes of Nov. 18, 2011 meeting, Swenson 2005

Attendance: Jacobs; Li; Stocker; Tucker (Kropid excused, but arrived late)

1. Minutes of of Nov. 4, 2011 approved (Stocker/Li)
2. Announcements:
   a. Jacobs distributed draft from Natural Sciences (electronically), and asked for feedback.
   b. Jacobs noted that APRC members had received an electronic progress report from Comm Arts. They anticipate completion by January 15, 2012.
   c. Jacobs also reported that she met with Chair of HHP. Carlson informed APRC that he hopes to complete the review within the next few weeks.
3. Election of secretary. Jacobs referred to the bylaws that indicate election of a secretary. Tucker indicated she believed that Kropid had volunteered; but since Kropid was not in attendance, no action was taken.
4. Discussion of Natural Sciences draft document. The draft is very incomplete. Council members indicated the draft is far too cursory. The department needs to update the mission, and include all programs. "They [natural sciences] just copied language straight out of the catalog" rather than indicating that any planning is occurring, and don't address the questions in the SSCI at all. Members noted there was a total lack of information for large portions, while areas that were covered need to be significantly fleshed out. They asked Jacobs to send the draft back to the department.
5. Discussion of proposed changes to the SSCI from the ad hoc committee (distributed electronically prior to meeting), and of the more detailed flowchart generated by Stocker.
   - Does the department align with the University mission?
   - Does each program fit the mission of the department?
   - Has the department provided/developed Learning Outcomes?
   - Is there evidence of some assessment plan?
   - Is there alignment between LELGS of the program and the campus?
   - How do the programs show capstone experience?
     o There needs to be a new Appendix asking for this data: How does the program use the data, and how does the Council indicate we value the data received?
   - **Flowchart** now indicates a date of Oct of Year 2 for submission of document to APRC
   - The ad hoc committee inserted a meeting between APRC and the Chair of department(s) under review sometime between Nov. 1 and Feb 15, for discussion, clarification, etc.
   - APRC will then send Council's formal response to the Department and to Programming & Budgetary Review Council for review by March 31.
   - Stocker also pointed out the addition of language in the flowchart and Review Guidelines that show the circular and continuous nature of the Integrated Planning cycle

– to indicate that the Program Review is a useful tool and necessary for campus planning.

Questions for the Ad Hoc committee:

- Is there a significance to 7 'falls' of data? (As opposed to years?)
- Some data sets seem to include spring; but do they also include summer?

The Council concluded that we should adapt the original 6 questions* alongside the SSCI for evaluating the current round of program reviews, but that our 'other' job is to develop a better set of questions. The SSCI, even in its current modified state, is still asking questions that do not necessarily fit the profile of our campus or our departments and programs.

The biggest steps our campus has taken are with regards to assessment and the LELGs. That structure and language needs to be explicit in the description and evaluation of all programs. We need to reinforce the value of the process and consequently the validity of the work of the department/programs under review. There needs to be a clear focus for the overall review.

*1. What are the department's purposes?
 2. By what means does the department accomplish its goals?
 3. Is the department accomplishing its goals?
 4. Can the department continue to accomplish its goals?
 5. What new purposes is the department to address in the next five years?
 6. How will the department continue to improve in quality?
 (APRC then adds areas of special recognition and Council recommendations)