Academic Program Review Council

Minutes of Feb. 16, 2012. 2:30-4:30 pm, Swenson 1007

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

Approval of minutes of Feb 9: Feb 9: (Kropid/Li)

Announcements:

- Jacobs will take new timeline to senate executive council for discussion of the process, and then to Senate.

Review: Discussion of HHP sections 5&6

Other: Discussion of the new program review template.

- What seems minor but makes a big difference is that the ad hoc committee separated the guidelines from the template.
- In the guidelines, they fleshed out the timeline, and included a better explanation of the importance/purpose of Review.
- The ad hoc committee put a better definition section in the guidelines, which helps with the AQIP language that comes out of the HLC assessment academy.
- The Provost took out the requirement that ALL depts/programs should have an external reviewer, since finding someone who could deal with our unique dept blends is nearly impossible (plus, it was $500, which was barely enough for 1 program)
- In the program review *template*, they separated the DEPT from the PROGRAM
- They added an executive summary section that deals with DEPT planning.
    - In order to make more transparent the relationship between activities, the section asking questions about strategic planning was moved up the document from part 6 up to Part 3 and addressed at the Dept level.
- Later, they also clarify where they are asking the *dept* alignment to the U mission, vs *program* alignment.
- They also clarified that while *some* information should be written at the Dept level, the majority is programmatic (Eri in particular goes crazy trying to distinguish between programs, comprehensive majors, major/minors, etc).
- The ad hoc committee also expanded the questions (for example, "Response to Recommendations Made in Prior Review". was merely "identify recommendations from the Depts last review, assessment and strategic plan and the actions taken." This is now 4 targeted questions).

More work needed:

- Some of the tweaking that still needs to occur relates to structural directions. For instance, programs using the old SSCI would neglect to tell APRC which program was 'speaking', or even address each question in the same program order (HBJD always indicated SW, Psyc, etc).

- Depts are trying to copy/paste chunks out of other documents to answer questions, so there is no clear narrative. They are just trying to answer questions, and not thinking about how they link together. Part of that is a structural issue carrying over from WEAVE.

- Beyond the structural element, what seemed obvious to the creators of the Program Review just doesn't seem clear to the Departments writing their reviews, and I'm not sure that has changed. Some of the broader questions APRC is now asking (although we haven't formalized them into coherent thoughts yet) are:

- Depts really struggle when asked to say how they are 'unique' in relation to the campus. For instance, sciences told me, 'we're science, we have always been in universities, we aren't literature'. HHP was not able to articulate how their curriculum bumps up to areas like psychology, education, and science.

- APRC is considering a 'signature' page that includes each program, rather than just the Chair, so we know people have had the opportunity to see it (since it's clear that some chairs are writing without input)

- Programs are not READING what the sections are to include. They do not understand "Other Distinctive Objectives", and keep returning to their curriculum