

APRC Minutes March 25 2019

Attendance: Jacobs; Rust; Rappley-Larson: Mainali; Bustos

**Motion:** To approve Social Inquiry request to delay submission of Program Review until Fall 2019. (Rappley-Larson/Rust). Discussion: Due to misinformation regarding chair rotation within the department, messages from APRC to the department were not understood as advisement of pending report. Additionally, the suspensions of Oct 30, 2017 significantly affected the programs of Social Inquiry and the department is still in the midst of determining the future of their programs. Approved unanimously. Rappley-Larson will convey the official approval to the department chair.

**Template and Scheduling Discussion:** Confusion regarding who to contact has been a continuing problem for APRC. The Council determined that in future the best route would be to notify the entire department, with explicit advisement that each program is responsible for completing all APR prompts for their program, while the department chair or designee shall write an executive summary response from the Department as a whole.

APRC still needs to determine how to transition departments to the new 4-year rotation schedule for submissions.

APRC discussed the challenges for 2019-20 submissions from the Education Department given current issues facing those programs, namely: retirement of 2 key graduate faculty in spring 2019; new Chair of the department; shifting programs from D2L to Canvas learning management system for summer/fall release; and changing requirements of WI Department of Public Instruction (DPI), especially changes in requirements for secondary ed programs and licensures. APRC discussed requesting approval from Senate to allow Education to submit DPI reports/external accreditation in lieu of completing APRC's template, along with a few targeted questions to address any gaps between DPI documentation and APRC's local prompts. Such an accommodation was recently approved for Music.

APRC is still challenged by the inability to communicate to departments the potential consequences of late submission or other non-compliance with Program Review schedules and requirements. APRC has no ability to put a 'bad checkmark'. Seek further input from Chancellor, Provost, Planning & Budgetary Council, Senate Executive on the purpose of the report from each of their perspectives. How do they use the information (for example, in making decisions regarding suspensions), and what further reporting or decisions do they make based on completed reviews? What are the consequences at the System level? Recognition that APRC also needs time to complete its review, potentially request further information, allow for department secondary response, and complete the review cycle prior to the end of the academic year. Should APRC write a formal letter to non-compliant departments, copied to Senate and Administration, notifying the department of potential consequences, including the potential for Administration to make budgetary decisions that negatively affect the program in lieu of sufficient information?

APRC then returned to discussion of the submission of Natural Sciences department.