Academic Program Review Council

Minutes, January 18, 2019 9 am – 11 a.m.

Attendance: Daniel Rust; Bhesh Mainali; Laura Jacobs. Excused: Pamela Bustos; Mimi Rappley-Larson

Invited: Provost Smith; Dean Anand; Chair of Planning & Budgeting Council. None of the invitees were able to attend. PBC Chair sent support for shortening of the review period and PBC's continued role in the overall review process.

Discussion: Shared governance – aligning Program Review, PBC and budgeting

These are referenced again at the point at which they are found in the Timeline & Template.

Time between reviews: 4 years = enough to develop plans out and to assess or at least see if direction is working.

Make the step of PBC consultation more deliberate.

Take Provost/Dean out of intermediary review (while they use the information for decisions, it is not the sole factor. They (or their predecessors) have been consulted about what information is helpful in their decision-making process, but they do not need to weigh in on the review itself.

Q: Does Senate vote, or merely 'receive/accept'? Trust is the foundation of the Councils, whose members are elected from among the entire faculty. If Senate were to step in on the decision, there could theoretically be personal or interdepartmental conflicts.

Q: What is the purpose of 'student demand for major'? Until students experience a course, they may have no idea if they are interested, since curricula at HS may be very slim. Is this information a program is likely to have?

Q: What exactly is the purpose of 'employer demand for a major'? This assumes 1) employers know their own needs 4+ years in advance; 2) employers know what curriculum is useful to their needs; 3) faculty know what employers expect that are directly tied to their major; 4) there is some 'master source' for the information. The NACE Report that is listed as a source for this information is dated and therefore reflects current time rather than future outlook. Even if employers know that in 4 years they will need employees with x major, or set of skills, it is not enough time to alter curriculum to meet those needs. The Report must be purchased; does IE already hold a copy? The Report may not define a 'major' in the same configuration or way that it presented on our campus (Comm; Writing are 2 examples). Additionally, it reflects national demand, which may not apply to the local population, or help our campus provide students with a degree that will allow them to stay in WI (and thereby meet System measures). If we keep the question at all, would it be better to ask what the faculty know through connections in their community? Should it instead ask questions about how they use feedback from an Advisory Board to tailor their programs? Because our curriculum 'matches'? What about jobs that do not yet exist, or that may disappear? Is this question something Administration should be asking of marketing or some other unit? Finally, is this review trying to address the success of students in the past 4 years, or predict the future employment outlook for students? (Or both?)

I.D. – how broad or narrow should this be? We try to simplify the template so the report is less onerous; but are there places with too little explanation?

II. What assessment do we want to see from a department? We don't want individual student evals of a course, but rather know about satisfaction or recommendations regarding the entire program. We acknowledge that students don't know 'the field' until later; but is there value in asking at various levels, or taking input into consideration to modify curriculum? If we ask 'what is the program's PROCESS', we may get simplistic answers of "we meet and talk." How likely are we to be given a truthful explanation of, "each faculty teaches their own sub-discipline and we don't interfere"? Does the program compare relative student success? (ex: in teacher ed, DPI issues standards of what a future teacher should be able to do, and measures based on the # of students who pass a test.) What about programs that don't have some sort of external standard by which to measure 'success'?

Point by Point Review of 2016-17 Program Review Timeline & Template

Pg 3 Timeline: (Note: Year 1 refers to year of notice to department to prepare a report; year 2 is year of submission to APRC and subsequent review actions.)

- YEAR 1 - Box 1, August/Sept: Do departments still get data from IE? Add reference to PBC Dashboard?
- Box 2, Year 1: edit to 4 years.
- YEAR 2 - Box 3, By Oct 1 of Year 2: remove reference to 'modify for fall vs spring. *We would now have at least 3 submissions/year. How will we decide order and dates we want submitted for timely review? Dates in subsequent boxes below refer to latest dates for last program, rather than defining dates for each separate review.
- Box 4, 'Between Nov and Feb': may be confusing to departments and doesn't match practice for actual submissions. These refer to questions Council has for program, not questions by departments about the template. Do we want Chairs to submit in person to the Council? Do we want them to attend when we have questions, or does email suffice?
- Box 5 'By March 31': Should PBC be asked for any comment before final review sent back to the Department, rather than after? The Provost/Dean should not be involved/copied.
- Box 6 'By April 15': Department/programs may respond to our comments. See box 5 for PBC
- Box 7 'By April 30': Submission of entire packet to Faculty Senate for RECEIPT/ACCEPTANCE (need to clarify that with Exec?). Should senate forward to Provost & Dean, rather than APRC?
- Box 8 ' Final packet goes to Strategic Planning Team': Is this still the appropriate send? Does it need to match up with some other budgeting cycle or not?

Pg 4-5 Data Reference Chart:

This chart describes what data is needed to complete the review, and where it applies within the template. Reference to 'new/exists' can be removed, as these were checkboxes for the Council, not applicable to the programs.

- Do we insert PBC Dashboard references here?
- Box "Student demand for Major". Council wonders how this is actually useful.

- Last box, "Employer Demand for Major" references external NACE Job Outlook Report. This is a 'pay for' source. Does IE purchase this report? Why/how is it of value? Is there a better (local knowledge) source?

Self-Study Template

- I.Mission & Program Goals: (**Pg 7)**
  - D - "What collaborations exist...": Add "or across System" to capture collaborative programs and initiatives (including emerging initiatives like Freshwater University). Collaborations between programs could mean sharing a course that meets criteria for multiple degrees, rather than teaching separately (e.g., statistics, biology/physiology). More detail could be provided in other sections relative to U Studies or Core courses. (Note: important we are using same iteration of template, as slightly older version confused programs who believed they were being asked how – for example – undergraduate chemistry at UW-S differed from offerings at Stout or other UW.)
- II.Teaching & Learning:
  - D: Teaching Effectiveness **(pg 8)**
    - 1. Student Evaluation: We should have a mandatory eval before a grade will be submitted. If the eval is about the course not the individual, and the intent is to improve the class, it shouldn't be an issue. You want to know did people learn what they were expected to learn.
    - 2. Effectiveness of Instructors: Is this truly a useful question? Not all 'programs' even have a 2nd faculty. This also becomes problematic when associated with 'review' of instructional academic staff. Is there any requirement to 'observe' online instructors/adjuncts? How would methods be compared?
- III.Program Resources (We skimmed over this section, only briefly discussed during meeting)
  - C: Technology, Library, and Other Resources. This section often downplayed, or simply answered as 'adequate'.
    - For 1), in an unrelated department meeting, it was noted that a class had expectation for ability to work during class time, but that it wasn't assigned to a lab, and that labs were usually not available/already scheduled. This is the sort of issue that should come up, but doesn't.
    - For 2), only externally accreditation ever consults regarding library resources. From the library perspective, there are problems with non-consultation, especially if a program is in a System collaboration. Is there a way to emphasize this?)
- IV.Program Productivity. **(Pg 9)**
  - A.Graduation, Retention, Enrollment & Credit Hour Production. This section aligns with PBC Dashboard. Please refer to the appropriate numbers (maybe we can put them at the end of each question).
    - Q: Council still needs to provide a section where programs may explain/justify transfer credit hours implications...we need average # credits coming in, and we can't change their total if we still have to assure appropriate training. This also applies to transferring out...

- - - 2, Enrollment Goals – "provided in Department Annual Report". No longer have annual report? Going back to annual report, or are these now in the PBC Dashboard?
    - "4, …Enroll fewer than minimum of 10 students per section." Q: Is this still correct? Some areas will never meet this, although the entire program is sustained (specialized courses, e.g., math education – secondary ed). There ARE exceptions.
  - B.Demand Analysis. **(Pgs 9-10)** Even the Section Title isn't quite right – Is Program Review about recruiting? How do students do well in the 4 years, and how do we help them complete on time, find a career? Departments/programs don't do 5 year projections of potential students in the field nation wide. For example in EDU, DPI makes projections and makes changes to requirements for teachers, which then filters to EDU teacher prep programs. Faculty can't study the prior 5 years and make inferences. Does PBC have some role here?
    - 1-Review SACT/ACT and analyze demand. This doesn't address our students where they are, and provide support to succeed. Students don't seem to have college prep – so what are we doing to meet students where they are, and support them, rather than wishing they were something else. How will your program develop the students so they can meet the goal of completing a degree. Once here, what do they need? 'Analyzing demand' is not a faculty report. We take who comes in the door: once here, how do we communicate what they could do with the major? What career opportunities exist?
  - C.Service to U Studies and Other Programs.
    - 2List the courses…Update to read "including U Studies courses"
  - D.Additional Contributions
    - Is there a reason to cap these with word limits? Don't recall. This may be the best place to highlight to campus individual accomplishments, since we don't see personnel files from outside our departments.
- V.Synopsis and Future Planning **(Pgs 10-11)**
  - This section was not addressed during the meeting.