

APRC minutes: Feb 11, 2019

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

### Consultation with Senate Exec

Mimi provided updates from questions posed to Senate Chair, Terri Kronzer / Senate Exec:

- Confirmed that Senate 'receives' our reports
- Terri had no specific recommendation on how to deal with late submissions
  - Suggested we indicate as part of our report to Senate when departments are tardy [I believe she means monthly report at Senate, and that we put it in writing; rather than merely commenting when we finally are able to submit APRC's response to the review]
- Per questions about shortening the review period and changes to the template
  - Exec has no comment; write a formal Memo to Senate requesting their comment on # years, other changes.
  - Suggested we check no conflicts with our bylaws. Those on APRC last year know that our bylaws do not have this degree of specificity (perhaps she means bylaws say we take proposed changes to Senate for approval?)

### Discussion of HHP Review

Noted no summary chart of graduates, nor of average credits towards graduation. Entire submission lacked any depth of reflection.

- Template consideration: Should request more specificity; for example, "please include average credits toward graduation per program."
- Template might specifically state: "Please list each major and minor (and concentrations or certifications offered) and reflect on the goals and future plans for each. By what means [based on what data] were the goals developed?"

Discussion of blending department and program responses. The template allows a department level summary and discussion of the alignment of mission, but each program should answer the subsequent questions individually.

Many answers do not provide context, where the information comes from.

Definition of 'program': any major or minor that is 'entitled' (approved) at the System level must undergo periodic review. System also indicates that data on certificates are useful.

Unclear whether all programs have the same Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Want information about outcomes for each program. If there is uniformity across all programs, indicate so and explain how alignment was achieved. [i.e., compared language and intent of DPI, ACSM, etc., and developed a set of seven "dimensions" common to each]. Show correlation between the programs and the outcomes.

Questions surrounding reference to external accrediting standards, but no explanation of a) whether a program is externally accredited, or merely 'aligns'; b) any benefits of external accreditation; c)

implications for staffing, funding, etc., if accreditation sought. [Links to such standards would have been helpful]

**This ultimately led to decision to send the review back to the department. Chair will write letter asking department and programs for resubmission. Council felt much could be a matter of cutting/pasting to reorganize into a more understandable document.**

Next meeting, Feb. 18: Review of Comm Arts