Present: Abdel-Motaleb, Alden, Boutin, Chandler, Dawson, Douglass, Damodaran, Falkoff, Goldenberg, Gordon, House, Li, Molnar, Shortridge, Than

Guests: Derryl Block, Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences; Beverly Henry, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences; Chris Parker, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Outcomes Assessment, Office of Assessment Services; Sherilynn Spear, College of Health and Human Sciences

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. There was an introduction of each member of the council, and Alden welcomed the members for the 2013–2014 academic year.

There were two announcements at the beginning of the meeting. Douglass announced that members should review the resource book located in the back of their APC notebook entitled “Revitalizing the Program Portfolio” by the Educational Advisory Committee. This contains information that was followed this past spring when the Program Review Process Task Force was considering ways to improve the program review process.

In addition, Alden announced that the IBHE has agreed to allow us to come up with our own program review process. In the past, we followed a program review template that requested information that the IBHE required, and the template was revised multiple times over the years. There will be more discussion about this at a later meeting.

The APC has two representatives on the University Assessment Panel (UAP); one is elected and one is appointed by the provost. Nominations were sought for a representative of the APC to serve on the University Assessment Panel. Douglass informed the group that the UAP meets on the first and third Friday of the month from 10 a.m. to 12 noon. The responsibilities include reviewing assessment status plans and reports, applications for grant funding requests for assessment purposes, and funding reports. In addition, the UAP plays an important role in the review of the mission of the university. Alden asked that members consider this position for the next meeting as this is an important liaison position. This item has been deferred to the next meeting.

Nominations were sought for assistant chair of the APC. The assistant chair conducts the APC meetings in the absence of the provost. Mark Falkoff volunteered to serve as assistant chair. A motion was made to have Falkoff serve as assistant chair, and the motion passed unanimously.

The APC needs one more chair-in-training. Lan Li volunteered to serve as chair-in-training serving on subcommittee A.

The subcommittee chairs are Marc Falkoff (subcommittee A) and Geoffrey Gordon (subcommittee B). Rebecca Shortridge is a chair-in-training serving on subcommittee B and Lan Li is a chair-in-training serving on subcommittee A. The subcommittee chairs and chairs-in-training were thanked for agreeing to serve in this important role. The subcommittees will meet briefly after this meeting.
The next item on the agenda is to elect an agenda committee. The common practice in past years has been that the provost, vice provost for academic planning and development, the APC subcommittee chairs and chairs-in-training, and the APC assistant chair have served as the agenda committee. The major task for this committee is to create an agenda for the spring semester. All council members have the opportunity to give suggestions for items to be addressed by the council, particularly for the spring semester. The APC voted to continue its past practice for 2013-2014. The agenda committee will meet in January to set the agenda for the spring semester. If anyone is interested in attending this meeting, please feel free to do so. Typically, there are two to four council meetings in the spring.

It was decided to move up the next agenda item to accommodate the guests from College of Health and Human Sciences. The college is seeking approval from APC for a Ph.D. in Health Sciences degree. Dean Block provided information to the APC regarding the need for the degree. The degree will provide students with a wide range of professions within the academic and nonacademic areas of health sciences. The inter-professional knowledge will allow graduates to be prepared to serve as educators and researchers in both academic and professional environments. There has been a longstanding need to bridge the silos between the two types of programs, and this new degree program would do just that. The program is designed as an online program requiring 20 credit hours of core courses, with two face-to-face meetings the first year, and one face-to-face meeting in the following years. In addition, the degree will require 45 credit hours of Ph.D. courses of individualized study including 12 credit hours of dissertation credit of either a standard dissertation or three published articles. The program has been in the making for over ten years and interest has increased tremendously over the past two years.

Alden informed the group that the program will continue through the approval process including moving ahead to the Board of Trustees and the IBHE for final approval. Damodaran asked if the entire external report was available for review. Dean Block said a large portion of the information was already received by the committee; however, the entire report is available to anyone who would like to review it. In addition, Block noted that the reviewers’ comments were all very positive.

Abdel-Motaleb asked how the college plans to support the program. Block responded that the students will be primarily part-time students and that there will only be about three graduate assistants per year for a maximum of nine graduate students at any one time. This number would include research assistants. A question was asked about the demand for such a degree, and if they had studied placement of graduates from Roselind or Midwest. Dean Block noted that, although they did not look at those places in particular, they did look at openings in positions that would apply and found that there were over 2000 openings just last year. Spear noted that students are being turned away because of the small amount of faculty who are able to provide post-secondary programs. Alden noted that this could help to grow some of our own faculty who would be more research based. Spear commented that the Educational Advisory Board has completed studies and found that research skills are in high demand in nonacademic settings and that the demand for such a program are especially needed in our region. Block also noted that the same demand was evident in research data conducted by Hanover Research and Georgetown University.

Than asked about the feasibility of the projection that approximately 30 percent of the students would come from out of state and of the willingness of students to pay out of state costs. Block said that there are no plans to do a large marketing campaign at this time and that it will be focused primarily toward our region. She also expects part-time students to support the program and expects a limited number of full-time students. She agreed that the college would not be able to support full-time students but that the field will provide part-time students. She noted that most health services professionals are working students and will only be able to attend part time. This will cover the costs of the program. It is
common practice in our field for students to earn their degree, be working, and taking additional courses for various reasons. There are no plans at this time to hire additional faculty.

Falkoff asked for an explanation about the requirements of the dissertation portion of the degree. Block explained that there is a dissertation research requirement, and it could be completed in a regular or alternative format. The alternative format of three published articles that flow from the individual program of study and reflect the inter-professional orientation of the program are becoming more common. The research articles will still need to be approved and overseen by the dissertation committee with the expectation of publishing.

A motion was made to endorse the Ph.D. in Health Sciences proposal, and the motion passed unanimously.

The notebook distributed to the council members was reviewed. The first section of the notebook contains information about the council and its schedule. The first document spells out the APC duties. This section also includes the schedule of planned meetings for the fall, and council members were asked to hold all Mondays between 3-5 p.m. open in case additional meetings need to be scheduled.

The background information section of the notebook contains reference materials that should be particularly helpful to new subcommittee members, and this information should be reviewed prior to reading the program review documents. This section contains information about the program review process for APC subcommittees, the 2013 Program Review Process Task Force Recommendations, the Vision and Mission of Northern Illinois University, the executive summary from the Illinois Public Agenda, the IBHE State Accountability Report, the program review schedule, and the APC and University Assessment Panel reports to the University Council.

The guidelines section contains the program review calendar and review formats. The formats should be referred to as you read the reviews. The program review format contains a departmental section where the departments report on resources, faculty, and contributions to the vision and mission statement and the Illinois Public Agenda. The center review format is also in this section of the notebook; it is an abbreviated format in comparison to the program review format.

The data section contains data from the Office of Institutional Research for all programs in the university.

Prior to reviewing the program review documents, it would be helpful to look at the notes from the summer meetings and the questions, suggestions, and recommendations document.

Douglass reported that NIU is moving toward a more streamlined process that will be matched up with the disciplinary accreditation cycles, where feasible. This will allow for disciplinary accreditation reports to be used as part of the fulfillment for program review and will allow for yearly updates from programs on key internal performance metrics. The process will be more effective and efficient and will be a time-saver for all.

A preview of the Blackboard Content Collection site was made. Information about logging into the system and accessing the program review data and reports was presented. The intent of using the Blackboard Content Collection site was to create a paperless process for program review. It will also make the process more transparent. Li asked if members are required to read all the documents on Blackboard. Douglass answered that it would be best to read the report submitted, review the
recommendations from the summer meetings, and use the other documents as reference for particular questions you may have.

The last item for discussion was the recommendations of the Program Review Process Task Force. Douglass gave a background of the task force and noted that the recommendations were drawn from the Educational Advisory Board report on best practices, guest interviews, and discussions of what information would be meaningful. The task force identified several short term goals and worked from there. Alden asked that the committee review the recommendations for discussion at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Carey
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