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ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL
Minutes of November 10, 2014
3 p.m., Holmes Student Center – 505

Present: Boutin, Brantley, Chakraborty, Coller, Douglass, Falkoff, Gordon, Goldberg, Howell, Mogren, Molnar and Shortridge

Guests: Chris Parker, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Outcomes Assessment; Jeff Reynolds, Director of Academic Analysis and Reporting; Ritu Subramony, Director of Academic Accreditation;

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

There were two announcements made. The meeting to be held on November 24, 2014 has a location change. The meeting will be held in the South half of the Capital Room instead of HSC Room 505. The second was inviting the members of APC to a Resources, Space and Budget Committee meeting on Wednesday, November 19, 2014 at 9 a.m. in the Holmes Student Center: Illinois Room.

Update and discussion for Program Review Process Task force 2013. We came up with a set of recommendations that we hope will make for a better process.

Difference between Program Review and Program Prioritization

Program Review
* Primary purpose is continuous quality improvement of academic programs
* Includes similar administrative and peer reviews
* Mandated by the HLC and on an 8 year cycle by the IBHE
* Focus on Program Health and Quality

The question was asked:
**What is an academic program?**
A program with students in it, typically it offers a degree, but it could also be a center.

Program Prioritization
* Primary purpose is to maximize impact of institutional program portfolio for both academic and administrative programs
  **Note:** Administrative programs can be anything from Residential Dining services, Athletics or Building Services. APC in the past has not typically been involved with reviewing the administrative programs
* Begins with peer review of programs, continues with administrative implementation of resource allocation
  **Note:** Will consist of two task forces, one which will review academic programs and one which will review administrative programs. Both will be followed by resource allocation decisions made by senior leadership.
* A process of this type has been requested by the NIU Board of Trustees and endorsed by the President
* Focus on Program Viability and Optimal Resource Allocation

2013 Program Review Process Task Force Outcomes
* Core Principles
* Short-term, Mid-term and Long-term goals
* IBHE supports alignment of program review with accreditation cycles
* Condensed annual review for continuous planning

Core Principles
* Opportunities for meaningful reflection
* Continuous improvement
* Accountability

Alignment

Effectiveness
* High-quality data
* Analysis and reflections on data
* External review

Efficiency
* Timely, clear and faculty friendly
* Efficient in reducing reporting burden for Faculty and Staff

Question was asked:
**What is the role of APC?**
It is a consultative process in connection with program review. The role of APC in terms of program prioritization would be working with the task forces and senior leadership in their review that would lead to resource allocation.

Short-term
* Revise Guidelines
* Improve alignment of review with institutional goals
* Delineate data metrics
* Permission from IBHE for alignment
  • APC’s role in review and planning

Question was asked:
**When the task force was originally working to come up with these guidelines, did they look to see what other Universities within the state were doing?**
Not in Illinois per se, but we did draw from a number of resources. **Would other universities within the state be employing a similar process for program review to meet IBHE standards?**
I am not sure of how long other universities take to do program review, but the process is similar. Our process, if anything, may be more robust, but that is why we are looking at it to see where it can be streamlined.
* Web-based program review portfolio
* Initiate reduction in process length
* Basic cost analysis of direct costs
Develop process flow chart for the program review process
  * Develop cost estimates for current process
  * Identify efficiencies/improvements

Mid-term Goals (by 2016)
  * Annual Institutional Data Metrics- by program
  * Annual formative report-reflecting analysis
  * Complete web based portfolio
  * Add external review component where none exists

Discussed components of Prospectus draft
  * Institutional data

Question was asked:
Is the idea that this would be a standard set up graphs that each program would get?  
Yes.

Much of the data in these graphs wouldn’t apply to the centers. Do you see them preparing these reports also?
The guidelines for centers are different regarding other issues, they will be different in this case as well.

Each review a program will get all their data and then might struggle to interpret it for their individual case. What are we doing to combat this?
We are working to make sure the information that is given has relevance and is presented in a way that will be readily understood.

  * Assessment data
  * Program and/or accreditation data
  * Summary

Chairs/Deans Survey

Comment was made from Committee member:
The current financial model doesn’t seem to be sustainable. Would it make sense to include a section that asks where potential cuts could be made to departments and how they would affect the program? Perhaps we should ask how a program would accommodate a 5 to 10 percent cut in their budget.

Could we create a document or a place on Blackboard to leave comments?
These documents are on Blackboard. Please E-mail any comments so they can be added to content.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Jeanne Essex