ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL
Minutes of November 24, 2014
3 p.m., Holmes Student Center- South Side of Capitol Room

Present: Boutin, Chakraborty, Cordell (for Dawson), Coller, Douglass, Falkoff, Freeman, Gordon, Goldberg, House, Howell 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 3:03 p.m.

There was a discussion of the Program Prioritization. The provost and the other members of the coordinating team gave a presentation at a Chair’s meeting on November 19th, 2014. This meeting went well and the information was well received. The same day, Carolinda Douglass and Jeff Reynolds met with members of communications and marketing. That information will be shared with the Coordinating Team November 25, 2014. President Baker will include further information on Program Prioritization within a few weeks in the Baker Report.

The following question was asked:

In regard to program prioritization, would there ever be a situation where budgetary money might be reallocated to a different resource as opposed to only finding programs where funds would be cut.

This is a good question. There are two ways that the task force can be instructed to proceed in Program Prioritization. One way this can be approached this would be to say they need to find x amount of dollars and reallocate the rest to the strongest programs. The other way this can be done is to separate all programs into quintiles and then that information will be used to align with the mission statement and the budget. Ultimately, we will probably be using the second method as a means of finding a dynamic number given the current state budget.

Would you say there was a lot of push-back from the chair’s meeting?
I wouldn’t say there was push back. I would say there were a lot of questions and curiosity about how Program Prioritization is going to be operationalized. There were further questions regarding the metrics that would be used as well.

The comment was made:
The marketing component for Program Prioritization is going to be very important as a way of getting the campus on board with this program. The ability to accurately share knowledge as to what the program will include will be vital to its success.

Another comment:
Another question that has been asked is why the university chose the Dickeson book as the model for our review process here and should more time have been spent looking at other options? We do not feel as though we should have. This Program Prioritization process that is
outlined in the Dickeson book is very similar to most other prioritization processes out there. Each will have components of defining programs, choosing criteria, using data to make decisions and then creating some type of ranking. Additionally, it’s been used on many campuses so there is a wealth of resources available to us.

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of October 27, 2014.

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of November 10, 2014.

Next, the IBHE and APC Interim Follow-up reports were discussed.

**Athletic Training: Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education**
The department was asked to comment on program outcomes: In the initial report, the department expected to have at least 63 students and that has been accomplished. They expected to award at least 21 degrees each year. In 2010, 2011 and 2012, they awarded between 20-22. The department has given additional information on assessment. This report was received by the committee with no further discussion.

**B.A./B.S. in Community Leadership and Civic Engagement**
The department was asked to comment on program outcomes: For enrollments, the department stated they did not have a projected performance target. Upon review of the original report it was determined that they did have one. It was projected that the department would have 20 the first year and 73 by the fifth year. They currently have 83, so they are exceeding that expectation. They expected to award 18-20 degrees awarded and they are currently at 22. Additionally, their assessment exceeds their targets. A change will be made to note that there were targeted outcomes. The report was received by the committee without further discussion.

**Institute for the Study of the Environment, Sustainability and Energy (B.S.)**
The department was asked to comment on program outcomes: Expected enrollment was listed as 40-60 and they are currently at 104. Degrees awarded: Expected to award 30 degrees and they are currently at 31. A change will be made to include the degree. The report was received by the committee without further discussion.

**B.S. in Nursing**
The department was asked to comment on program outcomes: Expected enrollment was listed as 76, the actual number is 26. Expected degrees awarded in the first two years was 22 and the actual number to date is 17. There may be some comments added as to why the enrollments are not higher. The assessment exceeds expectation. The report was received by the committee without further discussion.

**Masters of Business Administration**
Due to a lack of University and College of Business resources, this program has not yet been launched.
A comment was made by a member of the committee that this tends to be an issue of lack of available space.

Center for the Interdisciplinary Study of Language and Literacy (Center for P-20 Engagement)
The center was asked to respond to number of grants/contracts, amount of funding received, number of publications/presentations and student involvement. There were limited predetermined targets for the center. There was a target of $500,000/year in the area of grants and contracts received and they are meeting and exceeding that amount. The report was received by the committee without further discussion.

Last on the agenda was the continued discussion on program review. This includes the following topics:
Survey for individuals who have completed program review
Accreditation cycle alignment with program review
Feedback on the draft program review prospectus

First to be talked about was the accreditation cycle. The review cycle has been revised to align with accreditation.

The question was asked: Have all programs who have an accelerated cycle been contacted?
Not yet, but they will be.

The following guidelines were followed when working on the review schedule:
It was determined that internal feedback was very important. It was further decided that an accreditation visit should precede program review whenever possible.
The cycles should not exceed 10 years.
The range would span from 4-10 years, knowing that it might take more than one review cycle to become aligned.
External review from accreditation needs to timely.
Further there will be some adjustment that will need to be made to best accommodate the accrediting bodies in connection with specific programs.

Next the survey was discussed. Content, layout and target audience were all discussed.
The following questions were asked: Given the number of people who will be receiving this survey and the purpose of the survey, is there a need for concern over recipients losing anonymity? Are there changes that could be made to ensure that the respondent identity is protected? There are changes that can be made to broaden the classification of respondents to help with this.

Comment: We want to make sure that we are respectful of the participants while still maintaining continuity of the survey and its’ content.

The APC further discussed the following items:
Method of delivery for survey
Targeted recipients
Program Review dates to be included in survey
Information to be included and relevance/usefulness
Bias potentials
Overview of proposed data topics and page layouts.
Overall process questions
  Efficiency
  Alignments
  How they use the data
Open ended response questions
Accreditation

A discussion ensued about the APC’s role in program review for the “health of the program” or “quality of the program.”
Further discussion touched on the topic of delivery of data timing and mode in connection with Summer meetings. Possible ways of streamlining the process.

Comment:
There is a need to convey a more positive representation of what program review and the APC can do for departments and their programs. It is a process that is changing and progressing in a positive way.

The APC was asked if anyone had any comments regarding the program review prospectus. None were offered at this time.

Final announcements:
PLUS program is starting to go through the curricular process. If the program proceeds as planned, it should proceed in two stages. The first portion should appear in the 2015-16 catalog.

A second item was brought up in connection with University 101 (university experience) and 201 (transfer students). These classes are currently moving away from an extended orientation focus to an academic focus with an emphasis on problem solving, communication and critical thinking. This is keeping in line with the trend that is taking place at many colleges and universities at this time. Additionally, there is a move towards making these classes a requirement for the majority of students. These are moving through the process and are expected to appear in the 2015-16 catalog.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Jeanne Essex