

ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL

Minutes of March 21, 2016

3 p.m., Altgeld 315

Present: Abdel-Motaleb, Collier, Douglass, Falkoff, Gordon, Goldenberg, House, Howell, Isabel, Molnar, Olson, Parker, Reynolds, Shortridge, and Winkler

Guests:

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

The 9th Annual Assessment Expo will be on April 1, 2016 9:00AM in the HSC Sky Room.

We were unable to approve the minutes from February 22, 2016 meeting as we did not have a quorum. These minutes were approved electronically as of February 25, 2016.

This brings us to our main purpose for meeting today. That is the program review process improvement discussion that we are having.

Douglass: I have a short slide presentation to show. I wanted to get us back on the same page. We are going to roll up our sleeves today, and really work on the template, which Marc will lead us on. Again, you all know why we are working on the transformation of program review. This is with both the process and the template. We will be working on the template today, and if we have time, Chris will get us back to the process question. We would like to make program review more meaningful, putting annual reviews with KPIs on an online dashboard. I know some people were a bit disappointed last time, when we talked about KPIs and did not have finalization on those. I have had more conversations with Lisa and Al and we are going to get some determinations of those soon and they will be more closely tied to resource allocation. Al is definitely on board with that, as well as Lisa. We will also see more external feedback and alignment with disciplinary accreditation where appropriate. Not everyone wants or needs that, so where appropriate. Today, there are a couple of things that we need to do. We need to make sure that we know what's going to happen with the programs up for review in 2016-2017. What I believe we have agreed to do, and if there are no rejections, this is what I will tell people, "turn in your program prioritization narratives, if you have accreditation reports, turn those in, and there may be an additional minimal set of questions for you to address." When the small APC group met about the centers a few weeks ago, these are the questions that they came up with, with a 500 word cap, per question. We will be asking the centers:

- ∞ **Goals and Objectives**
- ∞ **What was accomplished since last review**
- ∞ **What are their goals for one year**
- ∞ **What are their goals for the next review (eight years, if it continues to be eight years)**
- ∞ **What resources do they need to accomplish those goals**

No more than 2000 words total

Douglass: We didn't do the same thing for the small group that met on the academic program side, which was a much broader conversation. Marc will be walking us through that today. What are the minimal set of questions that we need to ask the academic programs for this year, and then also, what are we going to do for 2017-2018 and beyond. This will be, not a more important, but a more complicated task for the academic programs than for the academic centers because there isn't as much content in the template for the academic centers. If we have the time, the other thing that I would like for us to be able to do today, is to finalize the overall process, making that process shorter, more focused and aligned. Just moving forward, after today, we made some changes to the schedule, and I believe Jeanne sent that out. We will not meet next week. On April 4th, 2016, we will finalize the process on that date. That is also the day that Steve Wallace and Ritu Subramony will be coming back with some best practices for program review and program prioritization to discuss with us. We have moved the conversation about the dashboard to April 25, 2016, and we hope to have those determined (KPIs) on the mock-up we will have for you that day. We will have some follow-up reports that we need to do and that we do on a regular basis at the end of the year. I think originally, I was over ambitious and hoping that we might be able to get a proposal done this semester. I would like at least like to start to think about what that proposal will be to the IBHE about how we are going to move forward to streamline program review, and potentially, bringing the two together, Program Review and Program Prioritization. Is that clear to everyone? I just want to make sure that we are all on the same page before Marc gets us started on the templates. Does anyone need a copy of the template or have any questions or concerns?

Falkoff: With that said, this is what I understand that we are doing. Tell me if you disagree with this. It sounds to me like the baseline document moving forward is going to be the Program Prioritization report. What I feel that we can do, is to take the old program review template questions that generated hundreds of pages of answers and look and see what's in our template that hasn't already been asked in Program Prioritization, and is necessary for IBHE or HLC or any other purpose that we might have for this. When I say that the Program Prioritization report seemed like the baseline, good starting point, what I am really saying is for this year, if you've already written a Program Prioritization report, for you, you don't have to do it again, you can just supplement whatever questions we need. For future years, the anticipation would be, you would take those Program Prioritization criteria and questions and you would answer them anew when it came time to fill out your Program Review report. In other words, I personally thought that the Program Prioritization questions were a good way to get the kind of information that we are seeking. Is everyone on board with that? Does that make sense? I think that was the same thing that you said, but maybe not.

Douglass: I think the caveat that I would add to that is that there is an ongoing evaluation of the process of Program Prioritization process, so obviously what's not working and what's working well would modify what the programs are responding to. And the other piece of course, is that people will be answering these in little bits, once we have the online dashboard up. So they may not have to write a whole entire report like they had to do this fall. They would instead be summarizing what they had seen over the period of time.

Falkoff: I think we should now go through the academic program template. I propose that we go through it question by question, and ourselves these questions. Has the question that we are discussing already adequately been addressed as part of the Program Prioritization criteria? If the answer is yes, then we discard that question and move on. If the answer is no, then we go to the next step. Does the question elicit information that is required by IBHE or HLC?

Shortridge: How do we know that?

Douglass: I know that and there was a document passes out called Program Review Audiences. I will keep an eye on that and watch as we go.

Falkoff: If something is not covered by Program Prioritization, it is required by the IBHE or HLC, we keep it. If not, the next step is: Does the question solicit something that will be helpful for us in APC for assessing the strength and quality of the program? This is kind of a nebulous area and we hope that not many things will fall into that category. If we think it's necessary to do our job, but not otherwise required, we should keep it. If not, then the last step is to ask if there is any other reason why we should keep this in? Maybe some Board of Trustees rationale that might not be pertinent to us.

Douglass: It is good that Dan is here as he can talk to performance funding too.

Falkoff: With that, I thought we would go through each question and Carolinda can note within the margins of her template, what we are keeping and if not, why we are deleting it, just for our records.

Parker: Can I ask one question? Your third questions speaks to the question of if the APC would need to use that question and the information generated by that questions. To me, that seems to imply that the APC is the only internal audience for this report. Is that true, or should we just leave that question, is this useful for some other internal process instead of just specifying the APC.

Douglass: That may go to his question four, is there any other reason? Does APC need this and then is there another reason an internal audience might need this, I think would be a good idea.

Falkoff: I know the Board of Trustees sometimes like to look at this stuff and might be a reason to keep something in. Under my catch-all number 4, we might not even need anything further. I wanted to make sure that there was a step 3, APC reasons. I know that Carolinda says her purpose here is to be able advise our colleagues about what we think about some of the things that they are doing. That too might not fall under IBHE, etc.

Isabel: I would just say that in some cases, the college that you are in is the internal audience because they may not be privy to all that is going on in the program and a department.

Falkoff: I would say if we get to criteria 4 on any question, at that point you might say, even though it doesn't fit any other categories, this should stay in for college purposes. Sound good?

Discussions for changes to the Academic Program Review template took place. The revised templates are attached. There was not time to continue the process discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Jeanne Essex

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
Office of the Provost

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REVIEW OF DEGREE PROGRAMS FOR 2016-2017

Name of Unit:

CIP Code:

Reporting Relationship within the University:

Date of Initiation:

Date of Last Review:

In responding to these questions, please keep your responses succinct and bear in mind that the Academic Planning Council will have your Program Prioritization narratives to review so your responses should provide additional evidence not contained in your program narratives.

1. What are the purposes/objectives of the unit? (Up to 500 words total)
2. What accomplishments has the unit achieved since its last review? (Up to 500 words total)
3. What goals and plans does the unit have for the next 5 years? (Up to 500 words total)
4. What resources does the unit need to support their goals and plans over the next 5 years? (Up to 500 words total)

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
Office of the Provost

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE REVIEW OF DEGREE PROGRAMS FOR 2016-2017

College:

Department:

In responding to these questions, please keep your responses succinct and bear in mind that the Academic Planning Council will have your Program Prioritization narratives to review so your responses should provide additional evidence not contained in your program narratives.

PART A: DEPARTMENTAL CONTEXT

I. Faculty Achievements and Recognition (Using no more than one table and up to 500 words)

Provide a summary of faculty achievements and recognition for the period under review including awards or other recognition for teaching, scholarship, and public and professional service; publications, performances, exhibitions, and/or conference presentations; grants and contracts; patents; invitations to publish or exhibit, speak, or assume leadership roles in the profession; and/or other relevant evidence of recognition.

II. Department Strengths, and Challenges

A. Strengths (Up to 500 words total)

- What are the major strengths of the department? (E.g., Cite strengths related to teaching/learning, engagement/service, faculty scholarship, use of technology; add other strengths as appropriate.)
- How will the department build upon these strengths over the next review period?

B. Challenges (Up to 500 words total)

- What are the greatest challenges the department faces? (E.g., Cite challenges related to teaching/learning, engagement/service, and faculty scholarship; add other challenges as appropriate.)
- What strategies and resources would be needed to address these challenges over the next review period?

PART B: PROGRAM REVIEW

[Please start the review of each program on a new page]

Program: [A separate review must be completed for each degree program.]

CIP Code:

Date of Last Program Review:

I. CONTRIBUTIONS TO GENERAL EDUCATION (For undergraduate programs only. Up to 500 words total)

How does the program participate in the university's general education program and how does the program in the major build upon the competencies students are expected to acquire in the university's general education program?

II. STUDENTS AND ALUMNI

A. Student Recruitment and Retention (Up to 500 words total)

- What recruitment and retention activities does the department and/or program carry out and how do these activities address ethnic and gender balance?
- What is the department's and/or program's evaluation of the effectiveness of its recruitment and retention activities?

B. B. Progress to Degree Completion (Up to 500 words total)

- How does the department go about monitoring and advising students to ensure that they are proceeding satisfactorily towards their degrees?

III. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EVIDENCE OF PROGRAM QUALITY

A. Continuous Quality Improvement Activities (Up to 1,000 words total)

- What quality improvement activities has the program undertaken since its last review?
- What changes have resulted in the program and the student learning outcomes as a result of these quality improvement activities?
- What are the priorities (rank numerically from highest to lowest) for future planning?
- What is the time frame for implementing departmental plans for the future?
- What resources are needed to implement these plans over the next 5 years?
- How do these plans fit with overall college priorities?

Planned Changes/Priorities for the Future				
Activity	Department Priority Ranking	Time Frame	Resource Requirements	Fit with College Priorities

Planning\PR\Formats\AcademicProgramFormat2016-2017Shell
 April 8, 2016