ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL
Minutes of April 4, 2016
3 p.m., Altgeld 315

Present: Coller, Douglass, Falkoff, Freeman, Gordon, Goldenberg, House, Howell, Hunt,
               Jaffee, Li, Molnar, Olson, Parker, Reynolds, Shortridge, and Subramony

Guests: Chad McEvoy, Chair of Kinesiology and Physical Education, William Pitney,
               Professor in the College of Education, and Steve Wallace, Associate Director for
               Office of Assessment Services

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m

**Falkoff: We have a couple of guests here today. Chad Envoy, Chair of Kinesiology and
Physical Education and Bill Pitney, Professor. We will be discussing M.S. in Athletic
Training in a moment.**

There were no announcements.

It was moved by Steven Howell and seconded by Geoff Gordon to approve the minutes of March
7, 2016, and the motion passed unanimously.

**Falkoff: We will now move on to the discussion and approval of the M.S. in Athletic
Training.**

**Douglass: As part of the normal process of a new program being approved, the last step
before it gets to the Board of Trustees is that it comes to the Academic Planning Council.
On Blackboard you saw a rather complete report that the KNPE folks have put together
regarding this change. Basically, my understanding is that the accreditation body is moving
towards the higher level of degree. So, rather than being a degree at the Bachelors level, it
will now be a degree at the Master's level. I will let Chad and or Bill say anything that they
would like to about the proposal.**

Department: Thank you for having us here today. As Carolinda said, our accrediting body has
mandated that professional programs be only offered at the Master's level. They have identified
2022 as the final date that we can matriculate students through a Bachelor's program. We have had
an accredited Bachelor's program on this campus since 2000. And currently, our accreditation
expires and we have a self-study scheduled for 2020, 2021 and 2022. We are trying to work ahead of
that a bit as well as be one of the first programs in the state to get the Master's level degree in place.
Currently, there is no Master's level professional programs in Athletic Training in the state.

Douglass: So we would be at the forefront of that.

Department: Yes, we would be at the forefront of that, right. We are proposing a new program that
would be started in 2019. So our first graduate cohort would be admitted in the summer of 2019,

and it is a two year program. This means our first cohort would finish in 2021 in May and our last undergraduate cohort would be admitted to the program in the fall of 2018. We would have a couple of years of overlap as we teach-out the undergraduate program and ramp up our graduate program. One of the key concerns that we often see when programs move from the undergraduate level to the Master's level is whether or not there is any degree inflation. Our program worked hard last fall to design a program and make sure that that's not the case. In fact, I'm very proud of our program because having an understanding of the landscape, of the profession and what is coming down from the accrediting bodies meant that we were able to implement some things in this proposed program that situated us very nicely. For example, recently the accreditor broadcast that a four plus one or a three plus two program was not in the spirit of an elevated program. A stand alone, two year program would be. They have also commented that future programs should address inter-professional education requirements. Ours does, we have that imbedded in courses throughout as well as research, statistics, epidemiology and other health components. I think we are feeling pretty good about the structure of the program at this point.

Douglass: Anything to add, Chad?

Department: One piece to add is just some context. Bill stepped in this year as our new program director for athletic training. We also have two new faculty that are off to an outstanding start in this program. I think it has been a nice opportunity, imposed by the accrediting body, but it's been a nice opportunity for essentially our new athletic training team to come together and build this out together under Bill's leadership. We are really proud of the work they have done so quickly to get this proposal in front of you.

Falkoff: Questions?

Douglass: I actually have a couple of questions. I heard you say that the last class will be accepted for the undergraduate program in 2018, and would those students likely want to take the Master's afterwards? Would that be a natural progression? And then the second part of my question is, once that is no longer there, who are the people who would naturally want to take the MAT as their first degree in Athletic Training?

Department: Currently, as we have drawn it up, the Master's program addresses all of the Athletic Training competencies and clinical proficiencies required to sit for the board of certification exam to become nationally credentialed. For our current students getting their undergraduate degree, even the ones that start in the fall of 2018, once they complete their undergraduate program, what we would call Entry Level Master's, would not help them. The only piece that would be added by going into the Master's level is the research, statistics and the directed research project that we built into that. I would probably encourage those students to diversify and go on and get a Master's elsewhere. Particularly a post-professional Master's degree. In terms of once we start the graduate program, who might be our potential audience, I think that it is important to understand that all undergraduate athletic training programs will have to be phased out by 2022. Those undergraduate programs will no longer be a path to certification. I think we are going to have a large number of folks, if that is the career path of a certified athletic trainer, they will have to get their undergraduate degree in a different profession or different degree, in order to even matriculate to a Master's program. Currently we have, I want to say 360 and change, students in the professional level athletic training programs in the country. Speculation is that we will probably end up losing about half to three quarters of those because some institutions simply won't offer Master's level degrees. As an

example, our accrediting body has a 70%, three year aggregate for the first attempt, pass rate for the exam as the requirements for graduation. There is a large percentage of programs that are on probation because they do not meet that minimum. I think that those programs that have a long standing track record of good performance, like ours, will be positioned quite well.

Douglass: I guess that part of my question was about the brand new high school graduate who says I want to be in Athletic Training, and he or she comes to the department, do you help them pick an undergraduate degree first?

Department: We developed our pre-requisite so that it works seamlessly with our undergraduate program in Kinesiology. With one strategic elective, they could be ready to be admitted. They would have to take medical terminology as one of the pre-requisites. The rest of the pre-requisites are embedded in the Kinesiology program.

Douglass: Thank you.

Falkoff: You do not require a GRE? I'm just curious if that's standard policy. I don't know if you can answer that or not.

Department: I think that the other piece for us is we wanted to be as consistent with the other graduate programs and departments as possible. And other programs do not require the GRE, so that was the other main factor. For us, if you've got an entry level test, with some concerns about whether or not it does justice for a diverse population, and they may score lower. We want to graduate health care providers that mirror the professions that they serve, is that really an entry level piece that we want? Is that an admission requirement that we want? I think for us, we defaulted to being consistent with other graduate programs in our department.

Falkoff: This is a really interesting conversation in that at the studies are not Kinesiology and Physical Education specific, so that argument can apply to every school that would or wouldn't choose to require a GRE.

Subramony: I was going to ask a similar question. Would the same thing go with the GPA? Requiring a certain GPA.

Department: We identified a 3.0 as the GPA minimum for admission. We came in a little higher. We did that because what we have learned at the undergraduate level, in terms of our data for the last 6 years or so, as best we can determine, we found that we tended to see more students go on probation, whether it's for poor academic standing or professional behavior, when their GPA started to dip below 2.75. We decided to raise the bar higher. We also took the temperature of a lot of other graduate programs across the nation and that seemed to be consistent.

Subramony: When I was reading this, I missed the GPA.

Department: I will double check and make sure that it is there. I thought it was, but maybe not.

Subramony: Thank you.

Falkoff: Other questions or comments?

Shortridge: I have a general comment. I think 75% of the programs are going away. Where are all of those students going to go that want to do a Master's in Athletic Training?

Douglass: NIU.

Shortridge: Well, we are only doing 20 per year.

Department: That is speculation, a shot in the dark. And the best educated guess of individuals in our discipline, we will have to wait and see how that plays out. What we have learned in some research that I've done and some others, is that we have a lot of attrition in our profession, after the age of 30 especially in one of our highest employment settings, the college and university setting. We see a significant drop in people that stay. But what we have learned is that when we compare the entry level Master's degree compared to the Bachelor's degree, we have better retention in the profession. And I think what we will see is with fewer people graduating from these programs, they will probably still stay in the profession for longer. I still think there is going to be a bit of in-balance. I'm not an economist, but perhaps the supply and demand piece might benefit Athletic Trainers from a salary stand-point, especially when we have groups like the American Academy of Pediatric Physicians supporting wanting every high school to have an certified Athletic Trainer in place, for health and safety concerns of that population and others advocating for the profession in that regard. Good question.

Parker: I've got another one too. What happens with the professionals that are out there right now with a B.A. or B.S. degree practicing? Will they be required to re-certify to reach that higher level of credentials or will they be grandfathered back?

Department: Good question, the accrediting body has said that they will grandfather those people, their credentials will stand.

Parker: There wouldn't be a retraining option or an opportunity for an online option that might be available to the department?

Department: I've not heard anything like that. The standard continuing education requirements would apply. So every three years we are required to have a minimum of 75 contact hours. And a large percentage of those have to be evidence based practice. There has been a big emphasis to shore up the continuing competence of practitioners.

Parker: Good. Thanks.

Falkoff: Now that we have had our discussion about the M.S., would anyone like to make a motion to approve?

Andrea Molnar moved to pass, with Steven Howell seconding the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Falkoff: Congratulations.

Douglass: Congratulations to you both. It sounds like you will be in the forefront of this wave, which is exciting.

Falkoff: The next item is a presentation by Steven Wallace and Chris Parker about program review best practices and processes.

Douglass: If I could just say a couple of words before they get started. This is following along the path that we have been on for this semester. We are really trying to figure out where we can best improve program review and potentially look at merging program review and program prioritization into a single process. We asked the Office of Assessment Services, mainly Steven Wallace, to look into best practices. What he came back with is more current practices, but we don't know if they are best or not. Not a lot of people have done this thus far. I also wanted to say that we are going to build on that with Chris Parker, who will talk to us about our process. Remember several weeks ago, we did a small group discussion about the process of, some of you were in that group, Barbara and Bill, maybe you were in that group, were talking about the process itself at NIU and how we could streamline that. Chris is going to lead us in a discussion of that on the heels of what we hear about current practice. The one other thing I wanted to tell you is that last week, Ritu and I presented at the Chairs and Directors meeting on the 30th, I think it was. She presented on some HLC topics and I presented on this idea that program review might be more streamlined and might at some point be a single process with program prioritization. I just want to report back that one of the things that we heard was some real apprehension around the idea of annual reviews. I think that what people are thinking is that it is going to be in addition to having to write these 200 page reports every eight years. I wanted you to aware of that, and that was some of the feedback that we got. I will say some of the louder voices said that, and then some of the quieter voices came up and said this is a good idea. I don't know how much the louder voices speak for the room, but it is something for us to be aware of as we move forward in this process. And I assured the Chairs and the Directors that we will keep them involved in what we are doing as we move ahead. We will be moving forward on the dashboard, but whether or not they will have to report every year, that is something that we can definitely talk about more. Any questions? Geoff was there, do you have anything that you would like to add?

Gordon: No, I think it was more so just fear that the annual review would be pushed on top of instead of, as you said, we are going to try to shorten the program review.

Douglass: They said every time they get asked to do something new, nothing else gets taken away. Now I will turn it over to Steve.

Wallace discussed the following ideas:
Best practices-current practices that are evolving
Program review marries or matches with program prioritization
Shortening program review process to less than what it has been previously
Documents reviewed to collect information on current practices:
      Education Advisory Boards publication
      2013 Program Review Improvement Task Force Report
      HLC Conference presentations
      Indiana University, Purdue University at Indianapolis Conference presentations
      AALHE Conference presentations

Conversations with leaders which included Larry Goldstein and other organizations that are leading in pushing these ideas of program prioritization/program review: Lehman College, Boise State, National Lewis, and Northwestern.

Purpose of Program Review:

∝ Clearly communicated why program prioritization is being done
∝ Strengthen program portfolio within department, program and the institution
∝ Opportunity to re-examine mission and mission alignment
∝ Meaningful reflection of where we have been, who we are, and where we want to go
∝ Continuous, strategic improvement
∝ Leading to resource allocation, can also be called incentive based budgeting
∝ Accountability with IBHE, HLC or within our own disciplinary accrediting bodies

Feedback from peers, internal and external

Types of data:

∝ Only capture what you need for a particular purpose
∝ Capitalize on existing data and the reflection that goes into it. Decisions made and actions taken based on accurate data
∝ Reliable data used for decision making
∝ Timely and frequent review (annual)
∝ Actionable and centralized
∝ Data looked at longitudinally-trends and characteristics
∝ Key performance indicators: students, faculty and institutional level KPIs
∝ Reactions and feedback on KPIs and other areas
∝ Dashboards
∝ Internal and external reviews
∝ Accreditation review
∝ Strategic planning of resources including alternate sources of income

Characteristics of the alignment process:

∝ Shift to a series of actions, not only every 8 years but based on a 5 year plan
∝ Informs budget and is aligned with accreditation
∝ Needs to be efficient
∝ User friendly

Importance of yearly review allowing the opportunity for reflection

∝ Actions plans based on reflection-strategic planning

Boise State Model:

∝ Institutional 1 day strategic planning meeting
  * All faculty and staff review data on where we have been and who we are today
  * Where do we want to go "action plan" at the departmental level
  * Shifting of allocations

In all cases, the total "pie" is fixed in terms of resources. Revenue sharing- if you brought in students, then a large piece of that revenue would come back to you on a departmental level to use towards goals

Overview:
- ∝ Elimination of the work intensive self-study
- ∝ Strategic, not defensive
- ∝ Components: Student learning outcomes are challenging. Most important, instead, how are you reacting the data? The decision making behind the scenes.
- ∝ What are you doing with the data?

Questions:

Falkoff: We have noted many times, the defensive posture that programs find themselves in having to go through program review. It's one thing to say that we are looking for an honest report using real reflection and-self assessment, so that we, as colleagues, can help guide you through what you would like to be as a program. And, if we don't like what we see, we're going to write a negative review about you. That's where the fear is, especially if there is real resource allocation recommendations coming from a body like this or similar to this. What you saw, programs must feel that same kind of tension. Did they acknowledge it? And have they really resolved it?

Wallace: Great questions. Where I think they seem to be reacting to it is on this yearly annual piece. Basically, they have taken program prioritization where it is and have now put those metrics on more of an annual piece. By the way, and this was significant, when I asked Larry Goldstein and I also asked some of the other folks that are doing program prioritization, can you name any other institution that is going to do program prioritization for a second time? No one said that they could. I cannot identify a single institution that will, but for good reason. Program prioritization is for a strategic imperative- major, huge budget. Instead what they see is, we've got these period pieces in place that we can now react to. We can react to programs that are not doing as well as we hoped they could, we have institutionally-based dashboards. And so you are getting more frequent and quicker reaction to issues. The other piece from National Lewis, I asked what teeth do you put into it? And they answered, we don't really look at it as teeth, we want people to succeed and sometimes we realize that there is a phase out, but there is a reason for it and it is based on the data that comes in. Most of the people that I talked to said that living in the fear of cutting programs was not a healthy environment to work in. I think it was Wisconsin, Platteville that shared how they do informational program review cycles. It's all about affirmation. What do you see 10 years down the road? That is their approach.

Reynolds: Program prioritization has been around for enough time for us to see a couple of cycles, but you comment that no one has taken it up again. What is their commentary on continued strategic alignment because program prioritization is not singularly about, I'm going to cut this or deallocate that. There is a lot of it there obviously, but that's every day. The majority of the university just doesn't' see it that way. So what was their plan for, the shiny side of the coin, for the future? You do it once for realignment, strategic alignment, then how do you continue that alignment?

Wallace: For them, their rationale, is that the next time we do it, sort of putting it on a five year cycle, it's going to be for a strategic imperative. Either because someone told us we had to it, or it's because we need it for a major accreditation like HLC, institutional level. It could be like Lehman coming up on their 50th anniversary, and really guiding where they want to go, our marketing pieces. It's going to be based on some future driving force as opposed to a date on a calendar. They are

getting through their annual, they are getting their reaction and the response that they need right now. Institutionally.

Douglass: Would it be safe to say, based on the materials that you read and the people that you talked to, that people have taken the principles of program prioritization and institutionalized them in a way that is maybe a little lower key, a little more often and maybe through existing committees instead of the ad hoc approach.

Wallace: I think that is exactly it. Some things are sort of part of the central data piece, the central data collection, and then there is a response and reaction to it. I did find differences in the reaction and the reflection where that went- at the leadership level being at the dean level or could be at the central leadership. But the institution is able to react to the metrics across the board, and much more often. Annually. It feeds into the data that the leadership wanted to react to in the first place. They want those data. I don't know about the evaluation from our campus and where we stand, but it was really a reaction to the data.

Falkoff: The taskforce several years ago, made exactly the same observation.

Wallace: I think what it does is to allow some flexibility to react to those things that you think are strategically important. One program might react to certain things dealing with student outcomes where another one might react to faculty issues instead. Another might be institutional resources. It allows some flexibility in targeting where you want to put your efforts. The key thing was that annually, you react to it, you close the gap, and in one way or another you have documented that. It's your story. You just put that together and here is my report.

Falkoff: At one point you said the resource allocation component was vital. How does that component manifest itself?

Wallace: I will say pros and cons. I heard from one institution where unfortunately, the economics weren't necessarily part of the process and it's been a barrier to successfully implementing program prioritization plans. This is because those that have the power to shift resource allocation aren't involved in the conversations, so they really don't have an awareness of what they are. Or, whatever their resource requirements and requests might be, they were either unrealistic or didn't fit with where the institution was going. Those that were successful, had a clear strategic plan for the institution that a program could target towards and within the short term budgeting model, those that are aware of the budgeting piece, were at the table. This allowed them to respond and reflect on, or were at least aware of the message back at central leadership. This allowed them, given everyone's requests for resources, they could still set their institutional priorities. But the communication had to be there, about the resources. And in any case, it wasn't just about, we're going to give you new money, it was, you need to figure it out within your own context. What are you going to do? And sometimes they were able to advocate for new items, but not without a rationale for how that was going to happen or be funded. It was an incentive based model. In terms of budgets, the goal is to get out there 5 years, but they realized, that is too far out for any one budget, but they would like to walk in that direction. Maybe a 2 year thing, but helping to move programs and departments in the direction, strategically, that they are looking to go.

Parker: Didn't you say that one of the schools that you looked at, that there was a formal agreed to action plan implementation between the Provost and the program that was a culmination of the periodic program review?

Wallace: Yes. I think for me, Boise State seems to me to be the one that I was most impressed with. They actually started to plan ahead. This is something for us to also be mindful of, with all of these places, it is still a work in progress. Just like for the people who are doing program review every 5 or 7 years, have come to find out that it is slightly different. For what's current in program prioritization is a moving piece. The other thing is, the institution has to figure out what works for them in the shared governance structure. And who is responsible for which part and which piece. There were different options with that.

Douglass: Thank you Steve for doing this for us.

Parker: Where we thought it made sense to try to take the information that Steve was finding in his review of programs was to try to identify some themes that are applicable to NIU and think about how those could apply. Think about the role of the APC with respect to something like an annual dashboard review. And then reflecting on or possibly scrubbing the current process that we have, thinking about what changes would be appropriate, based on what you heard. We thought that this was how this conversation could go next. What did you hear that you think is applicable to NIU? In terms of practices that people are talking about in here?

Gordon: I guess to me it sounds like there was no overall university team approach, it seemed like they were going along for so long with everyone wanting more, more, more, without realizing that at certain times you have to have less, less, less. I think applicable to us, especially in the environment we are in, has to be the realization that being told you may have to cut or there will be some cuts, shouldn't be viewed as a punishment, it should be viewed as a means to help the whole university.

Parker: I take that to mean being more strategic.

Gordon: Yes, and that we should cheer on those that are increasing enrollment getting more because it is for the good of the whole, even though someone may be telling me, Geoff, over time, through attrition, others will not be replaced.

Douglass: It sounds like you are saying that there might be a way for us to transition our thinking into really a more holistic view of the university.

Gordon: Yes

Wallace: An example that I came across, I think it was Boise, they had real significant growth in their programs just because of Engineering. And to me that's similar to what's going on in Computer Science, so there was a strategic imperative that increased faculty in order to meet the demand.

Jaffee: I was interested in probably the most ambiguous component when you were talking about the Key Performance Indicators with discussion of whether there should be things that can translate across the university versus things that are specific to programs and departments. And as long as

they are working within that area, that's ok. I guess I just, there was no resolution to how people are handling that.

Freeman: If I can just add, it's one that actually started on this campus way before Program Prioritization. If you go back to the Vision 2020 Working Group on Faculty Work, Excellence and Rewards, there is something in their action plan, a list of things that they felt were reported on routinely, that could be common across disciplines, but that would obviously need to be supplemented with things that are very critical, but specific to disciplines. It was a very good discussion and I think people were pleased to see that there were common elements as well as a lot of other elements depending on the context where you might use one set to inform your decision making. I don't think of Program Prioritization as something that you do and then you do it again. It is the beginning of becoming more data informed about decision making. It is institutionalizing the practice of resource allocation in the context of strategic priorities and using data, from specific data to general data, to inform those decisions. We had that conversation in a very amicable way before Program Prioritization was ever even on our radar, but it got buried in the recommendation for thirty thousand students. There was also a very important piece of salary equity and compression that also got lost.

Falkoff: I've been thinking of this in the recent weeks as we discuss the merging of Program Review and Program Prioritization, but that's not exactly right. It's reforming Program Review in a way consistent with a kind of data informed decision making that we just honed in Program Prioritization. But it's not prioritization, and if you think of it that way, it's really just a reformation of Program Review. I think it's going to be much more palatable to people.

Wallace: One thing that I found fascinating was that a number of institutions have given up the word Program Review and they just call it Periodic Review. To your point, it's like this transformation.

Parker: Are there other general themes or messages that folks heard?

Falkoff: Almost everything that you reported are the things that we have been talking about. Those are exactly the issues.

Douglass: It's reassuring to know we're following what other people are doing.

Parker: One of the things that came out, reflects the discussion that we have been having for a while, where there is sort of a process or two separate processes that have different cycles to them. One being a yearly cycle being the dashboard as a tactical planning, the other being more periodic review or Program Review that has a different life cycle to it. A much longer life cycle. Five years, eight years or whatever it might be. We had been talking about, and I wanted to put this here as a way to both summarize what Steve was finding and see if this was a way to accurately reflect what you would see as an approach to this year. The idea that the yearly review would be about metrics and data in the dashboard format that enables tactical planning at the local level that helps people in terms of how do we make progress and achieve our specific goals. It enables, at the institution level, institution being both the Provost as well as the peer review process and the shared governance process, but monitoring how well the institution and program are doing, compared to each other in terms of the KPIs. Making adjustments and recommendation in terms of resource allocations, that would be the APC perhaps or the RSB. Out of that would be a reporting duty to the IBHE on a

regular basis. So those would be things that would happen on a more yearly basis. And then longer term, a much more strategic focus would be focused around programs looking at strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats. It might involve analyzing what market they are playing in. Bring together external reviews from accreditors or perhaps an independent external review like we do for the doctoral programs right now. It would be an opportunity to then to review and revise their strategic direction and goals. And then something that could build towards accreditation or reviews and results that, from the institution standpoint, would be where funding for major initiatives, thinking about the portfolio and how that's managed on an institution level and building a case for accreditation. This kind of process seemed to be the theme that was emerging out of the work that Steve was doing here. Does that makes sense to you folks?

Freeman: Chris, can you show me where in this matrix, there is the connection between multi-year budgets and plans and the annual check in, because I am not seeing it, but maybe I am just missing it.

Douglass: Probably we need resource allocation in the bottom right box again. That's like a five year and then the resource allocation above the one year would be a tweaking, giving recommendations for changes with a five year budget.

Freeman: I mean certainly in a five year budget you're not going to expect everything to happen on a yearly basis. Some things have a longer term, some things have a shorter term. We don't expect every program to pivot on a yearly basis. I want to make sure that that's clear.

Douglass: Would that make sense to put it in that box? Five year budget plan in the box on the bottom right, at the institutional level?

Freeman: I'm not good at thinking in these four box models. I need more time to reflect on it.

Douglass: Let's put it as a question mark that it is something that needs to be built into the process. It's something, I think Chris created this to kind of get us thinking about how the dashboard might help us.

Parker: There is a little bit of an inaccuracy in terms of the timeframe on the left here in the sense that this could happen yearly for every single program. Whereas a periodic review would happen for a subset of programs, but on a yearly basis, so there would be an output of that process that might have strategic implications for a five year budget process.

Freeman: When you look at this box, you're not thinking of one plan when you look at all the bullets, you're thinking about the responsibilities in one year for all of the units? I'm really bad at these boxes, I apologize.

Douglass: What does each box represent, I think is what she is asking.

Parker: The thought was that at this level here, we would be providing yearly data in the form of a dashboard to all programs from the institution. And, at the local level, the degree program level, department or the college, that that information would be used for ongoing management of the program. The tactical planning and support of whatever their strategic goals might be. And they would be looking at that in terms of the trend and the like and identify how they needed to respond

to those things. At the same time, some groups, whether it's the entire leadership organization of the university, or a body like the APC, could be looking at KPIs and saying what programs do we have a concern about that we want maybe some quick action plans on. Or response to some trends that we are seeing that are worrisome. Or maybe trends that are laudatory that we want to figure out what's going on and driving those things to take advantage of them. That is the kind of monitoring that might be happening across the university on a yearly basis.

Freeman: I guess maybe part of what I see not being messaged there because of the words. I see annual monitoring as a much more local responsibility.   And periodic monitoring as a shared, higher-lower, responsibility, if that makes sense. It's not that there aren't constant conversations across the university, but it seems to me that yearly monitoring informs local decision making more than higher level at the institution.

Douglass: I think part of this may have arisen though because we felt like in the APC we get to the end of the eight year cycle and things have maybe been going astray for a while. And at this point we say, oh, maybe this should have happened three or four years ago. First of all, we don't have teeth and secondly, it's hard to communicate to your peers that maybe things have gone wrong for a while. I think part of this, was that if people had targets that they were staying in, and then the APC might just know, hey these people are not staying in their targets and they might send a message, what's going on?

Freeman: That makes sense.

Parker: I totally agree with you. This is the bigger, on a yearly basis, this is where the action is. And the role of a body like this should probably be a lot smaller at that stage.

Freeman: As sort of an outlier.

Parker: But the role might be greater here in terms of providing a peer review process that relates to an honest look at the strengths, weaknesses of that program. What are the opportunities that are presented for it as well? They could culminate, like getting behind strategic initiatives and making recommendations to a longer term budget process, helping with decisions related to program portfolio of the university. I think this is much more the current role of the APC too and if the APC were to get more involved in the role over here, the work load of this committee would get to be a burden. Unless you are dealing with outliers, that would be usurping some of the control that should naturally be within the college.

Falkoff: You mean if we were to be privy to the dashboards. See, my vision would be that we get to see dashboard after dashboard after dashboard. And they are all going to more or less look like and then whoa, this guy is way over in the red. What's going on, let's look at the past couple of years dashboards. And then, it's true that we may at that point say, ok, Kinesiology, explain yourself. And it's true that may mean an extra small presentation to us, but one of the things that they are buying is not having to generate the two hundred page monster reports every eight years. Rather, their expectation is going to be every five or six years to complete a Program Prioritization type document which in itself, would be informed by those yearly catches that we sometimes make.

Parker: So you are dealing with people, I'm not suggesting that you wouldn't have access to or insight into the dashboard, but rather that it wouldn't be our responsibility to be viewing every single one of those. You would be looking for outliers.

Jaffee: I guess I was just wondering what the response would be? I was just thinking of things external and forces of all sorts that we are very familiar with at this point, that create kind of artificial outliers. We get this kind of artificial outliers. People have a sudden cluster of retirements that has nothing to do with planning and thinking about how your program is developing or going. So on a yearly basis, how do we respond?

Douglass: Can I say something? First of all, this is a mistake I think I may have made at the Chairs/Directors Meeting, in not clarifying that this would be trend data, not just what happened this year. Let's say that things did change because there was a cluster of new hires. You would see over time, what had gone on, and then you would see this dip for whatever reason. That's exactly what the program would say. We had a bunch of retirees and we need to rethink what we will do in the future. And we actually would like to request to maybe make a strategic hire, or we would like to move in a different direction. These people retired and we need to rethink if these are actually the specialties that we really want, we may want to move to a different area. The response isn't necessarily, it shouldn't be punitive, the response is really about planning and about moving forward. Now if enrollments are dropping and people keep saying we don't know what's happening, that is a more serious situation. But if there is a real explanation as to why things have changed and now you want to react to that, Chris was saying the SWOT analysis, now you want to react to the threats that have occurred within your environment. That makes sense.

Freeman: I'm going to do the scientist analogy because that is where I come from. But if you have a five year plan, and actually have to send in annual progress reports, and they usually look like, this is what we thought we were going to get accomplished and we did, or this is what we said we were going to get accomplished and we didn't and part of it is because we underestimated the time. Or part of it is because this piece of equipment broke and we need money to fix it. Or part of it was because our hypothesis was wrong and we needed to revise it. As a result of that, I've redone the grant budget and I'm now moving in a different direction. And I think that's a great conversation to have in a room like this because you have a lot of thoughtful people who understand the academic context which sort of helps in saying, does this just take longer? Or do we need to do something different? Is this about a recommendation for more resources or changing the allocation? That is a great conversation to have.

Wallace: Barbara, I think you have the perfect example, let's use the annual assessment update example that there were two programs that were able to send in reports that say, it's strange, I look at my dashboard and it's red. Well it turns out, it's new leadership. It's the perfect explanation. In fact, it came in late and I'm still working on it. It actually led to wonderful conversations going forward and was perfect reasonable. At the same time, another program is running in a sinking trend and that's a problem. The data gives you the opportunity to have conversations.

Douglass: I think that is really important. The data in and of themselves don't tell the story, it's the conversations that you have as a result of the data that makes the difference. I think Bill had something to add.

Goldenberg: I was thinking, does not the assessment panel have some aspect of this shorter term tactical element in it?

Douglass: Yes we do.

Parker: Absolutely. There is a yearly annual update that programs are reporting on a couple of student learning outcomes or methods. So you see some activity going on. There is an opportunity for our office to comment on the assessment practices that we see on a short term basis. And then periodically, happening at the mid-cycle review process, they pull it all together and they give an update of their status as well as a report on how well the plan is being implemented and what their findings are. So, yes, there is a short term and then a longer term component.

Goldenberg: What are the longer terms?

Douglass: They just handle the one piece, which is student learning outcomes. What we are talking about now is could we look annually at KPIs that cover more than just student learning and then have a shorter process and a shorter document at the end.

Parker: I think one of the things that I was hearing, and maybe this chart is too busy to really relay what's different about what I was getting from the themes he was talking about is that there is a tactical element that happens on a yearly basis, and then there is a more strategic element that happens on a periodic basis, and how you define roles and responsibilities for shared governance for the institution with respect to the short horizon and the long horizon. Those have all been questions to try to sort out. The basic distinction to the tactical versus the strategic is clearly a theme that pops out of this for us. And that's kind of what this is built around and might obscure the basic point there. Other thoughts or comments?

Douglass: What else was on your list of questions?

Parker: One was thinking about the APC role in respect to a dashboard. We have been talking about that a little bit here, in terms of how to deal with outliers perhaps. Or, we haven't really talked about the periodic review piece, but one might imagine that could function similarly, in terms of its purpose to what the APC does right now. In terms of looking at the strategic planning program document and offering their suggestions and comments around what they see there. And the last of the questions that I have here was, what have you heard that has implications for our program review process right now?

Falkoff: I guess I am just thinking out loud here, but if we are thinking about Program Prioritization as fading away, and we as the APC want to adopt some of that role with respect to making recommendation for resource allocation, I'm just trying to think how that might work? If we are reviewing the new reports that may look like Program Prioritization reports, maybe one of our functions for each of those should be to, we are not putting programs into quintiles or things, we are not allocating twenty percent here or there, but if we've got five buckets that are reasonable and those labels work for Prioritization, maybe that can be one of our tasks. To decide after the periodic reviews, what bucket would we have put this program into? I wonder if that would be valuable.

Reynolds: Does that synchronize with the mandate of the APC?

Falkoff: Does it?

Reynolds: That's the question.

Falkoff: Well, resource allocation and recommendations is one of our, in our charter I believe.

Reynolds: It is.

Douglass: The IBHE wants to know what you are going to do with the programs. Are you going to continue with them, will they need a follow-up report, if you're going to end them or phase them out? So it's probably more specific than what the IBHE asks for.

Reynolds: That's the punch line, maybe, with at least two categories, going too far with that.

Falkoff: I'm really just thinking out loud here. If there's going to be a resource allocation recommendation of one ilk or another, how do we do that?

Freeman: I guess I think it's not, I don't know, but I don't think it works, but I have to think it through, because you are just thinking out loud. I don't think we want to lose the fundamental difference of Program Prioritization, being about allocating resources on our campus from a finite bucket to existing programs. And Program Review being about a programmatic excellence. And so although there might be an ongoing tweaking of resource allocation in the later context, and in the context of Program Review, that annual look is really about were the programs given adequate resources to achieve their assigned goal in terms of what they benchmark, what they haven't, do they need more, is it not working, but it's really still about making that program excellent compared to other like programs not about how that program is competing with unlike programs on our campus. Now whether or not a program is excellent in its discipline has influence on how we value that program, but Program Review is really about that piece of keeping pace with programs that are like that program.

Falkoff: I guess I was saying in the, suggesting in the spirit of adopting and adapting, the Program Prioritization stuff works, those five categories are interesting. They are not top twenty percent, middle or bottom. And if we take out the comparative aspect and just look at the categories for what they are, this is a program that would benefit from enhanced resources, this is a program that needs some reformation, this is a program that really could get by on or with fewer resources. There is no real value judgement and we're not, if we adopted those categories, we are not pitting programs against each other, because we are doing it without a budget really.

Freeman: So you are kind of finishing the sentence by saying this is a program that doesn't need more resources to maintain the desired level of excellence compared to like programs.

Falkoff: Yes, that's exactly.

Subramony: You know, one of the things that even as you are talking that Steve and I found out is up until now, and it's been echoed on our campus too with what we have heard, is that the dashboard aspect is what's most important and valuable from Program Prioritization. We really haven't heard the categorization like that. I think that the dashboard aspect of the metrics is what's useful on other campuses too. The focus of that is more important than the resource allocation. As

Steve and I were talking to people, the focus was not on resource re-allocation, it was on peer review and taking what was meaningful in Program Prioritization and bringing it to Program Review possibly and then making resource recommendations. That was one message that I thought that we heard. There is a semantic difference in my mind when I hear resource reallocation versus making a recommendation for allocation.

Falkoff: And then the Program Prioritization aspect really has to drop out, because we are not about prioritization.

Subramony: That's what we heard. That what's most valuable in Program Prioritization on some campuses. And I can only speak for the ones that I spoke to or heard was the data piece or narrative piece of having institutionalized and centralized data and trends that could be given to people. That was the valuable aspect of it.

Shortridge: I'm struggling with reconciling what you said about Program Review meant excellence of programs of a similar kind. So comparing Engineering to Engineering, comparing Art to Art across the country, then what is the point of the KPI for APC? So to me, the KPI was a way to compare program internally and look at flags of this program is going up in enrollment, this one is going down and there were key performance measures that were consistent across the university, but I am having trouble reconciling maintaining excellence in light of that.

Reynolds: It's relative to the ebbs and flows within that discipline or department. There are endogenous practices that come in and we can't control them. You just can't. Three retirees all of a sudden where you are not getting quality doctoral students, whatever the case is, right? So given that, a lot about outliers, what we are now talking about, I think, is the maintenance of trends of where we want to be relative to the discipline. From my standpoint, it's not… I'm comparing across the institution, because lots of institutions still do that, they just do. A strategic way of looking at data and reporting, to benchmark accordingly, relative to the type of discipline or thing that you are. And if that thing is a department with six CIP Code disciplines across Masters or Doctoral, or if it's one Bachelors, then try to benchmark and plan relative to those KPIs and targets, relative to where the discipline wants to go.

Freeman: I also think you have to think of the programs like athletes in an individual sport. If you ride horses and you do multiple events or you do gymnastics or a decathlon, you get event scores and then a composite score and then in the meantime, you might be competing with other athletes, but you are also competing with yourself. You are trying to work on the areas that you know you need to improve. And so for me, I think the reason that we should use KPIs or a dashboard is that programs are setting goals for themselves. And those that are letting you know, are you meeting your goals, if not, where are you falling short, what aspects of the program performance do you need to work on? And where those goals are set, is influenced both by what makes excellent programs in the discipline, but also what the individual programmatic goal is and how it complements the university's portfolio.

Wallace: You can think about this another way too. When I think about KPIs, they tend to be institutional level, but within our own disciplines, there might also be other metrics that are absolutely critical and feed into our strategic planning, and that we may end up using to guide, what is excellence in our field. Those might not be part of the KPIs, we might have our own discipline

specific. If you look at accreditation, each accreditor has a whole body of pieces of information that they are looking for. That's going to vary by program.

Parker: In at least some of the metrics that Jeff has been talking about, there is a discipline, and I think this is what he was just talking about, a discipline built right into that. It might be that we are looking at research and productivity, productivity relative to other like programs in your field. Not necessarily comparisons to other programs on campus.

Douglass: A couple of things are going to happen in the future. We are going to see the results from Program Prioritization, and we're going to see the evaluation results from Program Prioritization. Next fall, we're going to see the Program Prioritization narratives as part of what the APC will look at in terms of their Program Review. And I think, while a lot of what we have been talking about for months, some of us on a very regular basis, all seem to kind of make sense in our mind, there is still so much more that needs to be defined and these conversations need to continue. I think when these next few pieces come out, we are going to have a little bit better grasp on what it is we are trying to achieve with the KPIs and the dashboards and even just with this process. I want to thank Steve and Chris very much for leading this discussion but, I guess for me, I feel like we are still kind of at the beginning of how this is going to unfold. We don't have the answer today, maybe I naively thought at the beginning of the semester, that we would know by the end of the semester what we are going to do, but I am beginning to realize, it is going to take us a little longer, more thoughtful conversations, more processes and honestly just seeing some data on the dashboard, seeing the narratives as part of our APC review. I think that some of that is just going to have to happen before we have the answers to this. I don't know how other people feel, but this is the conclusion that I am getting to at this point.

Parker: Yes, I think in particular, the feedback from the taskforces about the evaluation of programs and making recommendations based on the data that they see there is going to be really critical.

Jaffee: I think if the goal is to find ways to streamline this process, right, that is the overarching motivation.

Douglass: Yes, it is.

Jaffee: There are really important reasons why we want to be sure to maintain certain distinctions. We are going to have to figure that out, because that is a problem. Seems…

Douglass: A challenge.

Jaffee: At first it seems easy, we'll just follow into the other and then it seems like we would do less.

Douglass: Right, but once you dig in, you realize it's not easy and it's going to take some thoughtful conversations. It really is. But, I think that we are up for the task.

Parker: The last thing that we have, and it's not a small thing I think, was to talk about the current process. I'm not sure that there is time or energy to do that right now. I'm wondering if you were to… in our charts here, what I tried to do was over the course… tried to keep a timeline description of what the Program Review process that currently exists looks like. So there is a number of high

level steps that you see that started in the year before the review even begins. This is where a number of different entities around campus, IR, my office, honors, graduate school, a whole bunch of people, the library, are all providing data that's available to programs that are coming up for review in the next year. This is currently being housed on Blackboard. There is a lot of energy that goes into…

Falkoff: You are purposely making this look horrific, right?

Parker: It's a lot of data and the question in my mind is really, is all of that data really necessary, is it useful? Then there is an orientation meeting that would happen, and again this is in the year before Program Review, to clarify what's expected from the program that is about to go through this process, what is the document going to look like, what are the resources, mainly these data that are available to them, and what other people are on campus? Then the program itself, in conjunction with college leadership, is going to produce an initial draft, and you can see here I am replicating the elements template that exists right now where they are asked to comment on a number of different aspects of their program, whether it's assessment, accreditation, these are in alphabetical order… It's things like HR data and faculty productivity, benchmarking, occupational demand, etc. This is the template that they are actually writing the document to and this literally takes a good bit of time. It's usually a semester or so in the review year, the spring of the review year where that document gets generated. And there is a review process that occurs with the college leadership as well. In the next slide, so then as the process has existed, in the summer that program is submitted to the Provost's Office for administrative review. There is additional data that generally comes from IR, and a revision happens for the APC based on their feedback. And again, that would be the program staff as well as the college leadership that would be involved in refining that draft. Then we have your work picking up where you would then assign those programs to a particular subcommittee. The subcommittees would meet with the program, review, discuss questions, strengths, weaknesses, areas for improvement, questions that you need clarification on and you would meet with the program itself. Next slide, then there is a report out from the subcommittee to the APC generally containing the same information and issues as was covered in the subcommittee meeting. Based on that, a final letter gets written to the program and they are asked to refine their draft one more time. Again, in conjunction with their college. This occurs in the spring following program review and then based on all of that, in addition to whatever the program itself got out of the process, there is a summary that then gets reported to the IBHE as well, in the summer of the year following. A question could be, and maybe not for right now, but we could post this on Blackboard and then ask for your thoughts on what about this process could be streamlined? Regardless of what else we do.

Douglass: I think that the small group that met a while back did have some suggestions. I remember one of them was that if the real interesting work is happening with the subcommittee when it meets the program, then there is no reason for the program faculty then to come here as well. The subcommittee can just bring the report, because the other way is just a rerun. And I think there were a few other things that are posted on Blackboard that came out of that group. We need to make this a much shorter process for people, a much more meaningful process for people.

Parker: And it might be that there are things related to the data that the institution is providing, the data that aren't being used, but are still very time consuming to generate. One example of that is that I look at the reports that are generated by the library and how comprehensive they are, and I know that they must take some time to develop. Are those reports in this context really a purpose

that is commensurate with the work that goes into them? You could ask that for a number of the other areas as well.

Shortridge: I thought two weeks ago this was what we talked about. What we were going to have people do with their reports. I'm confused as to how that jives with this.

Douglass: Yes, I think we have talked about how we are going to streamline this. Chris is showing for us again where we started at. We have already made, for next year, what's going to happen and it's going to be much more streamlined, based on the template that we went through with Marc's leadership.

Parker: There was certainly discussion about the template, which we have tried to capture here, how to skinny that down to where what questions could be asked in addition to the Program Prioritization document. I guess this would be an opportunity to reflect upon that. Not only the document and the data, but there are pieces that weren't addressed like the data that was posted to Blackboard or the process that we use. The idea of removing that second meeting, not inviting the department to the full committee for the APC.

Falkoff: There is a lot of the iceberg under the water that we just haven't looked at yet. But that we can also start pecking away at.

Parker: Another example might be, is it really necessary to have administrative review separate from the APC review. Could they occur more closely in time.

Douglass: I believe we said at the Chairs/Directors meeting that for the next term, it will happen concurrently.

Jaffee: Maybe if we want to bring those reviews closer together instead of cutting out the full committee meeting, we're saying the action happens in the small committee instead of the full, maybe the subcommittee generates the questions, but the meeting is the full committee.

Douglass: That's another idea. What do others think about that as an option? So they actually come to the full meeting, but with a set of questions. I guess one of the things that I would ask, are the subcommittee meetings partially more productive because they are smaller groups?

Falkoff: Yes. I think….

Jaffee: I think because you have to sit and actually think of questions.

Falkoff: No, I believe they are more productive because they are smaller groups and because people are much more likely in that smaller group setting to have done their homework.

Shortridge: I also think the subcommittees are more likely to have read the subcommittee reports that are assigned to them.

Douglass: So then you may have people who may not have read the whole report sitting and listening to the….

Shortridge: When you've got that smaller group it's just more engaging.

Coller: Conversational.

Falkoff: It is less like an inquisition. All right, are we good? This has been the most interesting APC year, hasn't it? We are changing. Any other business? Then we have reached the end of the agenda and we can adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Jeanne Essex