

ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL
Minutes of August 29, 2016
Orientation Meeting
3 p.m., Altgeld 315

- Present: Abdel-Motaleb, Blazey, Chitwood, Coller, Douglass, Falkoff, Gordon, House, Hunt, Isabel, Klonoski (for Birberick), Mini, Mogren, Olson, Reynolds, Slotsve, Strom, M. Subramony, R. Subramony, Wilkens and Winkler
- Guests: Jana Brubaker, Associate Professor-Libraries, Anne Kaplan-Vice President for Outreach, Engagement & Regional Development

The meeting was called to order at 3:03p.m

Douglass: I would like to welcome everyone to the Academic Planning Council. Some of you are coming back for a second or third year or more, thank you very much for that. And some of you are brand new, and so I think the first thing that we will do is to introduce ourselves. Let's go around the room and say whether we are part of the membership and, if you know, say what subcommittee you are on. If you don't know what subcommittee you are on, I can help you to figure that out. Please also state if you are an ex officio member or guest. And we have a very special guest today, Vice President Anne Kaplan is here to tell us about the historical background of the APC as only she can. She is a little uncomfortable because we are taping her so we can have this to put in our Blackboard as well.

Introductions were made around the room.

Douglass: So we have a lot of new people, and we are excited to have you here. The committee last year did a lot of really interesting work, and we changed the process quite a bit. We are still going to be changing it even more this year. So this is a good time to be on the committee. I had hoped that Provost Freeman might be here, but she is running late, so I will start out by discussing the purpose, context and goals. The purpose is to ensure the quality of the programs that we have at the university. This is different than Program Prioritization in that we typically look at Program Review as the quality of programs in comparison to other like programs, across disciplines, in which the program is similar rather than across programs and disciplines, as we did in Program Prioritization. There are some similarities, as you will see as we talk today. There is some alignment, but it is a different process, and the process is inherently different. You, the members of APC are the peer group that assesses quality. The APC looks at the programs and tries to give consultation to the various program representatives to help them to make their programs even stronger. You look at them in terms of a number of different aspects, from research to enrollments to service to engagement of student learning. You look at them in a lot of different ways and that is very important to have all of those different eyes. The ex officio members are here because we also want to contribute to that conversation. The way the process used to work, is that the programs would meet with the Office of the Provost staff in the summer. After that, they would turn in a second version of their report. Next, they would meet with the subcommittees and then with the full APC, after which, they would turn in a third draft of their report. It was a lot of work and I'm going to talk in a moment about some of the changes that we made, but we are really trying to integrate now, so that the conversations are happening more in the subcommittee level and then, when the

subcommittee comes and gives a report, we are having more of a conversation with the Office of the Provost and other Staff. In terms of the goals of Program Review and APC, we certainly want to assist our fellow scholars across the university to make our programs the best that they can possibly be. But we also have a role to advise the Executive Budget Committee in terms of priorities for academic funding. In addition to Program Prioritization results that have been given to the Executive Budget Committee, the vice-chair of the APC participates occasionally, I don't think they have had an opportunity yet this year, but the vice-chair will participate occasionally in the conversations about recommendations for funding with various programs. So that is another role that we have. Similar to, but not quite the same as the Resource, Space and Budget Committee from the University Council, the APC serves the EBC in this advisory capacity. For the RSB, this is their primary role, to talk about resources and budgets, but in the APC, that is just one small part of what we do.

If you don't know this, Program Review is mandated by the state on an eight year cycle. We have a permission from the Illinois Board of Higher Education, to align it with accreditation. So just in the past couple of years we've aligned it in such a way so that if you are being accredited, then the next year you will have program review. This means that these cycles might not be eight years, they might be five, they might be ten, depending on your accrediting body. And that is a big change, which Ritu will talk about in a little bit. Another part of Program Review that you should be aware of, is that the Higher Learning Commission that accredits us, requires that you have some sort of process like this. That is something that they look for in their annual reviews, and, more specifically, when they ask us to write assurance arguments. Our next assurance argument is due in 2018. That is a little bit about the purpose, context and the goals. I think another goal is really just to get all of you involved and this is the best way to do that. And it's your process, so you are free to make changes through this is shared governance committee. So even though we are here to support, we want to hear your voices. Last year we made some big changes on this committee, so thank you for returning and welcome to those of you that are new. I think with that, I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Kaplan, who had my job many years ago, as well as wearing many other hats during her time at NIU. She has a wealth of knowledge about the history of Program Review in general, in the state, and on this committee in particular. And last year, when we asked about the presentation, it was great to hear from that perspective and how things have evolved over time. We invited her back and asked her to be videotaped this time.

Kaplan: Well, I know that a lot of you were here last year for APC and heard this presentation, but I don't suppose you've committed it to memory. And it hasn't changed much. I thought I would take a minute to start talking not so much about the goals of Program Review but to the uses to which they are put. They are not necessarily the same thing. I think the most obvious and important goal in Academic Program Review has always been to maintain and enhance quality, either by looking for areas that need improvement or areas in which people can collaborate or incorporate some type of course revisions. Those tend to be internal assessments, and they sometimes include comparison to model programs or with programs of recognized excellence. But in any case, the goal is always to maximize the program's potential. I think that is the goal that is by far, what most of us is comfortable with. The second use of these reviews has been, in the past, and I think in most public institutions, to justify new programs or programmatic expansion and that has often been in the pursuit of external funding or internally, from donors or in states that have budgets, from state legislature. And then there is a third use, particularly in professional programs, which has to do with meeting accreditation requirements or satisfying other compliance mandates like the Higher Learning Commission. They are the primary audience, that is external to the university but the information is obviously important to the university and to those responsible for the program. Then I think it's just one thing to keep in mind, it's important that what you say in an accreditation report

and what you say in a Program Review, bares some similarity. It has happened in the past, accreditation visitors have actually asked for Program Review for the program that is under review for accreditation. And then we have had a couple of awkward situations where they were a bit at odds. That raises some questions that would probably rather avoid. Less frequently, but hardly less important, Program Reviews can be the basis for the defense of programs, whether being questioned by legislature, governing bodies or coordinating boards like the IBHE, or just journalist writing stories on waste and duplication in higher education. This is a topic that we all know more than we wish about. And then finally, these reviews are sometimes used to provide for the institution, that the program is meeting state and federal goals. So, as Carolinda said, we've had Academic Program Review since 1979. And I think over that time, we have used the review process mostly successfully for all of those purposes. Although I think the original intent was primarily aspirational. So, I will start with that. Like most of Illinois's regional institutions, NIU went through a period of significant growth during the 50s and 1960. NIU's student population, which had been about 2000 in 1950, reached 7000 by 1960 and 25,000 by 1975. NIU, along with Western and Eastern, was granted university status in 1957, and graduate enrollment went from 1,300 to 5,000 in the following decade. This kind of enrollment growth was accompanied across the state by an associated growth in institutional aspirations, causing the General Assembly to create in 1961 a coordinating authority for public higher education. By statute, the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) was to approve all new academic units and programs at the state's public institutions, recommend operation and capital budgets, and develop higher education "master plans" for development, expansion, integration, coordination, and the efficient utilization of the state's public institutions. This gave the IBHE substantial influence over institutional missions and program initiatives, just at the time when the university was trying to move beyond its historic role in the preparation of teachers. By the mid-1970s, the population increases which had driven the expansion of the '50s and '60s seemed to be over. An IBHE publication, "The End of Growth," (1977) signified a belief that the decline in the number of people in the 18-24 year old age group would mean a decline in higher ed enrollments. Coordinating boards across the country became concerned about controlling higher ed costs and aspirations, avoiding duplication and limiting expansion. The end of growth prediction turned out to be faulty, having overlooked the expansion of part-time and adult students and the growing importance of higher education in the labor market, but its immediate effect was to strengthen state coordinating boards. I joined the staff in the Provost's office in 1978, the year Provost Monat became acting president. John La Tourette arrived as provost in 1979 and was immediately faced with an IBHE demand that NIU justify its doctoral mission before the board would consider the university's proposal for a doctoral degree in Geology. This was a new kind of directive, and its immediate ramification was the development of the program review process. It was obvious that we would not make any headway with the IBHE without program specific information, data-driven evaluation, and a way to link programs to budget. LaTourette, with an academic background in developmental economics, was pretty comfortable with this approach. Associate Provost, Wilma Strickland, previously chair of the Management department, told me that if I wanted a career in academic administration, I'd better learn how to do this. I followed Wilma around for a couple years and in 1983 became the university's first Assistant Provost for Academic Planning. At about the same time, Richard Wagner was appointed executive director of the IBHE. Often referenced in the press as "the powerful executive director," Wagner held that position from 1980 to 1998. He built the board's agenda around important public goals such as affordability, minority student achievement, workforce preparation, economic development, and improved undergraduate education. Within that broad context, the IBHE attitude toward specific programs reflected the "end of growth" premises and was fairly restrictive. On campus, program review became a vehicle for indicating NIU's programmatic quality and justifying programmatic expansion. Doctoral programs were approved in Geology in 1979, Biology in 1982, and Mathematics in 1984. The College of Engineering was approved in 1985. Each of the doctoral

proposals was denied or deferred on several occasions; each brought questions from IBHE staff about the possibility of trading in an existing doctoral program in the humanities (these had been approved before the IBHE was created); and each raised questions about the university's mission. These discussions were frequently heated, featuring data duels between Monat and LaTourette at one end of the table and Wagner and his chief academic officer Bob Walhaus at the other. The review process took on increased importance in 1991 when the IBHE launched its Priorities, Quality and Productivity initiative. PQP was an attempt to examine all academic programs in the state for efficiency, productivity, quality and need - with a view to eliminating duplicative and low quality programs.

That process did result in the elimination or reduction of about 300 university programs around the state and, according to the IBHE, a savings of \$400m, some of which was reinvested in new programs. The board claimed that the process re-established public confidence in higher education management and led to increased political support and investment at a level which exceeded the national average. From the campus perspective, it was stressful and exhausting, but not as exhausting as it would have been had we not had an extensive program review process already in place. Most of the members of today's APC will probably not have experienced NIU as part of the Regency System. We were, until 1995, one of three institutions in a system which included ISU and Sangamon State (now the University of Illinois, Springfield). This meant that our program reviews, new program proposals, requests for authority to offer existing programs off campus and even changes to existing programs went first to staff at the Board of Regents and only then to staff at the IBHE. This "double scrub," as we saw it, was time consuming and, again from our perspective, particularly disadvantageous to NIU because the role and potential development of a university located in northern Illinois did not seem to us to be comparable to the role of a 2-year institution in Springfield or an institution focused on undergraduate education in Bloomington/Normal. Because of these concerns, every NIU president since Rhoten Smith had tried, quietly and diplomatically, to get his own institutional board, but no one had been able to get both sides of the legislature lined up behind him until 1995 when the stars aligned and NIU and 6 other regional institutions got their own governing boards. That reorganization of public higher ed left the IBHE in its coordinating role but significantly reduced its capacity for programmatic oversight. Absent the staff at the governing board level, the IBHE did not have enough staff of its own to provide the kind of detailed analysis which had been part of the program review and approval process under Wagner. Additionally, there was (and I think continues to be) a growing recognition of the demographic changes which justify programmatic expansion in some areas of the state but not in others. Moreover, given a decade of continued reductions in funding, it is hard to argue that higher education needs a state agency to keep individual institutions from excessive expansion. As a result, the IBHE, in the post-Wagner years (and under 6 subsequent executive directors), has been less focused on regulation at the program level and more on implementation strategies to meet broad educational goals. The 1998 IBHE, under newly appointed executive director, Keith Sanders, proposed eight primary goals under what was called the "Citizens Agenda." The goals included increasing educational attainment; extending access to higher education; assuring affordability; enhancing access and success for underrepresented groups; improving quality; enhancing responsiveness to students, employers, communities, and the state; strengthening school/college partnerships; and improving productivity. These were not particularly controversial goals, but the need for implementation strategies, performance indicators and benchmarks for success added new components to the way institutions think about and defend their programs. They also allow for much greater variation and more institutional choice in the identification of peer programs and relevant outcomes.

Douglass: Questions or comments?

Mogren: I appreciate the historic context and we all know that we have gone through the mother of program review over the last of couple of cycles. I guess my broader question would be, first of all, within the context of continuously involving policy making generated by this prioritization process, what it is that you see that this committee can contribute to the process? And part of the earlier process, you seem to suggest, not only evaluation of programs, but also helping programs set goals as they move forward. We are in a position immediately, where we're kind of uncertain about what goals we are going to be asking to pursue. Therefore, as we are tasked to look at programs submissions to us here, what are the standards and the criteria that you are being asked to use. What is the relationship between what we are going to be doing here and the prioritization process?

Douglass: He's asking you, but I'm going to try to give him an answer too.

Mogren: I'm asking for anyone to give me more information. We have a big job to do. We have a number of units that are adapting in very good faith and providing us with comprehensive materials, and much of it is going to be straight from prioritization materials or similar to it. Is it going to be duplicate, what we are doing here? Is it going to be relevant? Until we have a better and clearer sense of what our purpose is, it's sort of the fallout from the prioritization process. What is it we are supposed to do?

Douglass: I would say one thing that we need to do is to define what the role of this committee is moving forward because it is very different now that we have had Program Prioritization. And in fact, the foundational materials which we will be looking at for these programs are the Program Prioritization narratives. They have already been looked at once, but they were looked at in terms of looking with a specific set of criteria and identifying a ranking. We're not going to say they belong in category one, two, three, four, or five, but we still have a consultative role to play where we can help people to improve their programs. And as they develop action plans, and I can tell you one of the programs actually wanted to submit their action plan with their materials. But we didn't ask people for their action plans, we asked them for their narratives and we asked people for any accreditation materials they might have and asked them for a very short set of responses to supplemental questions. And as we move forward, if people want advice on action plans, then that is another thing that we can be doing for them. I think that part of it is, also setting up more frequent touch points with the programs so that we can be helping them, not every eight years, but helping them think about their goals on a more regular basis. We will talk more later about the Program Review Dashboard, which is another component that could help with that.

Falkoff: When I asked the same question of the Provost a couple of weeks ago, because I have long struggled with exactly who we are, one point that she made was that Prioritization was largely looking at programs in relation to other programs at NIU. In APC, we are looking at programs directly as peers and offering our observations. That is one distinction that is relevant. We are not sitting here as a left over from the task forces. We are not re-ranking or re-categorizing programs. Although with that said, I think there are aspects of what we do that are clearly in alignment with Program Prioritization.

Kaplan: It seems to me that you don't want to do anything that diminishes the kind of standard evaluation of the programs involved. But having said that, then if you've got a program that is a good program, I think there is a second question which is why is it good that it is here? And that is not all that hard to answer. We just do it. There are all kinds of reasons why it's good that it's here. What kind of students are you getting, do they have an opportunity to go anywhere else, what are the connections between them and whatever you are looking at? There are lots of those. And I

would much rather defend a program here than in a lot of other places. I just think we just need to think about that. And add it to.... it's always going to be hard to defend a program and it should be hard. But if you have a good program, it needs to fit, it needs to connect with something. It needs to have some kind of cognitive development. We are really pretty well positioned to do that.

Douglass: Let me ask you Eric, is there something that you have thought about that you would want to be involved in this review?

Mogren: Well Marc and I have had conversations. You suggested, for instance, that we could offer restructuring, recalibrating re-programing for departments and things like that. And it seems to me, a fair thing to say, but it's hard to get to that because we don't know yet, what departments are going to fade. Prioritization might say you have to cut your graduate program, for example. Or you might have to eliminate a unit. And it's difficult to do that. It's difficult to offer advice on that until we know exactly what the outcome is going to be. Now, if we were going to continue to do this process in order to continue a kind of longer longitudinal data base for units and how successful they are and that type of thing, that's fine. I think it's also difficult and perhaps it remains to be seen whether it was useful or not to try to come up with arguments about our relative success and what we define as peer institutions. I am still not quite certain what that means. Is a peer institution someone that is most like us? Does it happen to be a football conference? What does that mean and I would love to set our peer institution as every institution that looks worse than we do. So trying to come up with some of this is... what do I have to give, what have I accomplished? How can I move forward, successfully through what is going to be a very difficult period of resource allocation? But I am not certain that we can do that exactly. And I think it is going to be very interesting to see.

Douglass: I am glad that you said that. Thank you. I think that that is something that you should keep in mind as we move forward. As I have said before, this is an evolving process. This is the time for those kinds of comments and to start thinking about ways that we can help our peers. Are there other comments?

Mogren: My key question to you would be, what does the context look like right now? And when I say right now, I mean 2016-17 time frame. It looks like we are refocusing on requirements from the IBHE status.

Kaplan: I think a big part of the context, we don't know where the IBHE is right now. I think they are struggling with the kinds of staffing issues the rest of us are, but they didn't start out with a whole lot of staff in the first place. And so, they used to have a sort of significant role in making recommendations about the budget, but there is no budget. I have heard suggestions that the whole thing would go away or the state will move to some sort of education agency that would suck up the IBHE and community college board. I haven't heard anything that would tell me where that thinking currently is. But I think that these boards are sort of under attack because of state level bureaucracies that don't have anything to do. Not that I particularly want them to have a whole lot to do, but I think that's a possibility. I think there is a possibility that if we ever get a Governor and legislature who can work together on anything, things would change but we have a complete stalemate. So that very little is going on, but presumably, that won't last forever. I can imagine different kinds of organizations of higher education or education in the state, but we are not there. Do you think we are there?

House: No. I think the other thing is, through our history, there have been ebbs and flows where the IBHE is more adversarial towards the campus and functions on behalf of the legislature, right

now the pendulum, I think, has swung the other way. The IBHE is as supportive and sympathetic of the campuses as has been the case in Anne's time. But they are under the same or worse budgetary situations than any of the campuses. That they have received, as I understand it, salary funding only, so they have no equipment budget, they have people buying computer parts on their own. I think right now, they are as strong an advocate for the campuses as they have ever been.

Kaplan: I think that's true. And I think they are hoping for some advocacy in return. And then there is also the whole lingering on of the whole online thing and the fact that it's very difficult for an agency like the IBHE to control what it used to control. You can't stop students from having access to all kinds of things in all kinds of places, that they cannot draw a line around. That is a huge change. And most of their data systems, are organized around the theme that people are affiliated with a specific campus. It doesn't occur to them that you can live in Illinois and take a full load elsewhere. And so they have no mechanism for involvement in that right now.

Douglass: I was struck by something that you said, that during the PQP days, when everything was so tight, that it took a very long time to get anything approved and then money was very tight. Well, it takes a very long time now to get things approved and there's no money, but it's very different. Now because there's no staff, they want to help, but it still takes a long time to get things approved. They are doing better than they used to, but it's the same situation, but for a very different reason. They don't have money to give and they don't have staff to help. We are in a similar spot. Any other questions?

Abdel-Motaleb: I would like to get some information. Now, we review the academic program. What entity reviews the administrative programs or section?

Kaplan: On campus?

Abdel-Motaleb: Yes.

Kaplan: Only when we did the Program Prioritization process. Do we still have the administrative reviews?

Douglass: Well, there are certain administrative functions that are accredited, so they get reviewed. But no, there is not a companion piece to what we do here for administrative units.

Kaplan: Universities organize themselves in a variety of different ways. Things in one institution can be in the finance area and at another are in the student's services area.

Abdel-Motaleb: Don't you think we should have an internal review like this one at least?

Douglass: I think that is why the President and the Provost pushed to have an Administrative Task Force for Program Prioritization. It's because it really hadn't been done before. But there is a not a similar body, at least at this point and time, that looks at administrative programs on a regular basis. The other things about administrative programs, is that they are much more nimble. We have very rigorous and important processes for creating and eliminating academic programs. Administrative programs can come and go much more quickly.

Kaplan: And the people in them are much more moveable within that context. You can take someone from the finance side and move them to the student affairs side. You can't take someone from Physics and move them to History.

Douglass: Well thank you very much. I really appreciate you being here.

Kaplan: I wish you well.

Douglass: We will let you know when your video is up.

Reynolds: Good Afternoon. I want to talk about the new Program Review Dashboard and External Review. External Review is not necessarily new, but we are going to ask for your input and take a look at some changes we have been making recently. This is the Program Review Dashboard. Right now it is a draft, you have not received access to this yet, as we are still in the process of crossing all of the T's and dotting all of the I's. What we learned from Program Prioritization, whether the data and reporting by people like us was sufficient or necessary. Overall, it provided for a context for conversations. This was internal, an output of the narrative, and subsequently it's going to be useful to people like Jerry and the Executive Budget Committee. We want to continue this trend. When I used to be in college office, we regularly produced data like this. Dan's office and my office regularly look at information like this. And currently, to date, Program Review has seen data and reporting, more in a static way, which is fine. You can process it in any singular way. However, we are trying to make it more nimble, more easily accessible, so one of the things that Carolinda and I did, along with Provost Freeman's and VP Phillips' approval was to take a plan to the College of Deans and propose putting some metrics and measures up and online. This would make Program Review more data driven and data informed. Not that it wasn't before, but it would now be more activated. And we took it to this body last year, and the APC approved it as well. We have been working with two of the department chairs and we are currently uploading all of the data for this current fiscal year Program Review cycle. And it's information like you see here: new freshman admissions. This is data straight from Institutional Research file. Also new freshman applied, new freshman admitted, and then new freshman enrolled. For Fall 2010, 11,12,13 and 14. Once the 2015 data is available, in terms of the official census count, we will update that data. You will see the same thing for new transfers. A very astute chair, while reviewing these types of items, said these are ratios relative to those items that you just saw above. So it's a relative measure in terms of who's coming through the front door. And again, this is only undergraduates as an example. One of the chairs said, "well, I don't have control over this". Ok, fair enough, you might not have control over it. However, it provides us a context and a foundation for conversation about the flows coming through those degree programs, which this body certainly takes a look at. Next, credit hours produced at the various drive course levels. You can see trends across those levels. Next, fiscal year data. Not only fall census data, but fall, spring and summer.

APC: Are those off the pivot tables? Is that how you are creating them?

Reynolds: This is from Power BI, which is a new app within the Office 365 environment; so everyone actually has access to this. We roll the data up relative to pivot tables, totals, and actually Power BI does some of this.

APC: So if the department wanted to add some new tables, you could do it with this app?

Reynolds: We would do that outside of this context. These are pretty locked down because the Council of Deans and the APC approved them. However, you hit it. I've already had two chairs say, this is useful information for me organizationally, to help me strategically plan. We are just operationalizing what's going on in my degree programs or my department in general. There is no reason why we can't do that.

Douglass: Can I just add something? The way this got started, was the Program Review Process Task Force said, we would like to see something on an annual basis. We would also like to have a conversation on an annual basis with the programs and what they are doing in various areas. And what we are calling performance indicators. Performance indicators were developed. At this point, we in no way want to scare anyone off with these indicators. What we are trying to do at this point, is get people to engage with these, the ones that were approved by the Council of Deans. We want them to engage with them, see if they would be of help and, if they are not helpful, give us feedback on how they could be more helpful. This is one of the things that we hope you will do at your subcommittee meetings, and Jeff can be there to support you in talking about some of the things that you see in the Dashboard. And is that something going forward that would be beneficial to this group? Is it something that would be beneficial to the programs? But at this point, there are no high stakes connected with this information. This is really just trying to get a sense of can we engage in better data and conversation. Like the one that you just pointed out, well, that's something that I cannot control. That is something that we hear a lot. I have no control over who walks through the front door. Well you don't have control over who walks in the front door, but you can plan for what you are seeing. Maybe there is an opportunity to think about different ways to organize your program and ways that you all can help the program representatives think about that.

Slotsve: Just out of curiosity, you've got these programs that you are showing as an example. Will this be available to every department?

Reynolds: Right now they will be available to the APC members.

Slotsve: Some of the information, this looks like useful information. At some point, maybe a year down the line, that it would be available to the department?

Reynolds: Yes. We're working on this.

Slotsve: I'm thinking in terms of if the department is under review or not, so they can see what's happening.

Douglass: Exactly. Consider this a pilot year. We are trying to figure out how to get this right. And then yes, we do want this to be shared.

Reynolds: This is one of the diagrams that I like to show. This is actual Biology data. Barrie Bode and his department are being reviewed this year, his program being Biological Sciences. This is Biological Sciences MS enrollment totals, and then by sex, male and female. And you'll notice in 2012, it dropped. So immediately you might ask, whoa, what's going on? He had an intuitive reason for why this seemed like a new steady state, if you will, at forty students as opposed to sixty. There was a grant, and the department purposely brought in an influx of students. About a year or two before that, it was about forty students. The subcommittee might ask, "What is the expectation that you have as a chair or the graduate director, or whoever is showing up, for the capacity of your Masters Program?" Why did that drop? There is always intuition; there is always a reason. And if there is not, well then that's information too. That would just show a case where we say, let's dive deeper into that. This is just enrollment. Once you see it, it is a lot of that same type of information that we have tried to put out there, that we saw was useful for people in the Program Prioritization, but not necessarily all of it. You will see familiar reporting, as you saw before, like Research and Scholarship. This is just for Academic Analytics. It has pros and cons, but it is just to go ahead and provide a context for conversation with the subcommittee and the department about research and

scholarship activities. And then with the APC. If some metrics or measures are not relevant, for instance, in Theatre, a lot wouldn't be relevant here, than we would want to look at very different types of creativity and performance measures and data instead of externally funded grants. Although if that was there in the data already, then sure, we would want to go ahead and note that.

The other thing that we have been doing, is External Review. For most of the departments, External Review actually doesn't exist. At this campus, we have chosen, long ago, to only take a look at doctoral programs. So if you have a doctoral program, the whole department gets reviewed, but it's on that doctoral program that gets flagged for external review. We bring in individuals from the discipline. We take a look at disciplinary, peer based practices. To Eric's question before, "What is a peer?". On a disciplinary stance, Dan and I can take a look and say, we have a bunch of peer sets for the institution. But for the discipline, even though I'm an economist and I think I know what our peers are for the Department of Economics, I would ask George and his colleagues who actually are in Economics. At least, certainly, I would ask the chair and the leadership within that department. So for disciplinary practices, get those peer institutions, get some external reviewers, bring them on campus to meet with a variety of individuals, mostly within the department. That would include students, junior faculty and faculty from all the different fields. If there are labs, like Biology and Physics, we will have them meet with personnel in those areas. We will certainly go ahead and do that for Physics. I think we are going to take them out to Fermi. Right now, we just do External Review for doctoral program, but we have in the past, on occasion—and the we is basically the college in collaboration with the Provost Office, we've done it for one or two Masters terminal programs in departments. That was usually when they were fairly large departments. Right now, there is an opportunity to embed External Review in the Program Review. We are not necessarily doing it for this program cycle. I can certainly give you the information that we are going to be getting from the reviewers. But by that time, the cycle will have finished. We will probably ask you, what is your opinion on this? Should we go ahead and embed the External Review process in the overall Program Review process? Would it be useful to hear what the discipline has to say as opposed to just what the institution or our process says? And mind you, if we have any kind of accreditation, that is, if you will, an external review by accreditation. That goes into Ritu Subramony's area. Right now, this is still a work in progress, but promising.

Douglass: Both of these pieces are relatively new and we are trying to work them into the process. We are looking for your feedback. Nothing is set in stone, but Jeff has been working very hard on both of these processes to get them more integrated into Program Review. Was there a question for Jeff? Go ahead.

A question was brought up surrounding the importance of choosing peers carefully.

Douglass: The peers need to be chosen carefully is what you are saying. We've had some vetting processes for that.

Reynolds: In the past, we've usually looked at aspirational as well as comparative.

Douglass: Another form of the peer review is accreditation. So we will turn it over to Ritu to discuss that at this point.

Subramony: All of the things that Jeff said, we have valuable feedback come from External Review. We want to leverage what our accrediting bodies provide for accredited programs. We do pay a hefty sum to all of these. The programs know that. Disciplinary accreditation gives us the feedback, the self-study gives us many ideas in terms of what we are doing well or areas we could improve

upon. That feedback, that External Review, when it comes to accredited programs, would come a year before the Program Review. This APC group has talked about it for much of last year, and four or five things have happened. I'm just going to step back and give you the bigger context. The Program Review Task Force of 2013 came up with recommendations to use accreditation or External Review as part of Program Review. That was one part. The second part was that we have a dashboard now, to further inform our process. We have all of these performance indicators that we are talking about and looking at consistently. We can also imbed assessment and other items in there. The third part is also to see how it would impact our programs.

As we are talking about this, let's take a look at what would really happen. We have this long schedule, this is part B of the notebook, and this tells us about a few different decision rules. The purple ink are the programs that would go on the eight year cycle. Right now, the default is eight years for Program Review. The red ink is connected with CAEP, the teacher certification and used those dates to align their Program Review. In some cases, we were able to align Program Review with these programs and in some cases, it wasn't possible. Finally, looking at the green ink, which would be where we are looking at the accreditation. We have 57-58 programs that would be impacted if we go with their accreditation cycles. The good part is, we would have a lot of good information, and I will talk about that. The part that is not as good is that it makes the schedule a bit more complicated. It is a neat and clean eight year cycle right now. And now we are switching to some cycles being five years, some six years, some eight and others are ten years. There were a couple of decision rules we needed to use here. When you get a chance, please look at part B of the notebook. Some of the guidelines that we have used to put the cycle together, we've said that accreditation has to come before Program Review. The logic for that is for a public university, accreditation is the driver for a lot of change. Anything that we do, we are showing our best face before the accreditor comes. That is the most important thing, so it needs to come before Program Review. We need their feedback, which is part one. The second part is that, we want to be sure to align with the cycles, but the cycles cannot be longer than ten years. We currently have permission from the IBHE to align these within a cycle that goes no longer than eight to ten years. If the cycle is less than four years, we cannot possibly ask them to go through Program Review again in four years or less. There are a few programs in the College of Health and Human Sciences that would get impacted. They are in very good shape and they have agreed to do in that short time period. Those are the only exceptions and those are the rules that we used. This has been a two year process where we got in touch with people at the college office level. And in some cases at the department level to get their approval. This was done to make sure that we had approval and were okay with this alignment. In some cases, there are exceptions. The College of Business is one of these. The College of Business has a five year cycle. Within that five year cycle, their college decided that it did not make sense for their programs to go through Program Review every five years. The Accountancy programs will go with the cycle of five years, whereas the rest of the programs will go every eight years. The rationale for this is, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) is the accreditor for the College of Business, and they accredit the college, at that level. They do not get enough nuanced information at the program level that they felt would be useful. If they go an eight year cycle, they are doing it twice in fifteen years, if they go with a five year cycle, they will be going through it three times. And I am assuming that no one likes to do Program Review more often than they need to. So, there are those exceptions, but we have been talking with all of the colleges to get the schedule up and running. I would request, when you go back to your particular colleges, to please review this and let your colleges know, this is the schedule that has been finalized. If there are some changes that still need to be made, we would be happy to make them. Please do bring this back to your colleges. As we are going through 2016-17, the purple ink is the eight years. We also have a University Assessment Panel (UAP) cycle date included. In the past, the UAP cycle would be right in the middle of the Program Review cycle. If

Program Review is in six years, your UAP review will occur in three years. In 2017-18 cycle, you can see that National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Science (NAACLS) went to a ten year cycle. It is aligned with a ten year cycle. This is how we have started to do this and we are hoping that it will be successful for now.

Abdel-Motaleb: Can you tell me more about the Engineering cycle?

Subramony: Yes, for Engineering, their accreditor, the Accrediting Board for Engineering Technology (ABET), will be here in November. You are getting that accreditation now and you will get feedback in the next few months. This would mean that next year is when your program and all of the other programs for the College of Engineering would go through Program Review.

Abdel-Motaleb: Does this mean that in six years...

Subramony: Yes, you will be on a six year cycle because ABET is on a six year cycle. Typically, programs in the College of Visual and Performing Arts are on a ten year cycle, Music, Art, Theatre and Dance. This means they would go through a ten year cycle. In some cases, we had to adjust the first alignment date with not exactly ten years or five years. This is because we need to align eventually. You may see and notice that as well. Any questions, definitely get in touch with me. The sooner we can do this, the better it will be, if there are any changes.

Douglass: I want to thank you. This was an enormous task, the logistics are incredible. I hope this alignment will prove worthwhile. If that is something that people are worried about that they didn't realize that if they are aligned with accreditation then that means I have to come here every six years and I don't want to do that, then we may need to change this. I know it was an enormous task.

Subramony: Of course. Back to this. The point is, we use the guidelines, we want the accreditation feedback to be new, or at least fairly recent-within one to two years and a preference for one year. An important thing that has happened is that this is obviously going to affect the rest of our processes. The larger context that I talked about when I first started talking a couple of years ago, we wanted to listen to people in the programs who were saying there is a lot of reporting burden, and we wanted to reduce that. I don't think they can vanish, we are at a public institution, so those are not going to go away. Our effort was to align them as much as we could and see where there are redundancies enabling us to have less reporting. That was one very big deal in connection with this process. When we align these processes, we do lose something though. We lose that predictability of the eight year cycle. It's much neater that way and now it's a bit messier. It can be six years, it can be eight years, depending on what the accreditor wants. Sometimes, and this has not happened recently, you could have an accreditor come back and say, typically your cycle is six years, but because of all of these issues, we're going to give you accreditation for only four years. We may have to adjust if this situation occurs. There are pros and cons here. However, we hope that ultimately we can step up and manage this efficiently. The next point that I would like to make, is the mid-cycle status. Right now, this chart is showing how the Office of Assessment is connected with Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). There is an annual assessment that I'm sure you are all aware of, annual assessment updates that focus on student learning, and those are the objectives. The feedback for this is provided by the Office of Assessment. Typically, there is a mid-cycle status report, which is where the UAP or University Assessment Panel comes in. It is looking at what the program has done for four years. And I say four years because up to now, program review has been eight years. The UAP would look at what have you done for the last four years, how have you built up your assessment systems, your assessment plans, have you listened to feedback, have you done changes that need to be done, and put all that information in the mid-status report. Here is another

chance of how you can enhance it and here are some ideas of what you can do. This would come right in the middle and then there would be another four years to roll everything up and then you would come to Program Review. What we are trying to do with the dashboard that has been created, is to provide linkages so that APC can review these on an annual basis, as and when they occur. We may not be interested to look at every program, every year and its data, but we would certainly be interested to look at what's in the status report and what kind of feedback is being given. When Carolinda said that this is a much lengthier project that we need to think through, how do we leverage the system? From my point of view, right now I am the director of Academic Accreditation. This means that my first focus is how do we help our accredited programs become stronger? We do this so that we don't have to go through an accreditation, see where we fell down, when we could have easily prevented it. We want to be able to link the Program Review and the Accreditation self-study in such a way, that I and Assessment Services, which are merging September 1, can also provide that consultation and feedback right before the accreditor is coming. Or a couple of years before during the mid-cycle to help the program to make sure that their learning objectives and their educational outcomes are strong. This would allow them to go into accreditation, hopefully get really good results, and then when they come to Program Review, they are golden. That is again, a project that we need to plan, step by step, over the next month or two. This is what we are thinking and where we are going. The pluses in the graphic are deliberate. The Assessment and Accreditation data would definitely be more aligned. When I say there are about sixty programs that are going to be impacted, that should really be a boon for them. The other advantage here is that we are getting the external feedback through the Accreditation and we are getting the internal feedback through Program Review. This is very good for our accredited programs because that is what they need to take and run with.

Douglass: Just to wrap up. We are making a lot of changes and looking for your input once we see how those changes go. We want to see how we can make this better as this is a pilot year. The first thing that we will see is some evaluation at the subcommittee meetings. I want to move on to the next item, which is very important. The vice chair, Marc Falkoff, and the two subcommittee chairs, Jeanne Isabel and Geoff Gordon telling you a little bit about the expectations that they have for you as members of their subcommittees.

Falkoff: I think this is one of the most interesting committees at the university. It's incredible how much we learn about the university and your colleagues across different departments. Of course, it's the most valuable for the folks that are coming up in front of us if we all have read the documents and thought about it and participated in the subcommittee activities. It's also important to send in questions or comments to the subcommittee chair. The more interactive you can be, the more you do your homework, the more rewarding it is for everyone. I do think it is a really great committee to be on including for the people sitting on the other side of the table.

Isabel: I guess I would say that when you are reading materials, sometimes question marks come up and you say, well I don't understand how they can say this or what does this really mean? And that when we meet with the representatives at the subcommittee meetings, that is your chance to get clarification.

Falkoff: And if you have a question, there's a good reason for the questions and I think I was a little intimidated when I first started. How could I possibly understand what's going on in Biology, but we're all smart people, so if something doesn't seem to make sense, there is probably a very good reason, but one couldn't discern it immediately, so you need to ask questions. I think we are at the end of the agenda. No further items, then we are adjourned.

Gordon: The big thing is that everyone just needs to participate. I don't want anyone to feel threatened or fearful. You can learn a lot from what other departments are doing, and actually even help others a lot. I think for me, selfishly, the best part of being on this committee has been taking back to my department things like best practices being carried out or even not so best practices. We will meet as a subcommittee for like five minutes right after this, but just jump into the reports, read and participate and have fun with it.

Falkoff: The most annoying part about being in APC is just reading the hundred page, repetitive reports and we are largely limiting that, which is going to be tremendous.

Douglass: The next agenda item is the elections. We typically have elections for three positions. We have an election for the vice chair. We have our subcommittee chairs for this year, but we typically want a chair-in-training for each subcommittee that would be willing to do it next year. And then we have two representatives to the University Assessment Panel. One is appointed and Ibrahim is that individual. And then we have one that is elected. I understand that people may not want to jump up right now and volunteer for things since you've been sitting here for an hour and forty-five minutes. And we can tell you more about the chairs in training and the UAP positions, but I will ask if anyone is interested in volunteering or nominating for the vice-chair position or if you have questions about that, I would be happy to answer.

Gordon: We all look at Marc.

Falkoff: Don't look at me. You need not look at me.

Douglass: It doesn't have to be Marc. The position serves as the official chair when the chair herself is absent, that's Provost Freeman. The position will also be a part of some of the Executive Budget Committee meetings. What are your other official duties?

Falkoff: Some of the EBC stuff can be really meaningful, I don't know. I didn't realize this when I first started with this, you are expected to go to the Faculty Senate meetings as our representative and to the University Council meetings as a non-voting. I guess there is a lot of planning stuff that we tend to do, although not that much more than the subcommittee chairs sit through. We set an agenda for the year at some point in the summer. It's really not an onerous position. If you want to try to grasp it, this is a time of change for this committee. It has been changing over the past several years and I really think for the better. It is exciting to think about the ways in which this position would interact with Program Prioritization. I think if you are interested in that kinds of stuff, it's a nice place to be. And I really don't think that I insist on having it by any means. I'm busy too.

Douglass: Any questions or nominations or suggestions? We do need a vice chair today.

Falkoff: I don't mind doing it. I'm happy to do it, but...

Douglass: Anyone else here that would like to self-nominate?

Falkoff: I don't mind doing it as I have done it the last few years.

Douglass: If you are self-nominating, can I get a second for that?

Slotsve: Second.

Douglass: Any other nominations? Hearing none, all in favor of having Marc Falkoff continue as vice-chair of the APC, say aye? Opposed?

The motion passed unanimously.

Douglass: The chairs in training election, I think we can table that because so many people are new. I think it would be helpful if you met with your groups and actually learn more about what the subcommittee chair does. And then you can think about if that is something that you want to do. What you would do if you are a chair in training, is you would basically work with the chair, Geoff or Jeanne this year, and then you would learn that role so that next year you can take that role on yourself. And I think that unless someone is dying to make a nomination, that's better tabled. What do people think?

Abdel-Montaleb: I agree.

Douglass: I think I will ask if anyone is interested in serving as the elected member of the University Assessment Panel. And again, we can talk more about that next time. Or if you have questions, I can talk more about what they do. The University Assessment Panel looks at mid-cycle reports. They look at the Student Learning Objectives for every program on campus and they help again with peer consultation. They also look at things like selecting individuals for the Assessment Expo, helping to select speakers for assessment topics. Basically anything connected with assessment. We have two representatives that come from APC. We are trying to create a stronger linkage between the UAP and the APC, so this might be a good year to be involved with that. We really want, as we streamline the APC process, to also streamline some of the processes on UAP.

Winkler: Who is on this UAP? Is it similar to us here? Faculty or...

Douglass: They are a little bit different. It's faculty and some staff. The APC is faculty by college and the UAP is representatives chosen through shared governance, one elected, one appointed, from this body, from the graduate council, from the university council, so there is one from each. Some of them actually are staff but a lot of them are faculty. It's a similar make-up, but the way it's composed is kind of what Marc said earlier, you won the prize and now you get another piece. It's scheduled for two Fridays per month. We can talk more about that next time if no one is interested now, but we would like to have a second representative. Any questions before you break into your subcommittee groups? If not, then thank you very much, it's been a long meeting.

Subcommittees held introductory meetings.

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