# ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL November 25, 2019 3:00 p.m. Altgeld 315

## **Minutes**

Present:Bateni, Blazey, Campbell, Chitwood, Douglass, Falkoff, Gordon, Ingram, McEvoy,<br/>Mini, Montgomery, Nesterov, Peters, Reynolds, Thurmaier, VandeCreek, Zinger.

Meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m.

## 1. Approval of minutes from October 14, 2019

- a. Beth Ingram asked if any corrections were needed.
  - i. Minutes were approved.

#### 2. 2018-2019 Program Review Findings Report

- a. Carolinda Douglass discussed the 2018-2019 Program Review Findings Report.
- b. Everyone received the Program Review Findings Report for 2018-2019, which is an overview sent to the Board of Trustees (BOT) and the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) of a review of the twenty-five programs and the one center reviewed during the last academic year.
- c. There are four questions addressed for each program that are submitted to the IBHE. These include:
  - i. What are the major changes in the program?
  - ii. What are the major findings and recommendations?
  - iii. What actions have taken place since the last review?
  - iv. What changes will be taken as a result of the review?
- d. Each program is subject to another review in eight years, unless the program has asked to align with an accreditation review.
- e. All of the programs reviewed were in good standing.

## 3. Program Review

B.S. in Nutrition, Dietetics and Wellness and M.S. in Nutrition and Dietetics Brad Peters, Subcommittee A

- a. Ingram asked if there were any questions regarding the report.
  - i. No questions were asked.

M.S. in Statistics

Marc Falkoff, Subcommittee B

- a. Ingram asked if there were any questions regarding the report.
  - i. No questions were asked.

B.A./B.S., M.S. and Ph.D. in English

Kurt Thurmaier and Cynthia Campbell, Subcommittee B

- a. Ingram asked if there were any questions regarding the report.
  - i. No questions were asked.

# 4. 2020-2021 Program Review

- a. Ingram discussed a new formation of Program Review for 2020-2021.
- b. The university is moving to local control budgets on January 1, 2020.
  - i. This returns budgets to the colleges, and Deans will manage budgets within the amounts they are authorized for.
  - ii. Program Review is more pertinent to the decisions made at the college level than the central level.
- c. The value behind Program Review is considering how parts strategically align in colleges and collegiate review. It is important to consider how other departments align with each other as well.
- d. Ingram asked what the committee finds valuable about the current Program Review process.
  - i. Marc Falkoff said the committee learns about programs across the university and how the university functions. There is a cross-college discussion.
  - ii. Chad McEvoy said it is interesting to take deep dives into other programs. He asked if Provost Ingram had a chance to ask the Council of Deans their opinion on this.
    - 1. Ingram said she asked if the Council of Deans found the process as valuable as it could be. The only change discussed were concerns regarding the questions external reviewers look at.
  - iii. Brad Peters said hearing what other departments are doing is a valuable process everyone gains something out of. He would hate to see this disappear since the cross fertilization is very constructive.
  - iv. Ingram asked how many people read all three reports this week.
    - 1. A majority of the room raised their hands.
    - 2. Ingram stated that there were no questions regarding the reports.
- e. Ingram described a new model for Program Review.
  - i. There would be collegiate control of review process. An internal team would be required. The team could be comprised of people from the college and one outside person that conducts the review in conjunction with the external team. The internal and external team would meet with the department and create a report. This report would go to the Dean. The Dean would articulate their thoughts about the report and what should change. A summary of the Dean's report would then come to the central body, APC, to be reviewed.
- f. Thurmaier said the University of Iowa seems like the same amount of work. What is the difference between across university and college reviews? What is the actionable item?
- g. Peters said for checks and balances, getting actionable items might not happen. The report has more credibility if it goes across a university group and through a college.
- h. Geoffrey Gordon asked: if the subcommittees are making recommendations and there is no impact, what is the purpose? This is a discussion that has been held for a number of years. Does the APC impact the Provost's decisions?
  - i. Ingram stated the departments do not report to the Provost. The departments report to the colleges.
- i. Falkoff indicated this is always an area that is questioned. We always thought that this body might pick up more of a prioritization effort.
- j. Ingram asked what this committee can have an impact on centrally. Where does the APC want to see its time spent?

- i. Gordon said communication. For example, one of the issues we considered with the English report was offering more online classes. Math salaries are below the national quartile. These are issues central administration can address.
- ii. McEvoy asked Provost Ingram if she foresees this group playing an important role in the process of proposing new programs.
  - 1. Ingram stated the university has the Baccalaureate Council and Graduate Council that review new proposals. Would the APC address different issues than what is at these committees?
  - 2. McEvoy said the BC sits at the top of the curricular change and focus on curricular issues. This group might take into consideration capacity, faculty numbers, and budgets.
  - 3. Ingram said the committee can discuss program overlap. The Deans and colleges need to address resources themselves.
  - 4. Douglass said the Baccalaureate Council and Graduate Council look at overlap as well.
- k. Ingram asked if this is the only committee looking at policies and overarching academic program policies.
  - i. Thurmaier brought up interdisciplinary degrees and programs. If the university wants more, there needs to be a place for them to be vetted.
  - ii. Ingram said if there are policies that need to be vetted, changed, or approved, then this might be the place to discuss. How do they fit in with an interdisciplinary?
  - iii. Thurmaier brought up joint appointment agreements.
  - iv. Thurmaier said we still need a university understanding or framework of general education.
  - v. Peters echoed that from McEvoy, he is hearing concerns that something curricular may be assigned to the Baccalaureate Council, such as the CHANCE program. When it comes to state changes and policies important to elements of education, is this not part of the conversation?
- 1. Ingram stated there are bigger policy issues this group can weigh in on. Does the APC want to spend time on these reports?
  - i. Peters said the College of Liberal Arts and Science (CLAS) has a big impact here with changes of policies for general education. These are things that need to sift up to decision makers beyond the colleges.
- m. Evgueni Nesterov said he enjoys sitting in on the sessions and finds them interesting; however, he is not an expert in all of the programs. Is his opinion relevant in these areas? Maybe it is better to discuss more general, significant issues that require the committee's opinion.
- n. Ingram said Douglass and she will brainstorm. There are academic policies we can start thinking about and considering in the next semester. Provost Ingram encouraged anyone with ideas to email her. Bigger research universities do Program Review at a college level due to size. The committee needs to decide which benchmarking makes the most sense as a midsize university.
- o. Gordon asked if the committee should proceed this year as nothing else has changed.
  - i. Ingram indicated yes these changes would take place in the following year.

# 5. Other Business and Announcements.

Meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m. Respectfully submitted, Crystal Doyle and Paige Cosgrove

Planning\APC\Agendas\2019-2020\November 25, 2019