

## APARC Minutes

January 31, 2017

### **Reports:**

The Governor has published the January Revised Budget. The CSU's portion is only \$157 million. This only includes mandatory expenses, such as negotiated salary increases. We will wait for the final budget in May which will hopefully include money for enrollment growth and the graduation initiative.

Last meeting's agenda was approved.

The minutes were approved.

### **Business:**

#### **1. APARC Planning Process Document**

This was the first reading. This planning process document is meant to guide APARC. It lists key products of APARC's work and the timeline to accomplish them. Based on this document other committees such as PBAC will know APARC's timeline. The document was circulated for the committee to think about.

Action item: The document will be uploaded to the Senate website when approved.

#### **2. Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making**

The committee discussed whether paragraph IB was too limited with respect to the library. Should it be expanded to include roles of the library faculty?

It was noted that paragraph IB indicates that faculty have primary responsibility for ... "admission and degree requirements". The committee was unsure if faculty are consulted on admission requirements or admission in general, e.g. admission index (which would affect the number of students admitted), re-entry programs for older students, and the switch to a largely residential population. The committee would like to further explore this.

Action items:

Add that APARC will look back over the University's major decisions for the previous year and report on them.

Add phrasing that faculty consultation should apply to all levels.

Specify the role of faculty in tenure track searches, specifically that faculty have the primary role of choosing who to hire.

The committee suggested the idea of adding relevant parts of the Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters Policy into the APARC Planning Process Document.

The committee reached consensus to recommend rescinding the Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters because it was not actually a policy, that the faculty wish to move forward with a new relationship of trust with the Administration, and that is now redundant based on the above.

### **3. University Program Review Policy**

Program review now includes a new self-study template based on feedback from the January 2016 Faculty Retreat. The intention is to “close the loop”

UPRS and APARC will assess yearly what changed institution-wide based on the previous year’s program reviews.

The Provost’s Office is looking into what resources departments need to maintain an ongoing assessment of their program.

#### Action items:

The committee was asked to seek feedback on the new program review policy that was distributed to see if it fits all programs in the University. The new policy mandates a memorandum of understanding between the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost for what the department will accomplish before the next program review. The MOU could include tasks such as: refining graduate admissions procedures, creating sustainable assessment progress, and addressing specific elements of curriculum.

### **4. Role of Extended Ed in Off-Site Program Offering**

This was the start of a conversation of APARC to come up with principles guiding what is the appropriate use of Extended Ed for delivering our curriculum.

Committee concerns about Extended Ed offering off-site programs include:

Diverting state support from SSU

Ensuring quality of off-site programs without access to instructor SETEs

Worry about losing department culture

In general there was confusion amongst the committee of general Extended Ed practices and procedures regarding program review and quality control

The Dean of Extended Ed proposed that the “home department” for the off-site course along with the paid faculty coordinator will provide an annual review to ensure quality.