

Academic Planning, Assessment, and Resource Committee

Date: March 21, 2017

Time: 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Place: Academic Affairs Conference Room

Present: Michael Visser (Chair), Laura Krier, Kathy Morris, Mark Perri, Suzanne Rivoire, Daniel Soto, Tim Wandling, Beth Warner, Rachel McCloskey, Karen Moranski, JoAnn Dapiran, Laura Watt, Merith Weisman, Richard Whitkus

Chair Report:

- *Scheduling issues:*
 - MV met with Provost, IT, and scheduler to figure out scheduling problems; software change may be responsible. Problems should be brought to Dennis Goss and school scheduler.
 - LW reported many large GEs to shuffle. Suggests a) spreading out over more departments and b) letting us know whether minor adjustments such as to size of class will allow slot to work.
 - KarM: Zinfandel was taken offline so that affected things as well.
 - MP: The 3- vs. 4-unit class differential may also have impacted; may need more time blocks.
 - LW: Maybe 4-unit classes M/W and 3s on T/Th?
 - KarM: May need to go back to scheduling classes specifically, not using software. Also, need to rethink the time grid: does it maximize space use?
 - TW: Some classes pedagogically better at 1 x a week. Also, faculty need to be willing to rotate into “bad” time slots, perhaps expand teaching times
 - MP: Other CSUs have different time grids
 - KarM: Has info on 25 other colleges across US, will gather that information
 - LW: This first came up to EPC when APC was on hiatus; we didn’t want to have a computer assign our classes because then we have to bend to the system rather than have it serve us
 - MV: Will put scheduling issues on a later agenda.
- *EO 1100 GE Review/Reform*
 - MV: SSU is being asked to respond; looking at the schedule of meetings, May 16 is our last meeting and the response date is mid-June. There is probably a role for APARC here.
 - TW is planning to go to the GE Subcommittee meetings next year; KarM will forward the materials to him

Agenda: OK

Minutes: BW minor correction to SEIE site approval procedure request

Business Item 1: Program Review Policy

- MV: second reading today; we'll look at the EPC comments first; then there are some issues for SEIE that BW brought up.
 - *EPC bullet point 1: late program reviews*
 - KMor: There is a 5-year clock; we have 15 late programs, which is 1/3. Need to get late folks back on a schedule, not have them all due same year. We can stagger them.
 - RW: The accredited programs are fine, but this is a good opportunity to reset the rest. We can make sure all departments do the essential things, but have options if they want to add to it. Faculty Center can help train.
 - MV: What about resources?
 - MP: Some departments may not be clear on how the process benefits them.
 - MV: That's where the MOU comes in.
 - General discussion about best timing to bring late programs up to speed. LK reminds us to not write procedure into policy; Academic Affairs should handle the procedures.
 - *EPC bullet point 2: curriculum disagreements*
 - KarM: job of administrators
 - *EPC bullet point 3: Deans' responsibilities*
 - MV: covered in the MOU
 - *EPC bullet point 4: Release time*
 - MV: We can add language that departments need time and resources to do reviews
 - LW: Not every department needs a course release
 - LK: Our policy says so; need to get from Dean
 - KarM: Again, be careful about process vs. policy
 - MV: Suggest taking out last sentence of *Resources for Program Review* paragraph
 - TW: Faculty fought hard for that sentence. Need to treat work on review as having intrinsic value, not just busy work
 - KathM: In departments with low number of TT, can be abused; not equitable across Departments and Schools.
 - LW: Low TT ties into why programs are late with reviews; workload issues
 - *EPC bullet point 5: Faculty Center involvement*: No action needed; EPC just liked to see.
- BW: Who is in charge of the process?
- KarM: Collaboration between AVP and committees with UPRS.
- RW: Process shouldn't be too restrictive or too loose

- *SEIE points to consider for inclusion*
 - *Process:*
 - BW gave context: SEIE does administration, programs provide curriculum; programs are part of a program's pedagogy, but not consistently included in periodic review
 - RW: the sub-programs were listed for the last review, but for example, Hutchins didn't want to include
 - LW: Not getting SETEs for instructors teaching in Napa/Solano program; BW will check on this
 - TW: Workload is an issue; departments are loath to allow new things; few TT involved
 - KarM: Can't have both ways; can't say SEIE not in charge of curriculum and we want oversight but then don't want to do the oversight
 - LW: We have neither.
 - LK: Write procedure to mitigate; use 1st footnote, Academic Affairs in consultation will determine
 - *Resources:*
 - BW: SEIE can provide resources and support
 - *Finalizing:*
 - Step 1, School Level Review OK'd; department to send SEIE a copy of review for comment and to provide info about the program how it fits into SEIE's mission
 - Step 2, UPRS: do not need to change anything
 - Step 3, Review by Provost/Actions: SEIE may need to be included in MOUs for program improvement
 - *Combined Program Reviews:*
 - TW: What does oversight mean? May just need to know that it exists. If a program big enough, does own review; don't want to squelch innovation. Should leave squishy. Can have "sponsoring department" and get 4 units to run it.
 - MV: An operating MOU will address these issues.
 - RW: Currently, new programs, if SEIE, MOUs determine who has curricular oversight. Need succession planning.
 - BW: Some programs were formed before MOUs were required.
 - MV: Should leave policy as is, add procedure as necessary, and revisit other issues later, so will not add any SEIE language to the Program Review policy.
- RW: May not get policy done this semester; need to let Senate know what is going on, provide sunshine and give people time to think about it. Could possibly use Moodle for comments.
 - MV: four more meetings this semester; will try to get to ExComm by April

- TW: Send cleaned-up version to them now with callouts for important changes/issues, and note that some things may change. Gives more time for their review
- LW: Give to EPC a week before, give highlights so they have an idea of where to start; helps scaffold
- LK: Take to Chair's meeting; make sure the Senate rep knows that feedback has been collected; identify who is most likely to obstruct and make effort to answer their questions ahead of time
- TW: Need plenty of opportunity to comment

Business Item #2: Priority Recommendations

- MV: Added GE reform
 - LW: Belongs in EPC; will be planning that process
- MW: Should include career services
- LW: Is purpose of list to be unique to APARC, or echo other campus entities?
- KathM: Echo and add to; example HSI. Program assessment should have own bullet.
- TW: Need to slim down list; give guidance on budgetary priorities, what resources to allocate
- KathM: We could put the items in categories, use a taxonomy; will send example to MV
- RW: APARC needs to think bigger, 10 years down the road; relate to the strategic plan. That's what APC was supposed to do.
- KarM: A chance to define what academic planning is on this campus
- LW: Can take on the grey areas; don't need to do what other committees do
- TW: Implementation is key; over the years have seen good plans but how does it get done? For example, changes are happening at the course level but not at the program level
- LW: And different departments teaching same subject from different angles, e.g. climate change. Can we coordinate in some way?
- KathM: Not yet forward-looking. We have been in reactive, not proactive. What do we want to be doing in five years? More or less hybrid, interdisciplinary, etc.

Business Item #3: TT Faculty Equity and Compression: shelved for next time