APARC Meeting
September 8, 2020 3-5pm

Present: Elita Virmani (chair), Elias Lopez, Megan Burke, Laura Lupei, Stacey Bosick, Catherine Fonseca, Trevor Paige, Damien Hansen, Puspa Amri, Rheyna Laney, Emily Acosta Lewis, Merith Weisman
Notetaker: Megan Burke

Approve Agenda: approved
Approved Minutes: approved

REPORTS

APARC Chair's Report

Elita addressed three key issues from Ex-Com meeting (echoes points delivered from first APARC meeting):
1. Budget
2. Enrollment
3. Social/Racial Justice

Today's meeting is going to focus on program review and APARC's role in it. Provost Moranski has said that while the program review process has been well thought through, we haven't adequately addressed the RJ lens as it maps onto our priorities now. Diana Grant and Laura Krier are going to talk about program review process and how it is working and what APARC role is. Heather Thomson is coming to talk about academic dashboard regarding data to be incorporated in program review process. Some initial key questions/issues raised about the program review process:

Elias: One of the ideas of program review is a 5 year timeline, so how do we tie it in to the academic dashboard so that faculty don't have to wait for 5 years to get the data
Elita: What is APARC's role in supporting the feedback loop to departments in the review process?

A few reminders:
- Reminders about chair chats.
- RJ Faculty Fellow is being advertised.
- There is going to be a proposal at Senate to not include peer reviews and SETEs for this entire academic year
- Budget/PBAC: Laura Lupei discussed that campus budget has been finalized, there is some deficit to address for the year but there are still a lot of unknowns. Elita reminded APARC members that if we have questions, concerns, comments about decisions that are made with budget to bring them up in APARC, so Elita can bring them to PBAC

Academic Affairs Report

Stacey discussed the RJ faculty fellowship (applications are actively being sought), and mentioned that work is being done on GE projections for the Deans so they can effectively

schedule classes— the purpose is so that faculty do not have to be shuffled and reshuffled (esp. for lecturers)

Emily: Is there any traction with planning a 2-year GE schedule?
Stacey: That is happening to varying extents at the school and department level, but not around GE. GE is proving harder to project because there are so many moving parts, including implementing the Ethnic Studies requirement in Fall 2021 (e.g. we need guidance from the Chancellor's office with regard to how we will have to implement it), models are being setup to project out to Spring 2021 but it will take longer to project out GE beyond that

Trevor: Will students be sitting on the committee for the RJ faculty fellow?
Stacey: No
Trevor: Is that something that could be considered?
Stacey: We could consider that. Stacey will follow-up with Trevor on this and get possible names

Stevenson Task Force Update
We don't have someone on this TF; Elita suggested having someone from the TF come to visit APARC every once in awhile

ATISS
We need a liaison (meetings our Tuesdays 10-12), we will bring this up again next time
For now, Elita will invite an ATTIS member to come to APARC once a month

UPRS
Catherine Fonseca will be our UPRS point person

Assessment
(3:30-4pm Diana Grant and Laura Krier Visit)

Background: one area in which we are thin is assessment
Main question: what is APARC's role in assessment?

We need to think about how we take about some of the date being collected and how it can be used in the program review process. How do we integrate more explicitly a RJ lens into our program review process? We need to ask more specific questions about how equity in the program review

Laura Krier: What was/wasn't working well?
People didn't know what the purpose was/what they were to be doing. Policy revision was intended to give more clarity. This clarity has led to better program review.
People are delving more into what the future of assessment should look like and people are developing a growing understanding of assessment. The findings and recommendations process with UPRS is working well. Issues to fix: 5 year cycle (it is not long enough), time it takes for feedback takes a lot longer than anticipated. There is progress with assessment, but there is still uneven knowledge and experience about assessment. There are not enough resources (including time) for assessment

Key aspect of relationship between APARC and UPRS: the question of resources. There is talk of increasing the stipend amount for external reviewers

Diana discussed the issue of uniformity re: templates, guidelines, letters from deans etc. while maintaining department autonomy. Diana suggested the key for APARC is to make sure the Provost continues in the review process

Elita raised a possible key question/role for APARC in the review process: are you (i.e. departments) getting the support you need to make the changes you want/need to make?

4pm Heather Brown visits:

Heather presented 'Dashboards to Support Academic Planning' (slides to be shared after meeting). Heather reviewed the dashboards abilities to capture
- Department measures (metrics: size, ratios, trends)
- Student achievement (retention, graduation)
- SSU-Tableau (applications to enrollment—by region, high school, and where admitted students went instead of SSU)

She also discussed the additional resource of the [CSU Dashboard](#) and new dashboard on the horizon that will capture daily FTES, retention with equity lens, GI 2025 school and w/ equity lens, alumni tracking (degree achievement, salary tracking)

To get access to Tableau, departments need to request access (if program review coordinators are not chairs).

Meeting concluding with group discussion around identifying APARCs role in Program Review Process. Key ideas: follow-ups are very important, forum for sharing/developing common understanding how other departments are doing things, look up other timelines/best practices for assessment and follow-up, look at what stipends are given at other CSUs for external reviewers, the Library presents a unique case because the current Dashboard offers measurements that are not relevant to the library so we need to be cognizant of measurements that are helpful for the library and do not produce more labor, how do we start thinking about the RJ lens in assessment (aside from the dashboard) to improve the process? (look at self-study guide, look qualitatively at courses offered and content, faculty can self-report what things they can teach in their courses, get student experience about belonging, community in the classroom, on campus), do research on how other universities are holding people accountable for equity

Saved for agenda for next time: APARC Priority Recommendations