

APARC

12/3/19

Attending: Elita Virmani, Karen Moranski, Rheyna Laney, Emily Twisselman, Emily Acosta-Lewis, Megan McIntyre, Laura Krier, Sean Place, Christina Baker-Foley, Puspa Amri, Elias Lopez

Guest: Sandy Ayala (ATISS)

Minutes: Laura

1. Agenda approved.
2. Minutes approved.
3. Chair report (Place):
 - a. First reading of the scheduling module updates at Senate. No major concerns; second reading next week. Module updates don't have an impact on classrooms that are scheduled by the department. After new modules are in effect for a year, we might consider assessing to see where pain points continue to exist, what issues still arise. This is really a first step, only impacting start times, not impacting module patterns. That will be more painful; it will be more challenging to get lecturers to teach MWF classes. Won't necessarily need to be addressed soon; we still have capacity.
 - b. Elias and Melinda are co-chairing a working group to look at issues of room layout/furniture and pedagogy, in preparation for the Stevenson remodel.
4. Academic Programs report (Moranski):
 - a. Creating frameworks to help us move from enrollment and academic planning to budget, especially regarding the development of new programs and concentrations to majors. Trying to streamline forms for CO and campus approval so that we don't have to create duplicate forms. Looking especially at cost of program vs. enrollment revenue, which we haven't really considered in the past at SSU. Have developed a new template that will be coming to APARC.
 - b. Also looking at workforce demand projections related to starting new programs. Thinking about what professions might be available related to new programs. CO asks the campus to predict workforce demand. Looking at some software packages that might help with this issue. These packages often do analysis based on Bureau of Labor statistics; some tools are more sophisticated than others.
5. Associated Students report (Twisselman):
 - a. Resolution passed on Nov 18, officially endorsing a partnership with APARC and Provost's office to run a classroom conditions survey. Whether it would be the same survey we already are running or a new one is yet to be determined. The context is different for students. Next semester we can have more conversations. There are funds to use to incentivize students to take the survey. We would need to consider how to administer the survey, depending on the approach associated students wants to take.
 - b. Campus should consider putting together a master calendar of survey that are being sent to students to avoid survey fatigue.

- c. We probably do want granular classroom-by-classroom feedback from students to get at how the room functions from a receiving/learning perspective.
- 6. ATISS report (Ayala):
 - a. Syllabus policy mandate: Proposed syllabus policy update that would require faculty use the template and would require faculty to post syllabi to Canvas. Feedback provided to Sandy to revise the policy proposal before it becomes a business item at APARC.
- 7. Scantron issues (Laney):
 - a. Scantron machines in IT have been broken for three weeks. Students have not received results from tests taken almost a month ago; now that we are moving into finals this is a significant problem. We need clarity on what the university's level of support for scantron services will be. If we are going to support these services we need to have a better MOU about what the level of service will be. Lack of a sense of urgency and priority from IT about these services.
 - b. Maybe part of bigger issues about the level of services expected from IT. Procurement, service, license agreement, various issues beginning to come up. Maybe we need to identify what the major concerns and priorities are. Maybe to set up for the priority recommendations for next year.
 - c. Related to some questions we have about the timing of the strategic priority recommendations from APARC to the senate.
 - d. We need to make some determinations about what services IT is supposed to be providing, what MOUs already exist.
 - e. There have been significant shifts in IT which explains some of the lack of clarity about the roles and responsibilities of the faculty center vs. IT.
- 8. Strategic priorities issues for next semester:
 - a. We need to talk about timelines for recommendations.
 - b. We need to identify the progress that has been made on recommendations (and where progress has not been made).
 - c. Are there additional recommendations that we need to make? Things that have come up as issues this year? (Like IT).
 - d. Talk to your constituents about any other issues that may be coming up related to academic planning, assessment, and resources.
 - e. Sean will try to meet with Laura Lupei to get more clarification on the timing.
- 9. Classroom conditions survey:
 - a. Sean has been working through the data and identifying trends and topics that could be generated into priority areas that the committee recommends to focus on.
 - b. Sean has been putting together a brief analysis of the qualitative data.
 - c. Elias and Melinda established a working group to talk about classrooms. This group will be able to bring together different perspectives on classroom set up, technology, pedagogy, cleanliness. Pedagogy should always be the driver. Shift the perspective so that flexibility is not the priority, but we instead establish specific classrooms that can serve different purposes.
 - d. Important to also keep a focus on the maintenance of classrooms, not just putting money into technology, furniture, layout, but also basic janitorial/maintenance issues.