APARC Minutes – April 4, 2017

Attending: Michael Visser, Laura Krier, Mark Perri, Suzanne Rivoire, Daniel Soto, Tim Wandling, Beth Warner, Rachel McCloskey, Karen Moranski, Laura Lupei, Laura Watt, Merith Weisman

Report from the Chair
- Visser has been having preliminary conversations with people about APARC's strategic priorities; there hasn't been any striking resistance. The Provost suggested that salary equity issues should be near the top of the list.
- There were conversations at PBAC about admissions practices and the impact of admissions on budget. Be on the lookout for these kinds of questions and discussions in the future. APARC might be involved. Brief discussion about lack of emphasis on graduate recruitment, the timeline it takes people to receive acceptance notice, and development of a communication plan for prospective students to keep them interested after they apply.
- The Faculty Consultation policy proposals will receive their second reading at Senate this coming Thursday. Feedback after first reading lead to some clarifying edits. Will be pushing to pass them both simultaneously.
- Shawn Kilat's retirement party is today.
- Associated Students passed a resolution asking for a fall commencement. There could be some bureaucratic challenges but the administration will review.

Program Review Policy
- Visser sent the policy to department chairs and received several pieces of useful feedback (included in agenda packets).
- Important to make sure GSS rep is always part of UPRS and that this rep is a voting member.
- Moranski returned from a visit to the Chancellor's Office with some answers to questions, especially related to the length of time between program reviews. WASC says program review timespan can vary anywhere from 5-10 years. Most graduate deans reported 6 or 7 year cycles, rather than 5. We can look at changing this in the past; Moranski thinks 10 years is too long. Could make changes to make the policy more vague and leave it in the hands of Academic Programs, but there is concern about putting too much of the decision making in an administrative office. Wandling concurred that the time span should stay in the policy, and argued that it should remain at 5 years. While we are developing our program review processes we need to make sure we're doing it frequently enough that people are making progress on assessment and closing the loop. Watt would also not advocate for a change at this point.
- Warner gave feedback about the timing of programs that reside with SEIE. Still questions about how/when/who does these. Moranski: if a program is funded by SEIE they need to be involved in review. Also important that we identify a Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty member who is responsible for the program. The policy should not get too

specific, and the office of Academic Program will work to resolve issues with existing programs about who is responsible for program review.

- Some edits were made to the first footnote, as well as to the section about External Review. Removing process as much as possible.
- Suggestion from the Provost that the Provost's office should approve external reviewers rather than the Deans. Visser will discuss this change with the Deans to gauge their feeling.

Charge to UPRS

- Minor grammatical edits made.
- EPC should be copied on the final annual report produced by UPRS.

Strategic Priority Recommendations

- Salary and equity moved up into tactical priorities.
- Second page of ideas should be given to Ex Com as suggestions for them to delegate and manage.

Equity and Compression Program

- Visser consulted with faculty at Western Washington University about their process; they use a formula that sets in place a systematic process for decision making based on the amount allotted by the administration and a decided-upon benchmark. Using a formula like this "treats equals as equals" in a systematic way.
- Visser developed a formula that uses a benchmark of 50th percentile of CSU's tables based on rank and discipline.
- Discussion about whether rank and discipline tables are the best benchmark to use. CUPA data is the standard Moranski has seen used. Some private colleges may have other methods.
- Discussion about how to account for cost of living. There is the possibility of putting a Consumer Price Index factor into the formula, but ultimately it wouldn't affect our claims on the allotted pool of funds relative to each other; it would only influence the amount of money for the allotted pool to begin with.
- Warner mentioned that there are also staff equity and compression problems. Lupei said that the intention is to address staff and faculty issues in tandem.
- General consensus that people would be happier knowing there is a systematic approach.
- Visser would like feedback if people have better ideas for benchmarks.