Academic Planning, Assessment, & Resources Committee

Date: February 14, 2017
Time: 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm
Place: Academic Affairs Conference Room

Present: Michael Visser, Laura Krier, Kathy Morris, Suzanne Rivoire, Daniel Soto, Tim Wandling, Beth Warner, Karen Moranski, Shawn Kilat, Jo-Ann Dapiran, Laura Watt
Minutes: Suzanne Rivoire

Agenda approved.

Chair Report:
The Senate continues to work on formulating an office hour policy.

Tim requested that the committee discuss what should be in APARC's purview beyond areas of budget and resources. For example, the committee may want to look at the evolution of unplanned processes (like the use of undergraduate TAs and graders) that affect academics.

APARC planning process document, second reading
Suggested revisions:
- The Graduation Initiative Group (GIG) should be added to the list of committees. The APARC chair now has an official seat on GIG.
- The concluding sentence of Paragraph 2 should be revised to reflect that some academic support programs are now located in Student Affairs rather than Academic Affairs.
- The word "Executive" should be added to the title of the Vice President of Academic Affairs to reflect recent changes.
- Committee thought the process document looked Ok overall, but noted that it is still largely budget-oriented.

Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making policy and rationale for rescinding Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters policy, second reading
The latest round of edits serve to highlight and define "transparency."

In the rationale for rescinding, the committee proposed switching the first and third paragraph and making some changes to the 5th paragraph. The Chair will send a new draft via email for ExCom.

Discussion on possible development of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

At the moment, SSU has program-level outcomes and some school-level outcomes; the question is how we pull up another level and connect these outcomes to the University mission.

Advantages of adopting ILOs:
- WASC does not currently require ILOs but does recommend them.
- The results of our SSU Distinctiveness Survey do show broad agreement on principles.
- Could help with issues of GE relevance

A possible challenge: how to measure ILOs and whether it is even desirable to measure them.

Chair will raise the issue with the Academic Coordinating Team to make sure that APARC is involved in the conversation.

University Program Review Policy revision – feedback
EPC will be discussing the policy this week. UPRS is working on a new program review schedule. UPRS is working on a template for their own reports, which will be similar to the self-study and has a lot of questions.

Questions/issues
- How does the Library fit in?
- How to evaluate programs that merge, disappear, or change substantially during the review period
- How to include a department's GE offerings in its program review
- How to include institutional goals and regional needs
- Closing the loop with MOUs will be tough in the absence of accompanying resource commitments.

Lecturers should be included in the program review process, but not required to participate. The heavy use of lecturers poses challenges for program reviews, since lecturers don't necessarily have enough clout to identify or fix problems.

Target for second reading is March 21 meeting.

Sustainable Financial Model
The Chancellor's Office is discussing the idea of attaching tuition increases to some kind of inflation index, rather than having large jumps every few years. Laura Lupei would like APARC to host these conversations on our campus and provide input.

Prioritizing recommendations

We need to pare down our recommendations to 3-5 items from the list in the December 2016 minutes.

-
- *Graduation and retention:*
    - Number of students enrolled (undergraduate, graduate, credential programs)
    - Number of transfer students
    - First- and second-year retention rates
    - Four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates
    - Number of students within 30 units of graduating
    - Number of students enrolled in intersession courses that fulfill graduation requirements
    - Ratio of full-time to part-time students
    - Retention rates of students enrolled in FYE/SYE courses vs. not
- *General academic quality:*
    - Amount spent on instructional equipment/software
    - Academic Affairs budget as percent of total budget
    - Number of students in each major/program
    - Ratio of Assistant, Associate, and Full Faculty
    - Number of students who enroll in a capstone/senior research project before graduation
    - Amount spent on academic support per FTES
    - Amount spent on instruction per FTES
    - Students enrolled in internships, service learning, research and creative experience
    - Student-faculty ratio for undergrad vs. grad/credential
    - Number of FTEF
    - Ratio of lecturer to tenured/tenure-track faculty
    - Percent of courses integrating information literacy instruction
    - Percent of students receiving information literacy instruction
    - Percent of students enrolled in writing-intensive courses
- *Faculty development:*
    - Amount spent on faculty start-up funds
    - Amount spent funding research
    - Amount spent on faculty travel
    - Number of faculty within each salary range (compared to other CSUs)
    - Number of faculty below SSI max (compared to other CSUs)
    - Number of software packages purchased outside of IT
    - Number of or amount of money spent on upgrading workstations beyond IT's provisions

- o Percent reassigned time for faculty to engage in scholarship and professional development
- *GE:*
  - o Student-faculty ratio in GE courses
  - o GE class sizes vs. courses in majors/programs
  - o GE courses taught by lecturers vs. tenured/tenure-track faculty
  - o GE enrollment across first, second, third, fourth year students
- *Diversity:*
  - o Should explicitly link these metrics to the President's pursuit of HSI status
  - o Student, faculty, and staff demographics (compared to service area?)
  - o Retention rates across diversity categories
  - o Number of students receiving financial aid and need-based scholarships
  - o Number of students eligible for Pell grants vs. Pell grant recipients
  - o Number of workshops offered for professional education in cultural competency
  - o Number of faculty and staff enrolled in workshops in cultural competency
  - o Percent of students who complete the FAFSA (broken down by diversity category)
  - o Percent of first-generation college students
  - o Percent of student across ranges of Expected Family Contribution
  - o
- *Other possible sources:*
  - o WAGS (Western Association of Graduate Schools) may have a set of metrics
  - o Educause ECAR survey, which is mostly about technology
  - o NSSE (which we already do), which covers student engagement and campus climate
- Committee also brainstormed the single most useful metric of investment in academics: e.g. instruction $ / FTES or academic support $ / FTES, especially over time. These numbers have jumped in the last two years, largely due to tenure-track hiring.