

# Academic Planning, Assessment, & Resources Committee

---

**Date:** August 30, 2016

**Time:** 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

**Place:** Academic Affairs Conference Room

**Present:** Michael Visser (chair), Laura Krier, Kathy Morris, Mark Perri, Daniel Soto, Tim Wandling, Ryan Fitzpatrick, Richard Whitkus, Laura Lupei, Justin Lipp, Shawn Kilat, and Merith Weisman

**Minutes:** Laura Krier

Agenda approved.

Reports from the Chair:

- Classroom renovation workgroup now falls under APARC. Mike had a briefing from the group this summer, and the reports are available on the senate website under APARC. Jason Wenrick sent a report on expenditures and plans for the projects. Mike also had a discussion with the Provost and Faculty Center Director to update them on the project.
- There is a feasibility study for renovations to Stevenson underway. This will probably wrap up around January. The Senate will be getting a presentation about this work at this week's meeting (9/1) at 3:30.
- President Sakaki is quickly working to file a plan for use of one-time student success funds that are dedicated to improving graduate and retention rates. The draft of the plan is being prepared and Ben Ford would like any additional information by Thursday, 9/1. There was a discussion about how programs that do not fall into the scope of "4-year graduation rates" issues, like Education, which offers only teacher certification and graduate programs. This particular funding is mandated for graduation rates and retention.

Review of the APARC Charge:

- This committee was given directive guidance from Senate when it was formed. There are three main umbrellas: planning, assessment, and budget/resource allocation.
- APARC is intended to look at the curriculum as a whole. Program Review is a part of helping this group to get information from programs about what they need, strengths and weaknesses.
- This group should not be just a renewal of the Academic Planning Committee; the charge is different and there is an expectation that action can be taken. Folding the budget and resource allocation aspect into the charge is intended to

keep recommendations grounded in the possible. Assessment will keep us focused on data-driven decisions making, while also looking at opportunities to think about innovation. Assessment data should provide support for requesting resources.

- This committee should not be the place to advocate for our own programs and our own interests, but to look at the needs and interests of the university as a whole, and the student population as a whole. We should work to reduce competition between our programs.
- The priorities this year will involve a lot of learning, about program review processes, budget processes, and assessment practices across campus.
- A holistic view of the curriculum will be key.
- We are waiting for a liaison from EPC.

#### Process of Committee Work:

- Review the flowchart on the Senate website.
- Work will originate from the committee and go to Ex Comm, or will originate in Ex Comm and come to the committee.
- We still need to sort out the details of how we will work with EPC.

#### Classroom Upgrade Work Group

- This work group established a lot of good systems and principles and it would be beneficial to the university if we could find a way to continue the work. Possible to convene as a permanent sub-committee of APARC? Visser is hopeful that the incumbents will be willing to stay on the group. We'll have annual funding for classroom upgrades, so there will be ongoing work.
- This group might look at academic technology as well as space and facilities. Important to also think about training for using new classroom tools.
- **Decision:** Visser will talk to Scott Horstein about interest in continuing this work, and will draft a charge. If anyone has specific input, send to Visser.

#### Relationship of APARC to University Program Review Subcommittee:

- Review of the Program Review Policy revision process: there were a lot of discussions last year, and a fruitful meeting at the faculty retreat, but not much actual progress has been made.
- Discussion about the purpose of program review for departments, and how it's been used on campus in the past. Acknowledgement that the lack of closure or forward movement on past program reviews has been a problem. Important to bring the provost back into the process. Possible the policy should provide some guidance about what needs to be included, and for the revision process to consider whether all the components that have been included in the past are really necessary.
- Discussion about what UPRS should be providing to APARC in terms of reports, and what information will be most helpful to APARC.

- Possible that UPRS should vet assessment plans and hold groups accountable to the plans? To provide more guidance on assessment? To help departments think about how to assess the health of departments? To provide examples of good assessment?
- **Decision:** Idea was floated to form a working group to work on the policy revision this year, with representation from UPRS, APARC, and EPC. Krier will bring this idea up at UPRS meeting on 8/31.

Relationship to EPC (Guest Melinda Milligan):

- Liaison has not been identified. Discussion about how UPRS and EPC might continue to work together.
- **Decision:** A liaison to UPRS from EPC is probably unnecessary because the majority of the work is just reviewing department reviews. Policy work should be reviewed and vetted by EPC.

Consultation on Reorganization of Campus Units:

- **Decision:** Agreed that Tim Wandling, Mark Perri, and Suzanne Rivoire will represent APARC in this work. If scheduling does not allow these people to participate, Kathy Morris and Laura Krier can provide back up.