APARC Minutes – Sept. 12, 2017

September 12, 2017, 3:00 – 5:00 pm, Academic Affairs Conference Room, ST1040

Minutes: Kathy Morris

Present: Mike Visser, Kathy Morris, Daniel Soto, Tim Wandling, Mike Ogg (proxy for Laura Lupei, Karen Moranski, Merith Weisman, Sean Place, Laura Watt, Elias López, Mark Perri, Laura Krier, Beth Warner, Jason Korelick.

Guests for Presentation: Karen Thompson from School of B&E, Rob Eiler from Ext Ed. Greg Milton from Ext. Ed.

1) Chair Report
   a. Confirmation that all of the policy changes that were sent forth from APARC have been signed.
   b. There will be some sort of strategic planning process that the campus will be undergoing this AY. Likely to be overseen by the provost. Information will be forthcoming re: how it will be executed.
   c. Graduation Initiative – Mike Visser will be attending a CSU wide conferen e with 9 people from campus. Will report back from that. Laura K will be APARC proxy for the Senate at Oct. 12 while he is there.
   d. Senate: There will be discussions about EO 1100 and new implications for the campu; there is likely to be a discussion of a possible rethinking of the position that oversees the director of Research/Scholarship…
   e. Brief discussion of what is on the horizon regarding the Learning Management System and what is going on campus wide regarding. ATIS (Academic Tech and Instructional Spaces) will be looking at this and APARC will be overseeing that work. APARCs perspective is re: how it helps us to enact the work at the heart of our mission. We may also serve as clearing house. Daniel Soto can be a conduit from APARC.
2) Agenda - Added to the agenda – Discussion of WASC Assessment rubric and a discussion of Moodle. The former is added. The latter was briefly discussed as part of the chair report.
3) Minutes were emailed out. Changes were sent back from Laurel Lupei and they are details that have been sent to Laurel and will be distributed asap.

Business:
1) Program Review Template: Committee reviewed the edits and more substantive changes that were proposed in the previous meeting. Mike V. typed into the template during the meeting for

a. **III.e** - considering who are the students at the point of entry. What do students enter in wanting to do?
b. For **VI. d/e** – considering "outputs" Discuss post program achievement.
c. The Program Review Template - Mike and Karen will finish the clean up and remove the DRAFT label from the document.

2) BS in Business Administration Degree Completion program at College of Marin. Guests noted above.
   a. They are presenting at all Senate Standing Committees:
      i. Alignment to mission
      ii. Resources
      iii. Connection to/Impact on campus programs (e.g., not supplanting)
   b. Presenation: Students would complete the upper division part on the CoM campus. It became evident that the campus didn't necessarily have plan for how to get such a program off the ground. So they are making sure that all committees that have expertise will get a say. In packet is the proposal for the program.
   c. Clarification of specific points:
      i. Re: resources – there is a forecasted loss for the first year. The loss only would impact Ext Ed. And wouldn't move to state-side. Students will have access to both libraries at COM and at SSU.
      ii. Re: SSU processes of approval – because Business has accrediting agency, it will require TT faculty.
      iii. Question – what happens when students need any kind of GE course or other course… Answer: They would take these through pre-extisting winter and summer GE courses.
      iv. Hiring and Assessment of faculty (TT and Temp.) would be the same as what is on the stateside. Faculty would be volunteering to teach these courses on overload.
      v. Question about sustainability for a program that is dependent upon overload for 50%. – concerns about drains on faculty in terms of teaching quality or service or scholarship. Concern about fatigue, concern about drain on dept., and concern about pressure/expectation for students. Response is that there is enough faculty in Business share the burden. Follow up – worry is whether there is something that isn't happening on campus overall. Response: that like the Exec. MBA programs in Napa and Solano, they don't seem to have redirected funds for them.
      vi. Question about comparison for cost comparison for these candidates. A Stateside student would pay less if their degree was completed in 2 years. After 2.5 years, it shifts to being cheaper through Extended Ed because they pay per unit, not per semester.
      vii. Questions regarding supplanting: CSU defines this as a self-support class replacing a required Stateside class. You cannot require a Stateside student to take a self-support class, but it can be an option for students

(at an extra fee). Chancellor's office sends an email each year requiring Extended Ed to annually audit the process.

      viii.   SEIE is discussing scholarship opportunities with local organizations to lower costs.

    d. **APARC committee is satisfied that we have fully participated in consultation**.

3) WASC Rubric discussion – Question: what is our role with engaging the university with this rubric document.

    a. Should this go out to all programs/departments from Karen? Karen & Mike? It is already being used in some places. (e.g., the Template, the faculty development program review workshops) GE is working to use this rubric as part of their program and in particular for EO1100.

    b. It is not the case that all departments will be as robust or well informed in this process. It is aspirational. This is framed in terms of the campus. We are somewhere between Initial and Emerging and as a campus we need to mature.

    c. Programs that go through the program review process could use the template for a post hoc review of the process.