

## **APROC Meeting Notes Thursday February 9, 2017 9:30-11:00 am**

**LOCATION: 16/211**

### **In attendance:**

Sharon Hagan, Dennis Gilbert, Tammy Salman, Kate Sullivan, Anne McGrail

#### **1. Announcements and updates**

9:30-9:40

Moodle Page has minutes, agenda, communications and document archives

**New Staff Support for APROC:** Welcome Tammie Stark, Academic Program Review Project Coordinator

#### **2. Program List Finalizing: Work Group Meeting**

9:40-9:45

We talked about how complicated the word “program” is on campus and in higher ed, and we need to develop an agreed-upon list and definition for what constitutes and APR program on campus. Kevin pointed to the Program Definition document for language and we may use this to finalize our definition. A work group comprised of Dennis, Tammy, Kate and Anne will finalize the list and definition (Meeting TBA).

#### **3. Program Updates, Coach Reports, Review Complete Question Sets**

9:45-10:15

Dennis agreed to check in with JS for 2D Art since 3D Art is delaying APR. Discussion focused on the need for more coaches. Our original idea that coaches could be recruited from PRCs from previous years was optimistic given PRCs Implementation work in Year 2 (very busy). Anne called on APROC members to work with their networks on campus for volunteer coaches.

Sharon spoke as a PRC lead: she is working with her dean to assign the \$\$ stipend to part-time faculty to work on APR for her program. She will not take reassigned time or money as she is on a grant already. Anne suggested that the Health Professions Dean, Tammie Stark and Jen Steele meet to write up a procedure for allocating funds. Faculty must be paid their regular hourly rate (not CD) for APR work. The issue emerged again that reassigned time is better than \$\$ because of the nature of the work but some faculty have been unable to take reassigned time because of staffing shortages.

#### **4. Discussion: Plan for Winter Check-in Meetings**

10:15-10:30

We agreed that providing PRC leads with positive feedback as they move forward is important for the Winter Check-Ins. APROC will be in a listening mode and so it was agreed that the opportunity for PRC leads to talk about their processes, obstacles and issues that are being raised was the key outcome for these check-ins.

5. **Set date and parameters/guidance for PRC leads for PRC Spring “Round-up” Presentations**  
10:30-10:40

Given the short window for PRC leads to talk and get feedback in the Winter Check-ins, it was agreed that the Spring Round-up presentations would still include PRC leads and program faculty as well as APROC and IRAP. We decided to maintain the “workshop” atmosphere of these sessions rather than a formal presentation to generate the most open conversations. We would pursue using Spring Conference and Fall Inservice as formal reporting sessions so that the college could be informed of key findings of the programs.

6. **Document Review: Charter Draft**

(Third Reading, *focused question*): Clarify language around “membership.”

10:40-11:00

After much discussion about the importance of providing broad representation on the APROC while maintaining fluidity, we decided that Faculty Council appointments of APROC faculty would not be by position (on certain councils etc) but rather allow for faculty with expertise and interest vetted by Faculty Council to populate the APROC. Terms are 2 years with reappointment possible. We talked about the need for a large group—and settled on “at least 8 faculty” to maintain a reasonable size and yet broad representation. Anne will write up a paragraph description for our next meeting.

7. **Next meeting’s agenda: APROC’s quality assurance role and IEC.**