APROC Meeting Notes
May 23, 2016

In attendance: Dennis Gilbert, Craig Taylor, Tammy Salman, Anne McGrail, Christina Howard, Jennifer Steele, Rosa Lopez, Kate Sullivan, Tammy Steeves

1. Announcements: (5 minutes)

   Updates on programs for 2016-17

   - Joe Russin is going to launch program review this summer, but someone else will be the lead.
   - Margaret Robertson sent some information; they are working to finish their report
   - Chinuk Wawa wants to undertake program review
   - Dennis is completing the electronics program review, started by Terry Dale. He will abridge after receiving a report from the national academy of cyberphysical systems. Would like to archive all the documents used in the analysis of the program cut.
   - Deans would like a list of the programs going through review next year (Anne will send)

2. Board presentation on program review - June 9 (Jen Steele) (10 minutes)

   - Anne will work on putting together information for the packet and organizing the presentation. Anne, Dennis and Christina will present.
   - Jen will request it go as early in the agenda as possible

3. First discussion: Definition of a program and drafting a process for exceptions (see p. 2) (15 minutes)

   - How do we deal with areas such as film and Chinuk Wawa?
   - APROC has taken the position that everything should go through program review before being cut. If Chinuk Wawa isn't a "Program", then it is part of another program, which should be given the opportunity to undergo review.
   - Any program can volunteer to undertake program review; the administration controls release time, however
   - APROC should support reviews in any case; people have a home here
   - There are considerations outside of financial (e.g. cultural in the case of Chinuk Wawa)
   - APROC will provide recommendations to ASA on how to deal with this questions for review and response
   - Can we tie this discussion to the emerging strategic directions?
   - Dennis and Anne will work on a recommendation and set up a time to meet with Dawn and ASA in advance of the board meeting

4. IRAP, Data and self-study questions (this seemed to be a major discussion item at the team meeting so we should not leave for the summer without addressing). I am not able to attend the Data Summit on May 13th. Perhaps some details will emerge there about this question. (20 minutes)

   - Should APROC sponsor information requests?
   - The data that Christina collects for her students in demographics and degree completion is markedly different from data she received from IRAP
   - Faculty are creating their own surveys, tracking systems, indicators, and maintaining their own data. This data isn't used by the institution.
   - Standard data packets don't contain needed information about student demographics, progression and completion.
   - How do we support broader and/or more complex questions specific from individual review teams?
   - How can we keep within our one-year calendar when data isn't always available? If a major study needs to be done and data isn't readily available, that should be in the form of a recommendation.
   - Our vision is that we will continue to build IRAP systems to support recurring program review data needs, and also develop additional expertise at Lane (for example, faculty who have already gone through program review)
   - Need access to longer-term longitudinal data (e.g. 10+ years instead of 5 years)
   - Need to have a feedback loop through program review that highlights data issues and opportunities
   - Need to broaden financial constructs around program data and analysis
   - Need to be able to provide faculty with some level of analysis; Molloy is very helpful in this area
   - APROC will be providing an annual report to IEC. This is an opportunity for us to share issues, opportunities and recommendations for improving systems, policies and practices (e.g. application fields)

5. Implementation Steering Team staffing and directions (Phase II for 2015-16 self-study programs). (20 minutes)

   - Faculty send completed reviews to APROC, who review them and forward them to AMT
   - After the self-study, the PRC sets up its half of the IST, the AMT sets up its half. The faculty develops a consensus document after external review, then the IST determines any resource barriers to implementation. The IST does not challenge the recommendations but rather works collaboratively to overcome resource barriers.

6. Fall in service opportunity (Jen Steele) (15 minutes)

   - We have been invited to have a program review session on Thursday of inservice week. More information forthcoming.

7. **Wrap up and close**

Defining a Program

From Temple University: "An academic program is defined as any combination of courses and/or requirements leading to a degree or certificate, or to a major, co-major, minor or academic track and/or concentration (from Temple policy 02.60.01)"

From Univ of Alaska Anchorage:

To: Deans, directors and program/department chairs
From: Mark Fitch, Tara Smith and Robert Boeckmann, Academic Task Force tri-chairs
Date: July 17, 2013
Re: Academic program definition, decision tree and program list for review, program prioritization project

Attached is a draft copy of UAA's academic programs as refined by the Academic Task Force (AcTF) for the purposes of evaluation as part of the program prioritization process. The AcTF established a shared definition of "program" as it applies specifically to this process. Using the following definition and decision tree criteria, please review the attached program list. If you feel that a program (based on the AcTF's definition of program) should be added or removed from this list, please contact Tara Smith tmsmith@uaa.alaska.edu or Mark Fitch mafitch@uaa.alaska.edu by Aug. 13, 2013. Immediately following Aug. 13, the program list will be finalized.

Academic program definition

The AcTF will consider a program, for the sake of the prioritization process, as "*any activity or collection of activities of the institution that we have committed ourselves to providing (catalog copy, grants or funding awards received) that consumes resources (dollars, people, space, equipment, time)*." This definition is based on the work done by Robert Dickeson in his book, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*. Specifically, sections listed below:

- "An operational definition of a program is any activity or collection of activities of the institution that consumes resources (dollars, people, space, equipment, time)." Pg. 56
- "Programs are more usually narrow and disciplinary in nature." Pg. 56
- "The definition of a program should include all programs using the institution's total resources. Stated another way, all resources should be allocated to one or more programs. And the definition should be discrete enough to permit real analysis to take place." Pg. 57
- "The point is that a subject discipline may be engaged in multiple programs because it seeks to meet multiple expectations. The discipline simultaneously offers majors, minors, service courses, and general education courses, and no analysis of that area would be complete without identifying the sum of the contributions it is making to –and resources it is drawing from—the whole." Pg. 59

Decision tree

The following questions might be helpful in determining if a "program" should be recommended for inclusion in the draft list. In addition, these parameters might help identify "programs" currently included on the draft list that should be removed or combined with another program.

- Are there any courses, faculty or other resources consumed by this program? If yes, it should remain a separate program. If no, continue to the next question.
- Does this program draw students or generate resources that the other programs do not? If yes, it should remain separate. If no, continue to the next question.
- If the program is deleted, can any resources be reallocated? If yes, it should remain separate. If no, then recommend to the AcTF (through Mark Fitch or Tara Smith) that the programs be combined for this review. Please include a discussion for each item above.