

L&S Academic Planning Council

Tuesday, October 6, 2015 (1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m., 101) *Approved November 3, 2015*

Chair: Karl Scholz

Members Present: Angela Powell, Katherine Bowie, Ivy Corfis, Steve Kantrowitz, Charles Fry, Harry Brighthouse, Jan Edwards, Clark Landis, Matt Turner, Anna Gemrich,

Observers present: Anne Gunther, Susan Ellis-Weisman, Greg Downey, James Montgomery, Wren Singer Elaine Klein, Kimbrin Cornelius, Nancy Westphal Johnson, Sue Zaeske, Eric Wilcots

1. Announcements and updates. Next meeting will likely canceled.

2. Consent agenda. a. Approval of notes, 15 September 2015 b. Technical Corrections to L&S Centers and Institutes i. Discontinue L&S LEAD Center ii. Rename L&S Center, COWS. Consent agenda approved (notes approved by members present at that meeting).

3. Academic Program Review – Report and Process (a.) Annual Report on Program Review EMK led discussion. The L&S Annual Report on Program Review, which was submitted to the Provost in August 2015, was distributed to members. The report outlines how L&S approaches program review, how review items are presented to the APC, how discussions and decisions are made, and how these are reported back to departments. The Board of Regents requires reviews to be conducted at least every ten years; however, they may also be conducted for other purposes, as when a program undergoes an accreditation review or undertakes a strategic planning exercise. The dean may also convene a review to address programmatic issues. In all cases, L&S intends the process to be rigorous and to achieve program improvement where possible. **(b) Revision of Program Review Guidelines.** The L&S APC oversees the review process, and is responsible for articulating guidelines for program review. Since the current guidelines were developed under different conditions and with less attention to student learning, it seems appropriate to revisit them. To that end, EMK has interviewed associate deans and JKS invited current and past APC members with extensive experience with program reviews to discuss the guidelines. The goal is to revise the questions to better prompt candid program reviews that identify program strengths and weaknesses. A draft of the revised guidelines will be presented to the council in November. Members noted they are particularly interested in what programs could do better with their current level of resources, what programs do to ensure students are learning, and what programs intend to do with respect to implementing plans to improve.

4. Academic Program Review: Religious Studies Certificate Program. SZ led discussion of this review, which had been revised after its first presentation to the council in March. SZ reminded the council that because certificates are limited resource programs, L&S reviews are also somewhat limited in scope. She noted APC members agreed the first report did not fulfill the expectations of a rigorous review, and asked Religious Studies to revise the review and respond to questions about assessment. In conversation, members noted the review identifies issues, and they are moving towards a more coherent program. Although the council understands that small, low-resource programs need time and guidance to build a quality assessment program, members noted there the program relies on surveys and conducts little direct assessment of learning. Committee members counseled the program to find

more instruments to measure student learning, and create a plan so they can make historical connections. Members also discussed the use of Religious 101 as an early gateway to the certificate, since many students do not complete it early. Members unanimously voted to accept the program review, and directed the dean to communicate their discussion points to the program.

5. Academic Program Restructuring: Update on work in progress. SZ led discussion. Restructuring programs to achieve better use of resources is under way campus-wide, and L&S has been focused on this topic since 2012. Small departments have increasing pressures, particularly since the day-to-day expertise needed to administer various systems and procedures is growing; further, smaller departments have trouble with governance and mentoring junior faculty. Even moderate sized units may benefit by merging with complementary units. EW provided updates in Natural/Mathematical sciences, noting that the departments of Botany and Zoology continue to discuss how they can work together. GD noted that in the Social Sciences, the programs had moved to the International Division, where they are sharing resources in a new configuration. Geography and URPL are discussing cooperation where disciplines are similar. SZ gave Humanities restructuring updates. A restructuring of Hebrew and Semitic Studies and of Classics has been achieved, resulting in Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies. Comparative Literature merged with the Folklore program and became Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies. A conversation is occurring with over a dozen departments in Van Hise, with the World Languages, Literatures and Cultures Task Force. Several other departments are actively engaged in planning: Slavic, Scandinavian Studies, and German may become one department, and Languages and Cultures and Asia and East Asian Languages and Literatures are discussing merger. In each case there are good pedagogical reasons driving the decisions, not just economic or staff decisions. All processes follow shared governance with respect to faculty leading inclusive discussions, observing Faculty Policies and Procedures for moving tenure lines, articulation and adoption of new governance structures and procedures for how programs and curriculums will be administered, etc.

6. Consultations of the Dean. KS gave brief updates about the campus budget model, changes anticipated with the new HR system, the impending L&S climate survey, and the Comprehensive Campaign.

Meeting adjourned, 2:30 pm.

Notes submitted by Kimbrin Cornelius, Curriculum Administration Specialist.