ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
Minutes of November 16, 2004

Present: Lauren Adamson, Paul Alberto, Faye Borthick, Michelle Brattain, Laura Burtle, Joan Carson, Denise Donnelly, Crawford Elliott, Michael Eriksen, Sally Fowler, Teryl Frey, Shelby Frost, Cecelia Grindel, John Kesner, Patricia Ketsche, Susan Laury, Basil Mattingly, George Pullman, Don Reitzes, Tim Renick, Mary Shoffner, Sara Weigle.

Call to Order
The Chair, Tim Renick, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. in Room 718, General Classroom Building.

AGENDA ITEMS

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the November 2, 2004 meeting were approved.

The chair explained that the purpose of the November 16th meeting is:

1. Consideration of the revised document, “Senate Procedure for Program Evaluation in the Context of Possible Deactivation or Termination”

Tim Renick outlined three major changes in the document since the November 2 APACE meeting: (a) the third-member of the three-member review team may now be from the faculty at large and does not have to be member of the Senate; (b) there is now a section of the document allowing for “expedited” review in cases in which the Provost, Dean, and Chair/Director all agree on termination/deactivation; and (c) APACE’s role is the process is now two part, starting with an evaluation role in reporting on pre-established indicators for targeted programs and ending with a formal recommendation regarding termination or deactivation only in those cases in which FACP should first recommend either deactivation or termination. The name of the document has been adjusted according.

A discussion of the revised document ensued and included questions from Crawford Elliott and George Pullman about faculty participation in the process and from Michael Eriksen concerning what happens to the APACE recommendation after it is forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee.

Susan Laury moved approval of the document. Faye Borthick seconded. The motion passed unanimously. [The approved document is appended to the end of these minutes.]

2. Discussion of the report of Joint Budget/APACE Subcommittee on Costs concerning the indicators of “quality” and “centrality.” The subcommittee was charged with this task by the Senate Executive Committee, so this document came before APACE as an informational item. After a discussion of the document, APACE members and other faculty were encouraged to share their views both of these first two indicators and the subsequent four indicators with members of the subcommittee. Beginning
Thursday morning, November 18, the subcommittee will begin to meet to consider the other four indicators for program evaluation.

3. Continued consideration of APACE’s mandate in the Senate bylaws

The Senate Committee on Statutes and Bylaws is working on a document to guide membership issues for all Senate committees [Section A of the current bylaws regarding APACE]. As such, the discussion focused on proposed revisions to APACE’s specific charge in the Senate bylaws.

After a discussion, the following copy was proposed for section B (with section C of the current bylaws remaining unchanged):

B. The duties of the committee shall include the following:

1. developing long-range plans for the academic affairs of the University;

2. reviewing and recommending university policies and proposals concerning:
   curricula,
   new and existing academic programs,
   the deactivation and termination of academic programs, and
   the core curriculum,

3. assessing academic programs and general education;

4. approving courses having a university-wide designation;

5. advising the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs on graduate and undergraduate matters, including the promotion, development, and coordination of graduate and undergraduate education.

Don Reitzes proposed the dropping of “and continuing education” from the name of the committee and the renaming of APACE to CAP, Committee on Academic Programs.

Teryl Frey moved approval of the new section B of the bylaws with the name change. Michelle Brattain seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Reports from subcommittees

Subcommittee chairs reported on the recent and upcoming activities of their committees.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 pm.

Approved by APACE 11/16/04

SENATE REVIEW OF PROPOSALS FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION IN THE CONTEXT OF POSSIBLE DEACTIVATION & TERMINATION
I. Preface

By University Senate Bylaws, the Senate Committee on Academic Programs and Continuing Education (APACE) is responsible for “developing long-range plans for the academic affairs of the University” and for “reviewing and recommending” policies with regard to new and current academic programs. In particular, APACE has a long-established role in both the creation of new academic degree programs and in the review of these programs as part of the ongoing program review process. While the input of departments and colleges is a critical part of the assessment of academic programs, APACE’s role is distinct and is valued for allowing faculty, students, and administrators (including the Provost and college deans, all of whom are sitting members of APACE) formally to examine and to assess academic programs from a University perspective. In light of these facts, APACE is the appropriate Senate body to consider issues involving the continuation of academic programs, including questions of potential deactivation and termination.

II. Procedure

Overview: A Senate evaluation of an academic program in the context of its possible deactivation or termination shall consist of a two-stage process: evaluation and recommendation. In the evaluation stage, APACE shall compile a report on the strengths and weaknesses of the academic program based on established indicators. The APACE report will be submitted to the Fiscal Advisory Committee to the President (FACP) for consideration. In the recommendation stage, FACP will recommend a course of action which may entail the deactivation or termination of the program in question but may alternately entail reorganization, strengthening, or other measures. If deactivation or termination of the program is recommended by FACP, then the matter will return to APACE at this stage, and APACE will make a formal recommendation regarding the deactivation or termination of the program and forward its recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee.

A. Evaluation

1. A proposal to evaluate an academic program in the context of its possible deactivation or termination shall be submitted to APACE in writing by the Provost, the Senate Executive Committee, and/or the Dean of the college housing the academic program in question. The Chair or Director of the academic program in question, as well as the Dean of the college in which the program is housed, shall have the option of submitting an accompanying written response to the proposal.

2. A proposal which has been submitted to APACE initially will be assigned to one of two APACE sub-committees, the Graduate Council or the Undergraduate Council, depending on the level of the academic program in question. (In cases of programs simultaneously put forth for deactivation or termination at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the chair of APACE will appoint a joint subcommittee consisting of the chair of either the Undergraduate or the Graduate Council and four additional members from each subcommittee.) The chair of the appropriate subcommittee will then do the following:
(a) Solicit recommendations for prospective review-team members from the Provost, the Dean of the college housing the academic program in question, the Chairs of APACE and Budget, and the Chair/Director of the academic program. (See stipulations in section b.)

(b) Appoint a three-member review team to conduct an initial assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Each member of the review team shall be from a different college. The review team shall consist of one member of APACE (ideally a member of the subcommittee in question); one member of the Senate Budget Committee; and one member of the faculty (ideally a Senate member) with an expertise in the academic area of the program being reviewed and who shall be designated by the Dean of the college which houses the program in consultation with the program’s Chair/Director. None of the three members of the review team shall be a member of the academic program being considered for deactivation/termination or of the department in which said program is housed.

(c) Instruct the three-member review team to write a report assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the academic program structured around the Senate-approved, eight-point Template for Academic Program Review Self Study and based upon assessment indicators as established by the joint APACE/Budget Subcommittee on Program Costs and Organization. This report may take into account the written proposal for deactivation/termination; the written responses, if any, from the Chair/Director of the program and the Dean of college in which it is housed; previous program review documents pertaining to the academic program in question; interviews; and other data and resources supplied to the team or that the team should deem appropriate.

3. The report of the review team on strengths and weaknesses of the program will be brought back to the appropriate subcommittee (the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, or jointly appointed GC/UC subcommittee, depending on the level(s) of the academic program) as a whole for deliberation, after which the subcommittee will forward a report to APACE. It is the expectation that the review of proposals by these bodies will help to insure the consistent application of the assessment indicators across academic programs.

4. APACE will consider the report of the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, or jointly appointed GC/UC subcommittee on strengths and weaknesses of the program and, in turn, forward a report to FACP.

B. Recommendation

1. Based on the APACE report, FACP shall deliberate on the question of deactivation or termination of the program in question. If FACP recommends the deactivation/termination of an academic program, it shall forward this recommendation in writing to APACE for final deliberation.

2. In the context of their existing evaluations of the strengths and weaknesses of the academic program produced during the evaluation stage, the APACE subcommittee (Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, or joint GC/UC subcommittee) and the three-person review team which were originally assigned to evaluate the academic program shall formulate a written recommendation to APACE
regarding deactivation/termination of the program. This written recommendation will be presented to APACE which will, in turn, formulate a final recommendation with regard to deactivation/termination of the academic program. This APACE recommendation will be forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee.

C. Timeline

The three-member review team will be appointed within 10 days of the submission of a proposal for deactivation or termination. The evaluation report of the three-member review team will be completed within 45 days after the review team is formed. The initial APACE report on strengths and weaknesses will be provided to FACP within 30 days of receipt of the report of the review team. In cases in which FACP formally recommends deactivation or termination, APACE shall make a recommendation concerning deactivation/termination to the Senate Executive Committee within 15 days of receipt of the FACP recommendation.

D. Expedited review

In cases in which the Provost, the Dean of the college housing the academic program in question, and the chair/director of the academic program shall all support, in writing to APACE, the deactivation or termination of an academic program, the above process may be expedited. Under such circumstances, the proposal to deactivate or terminate will be considered by APACE as a whole committee in lieu of being sent to subcommittee. If a two-thirds majority of APACE shall approve, an APACE recommendation to deactivate or terminate the program shall immediately be forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee. If a two-thirds majority of APACE does not approve, then the proposal to deactivate or terminate shall be sent through the full evaluation and recommendation process.