Committee on Academic Programs  
Minutes of June 7, 2005

Present: Paul Alberto, Al Baumstark, Elizabeth Beck, Faye Borthick, Michelle Brattain, Margo Brinton, Laura Burtle, Joan Carson, Ron Colarusso, Dean Dabney, Irene Duhaime, Crawford Elliott, Teryl Frey, Yu-Sheng Hsu, Philo Hutcheson, Carrie Manning, Valerie Miller, Thomas Netzel, Lloyd Nigro, Bruce Pilling, Cora Presley, 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.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the April 28, 2005 meeting were voted on and passed.  
Dr. Netzel motioned to approve the minutes.  
Dr. Weigle seconded the motion.

AGENDA ITEMS

The chair explained that the purpose of the June meeting is:

1. Election of CAP subcommittee members

   Dr. Nigro recommended adding Jim Wolk to Social Work.  
   Dr. Alberto will email Dr. Renick with two persons from the College of Education that want to be added to subcommittees.  
   Drs. Alberto and Nigro moved to accept the changes.  
   Dr. Dabney seconded.  The slates passed unanimously.  
   (The approved subcommittee slates are attached to these minutes.)

2. Consideration of APRC reports on:
   African American Studies, English, Mathematics and Statistics, School of Music, and Sociology.

   Dr. Nigro moved on behalf of the APRC that CAP to approve all five committee reports for consideration.  It was agreed that Dr. Carson will post future reports on the website as a draft.  They are password protected within Georgia State University.

School of Music
Dr. Haberlen, Director of the School of Music, expressed thanks to the committee for helping the School of Music for the report and for recommendations, which helped them formulate their action plan. Dr. Renick thanked the committee (Drs. Brinton, Manson, Shoffner) for their hard work. There were no changes to the draft.

Mathematics and Statistics

Dr. Renick: Thanked Drs. Donnelly, Elliott, and Frey for their work on this committee. The report was opened for discussion and Dr. Schultz expressed concerns regarding the report’s comments on the proposed Ph.D. in Mathematics, particularly the concentration in Math Education. She regards such a degree to needlessly duplicate work already being covered by a doctoral degree in the College of Education (pointing out that many of the COE doctoral students go on to careers in academia in Mathematics) and felt the APRC report endorsed such a track (specifically, lines 80-83, 265, 322-323, and 366-68 of the proposed APRC report).

Dr. Renick and others suggested that the report did not recommend such a track per se, but merely cited the fact that other parties—including the Provost and the external team—had done so. It was pointed out that a full proposal for a new Mathematics Ph.D. would have to go through the Graduate Council and CAP for a full discussion. Dean Colaruso stated that this would not be the context for a full discussion of the point since the appropriate proposal was not yet before CAP, but that he wished “to go on record” as believing that a new Math Education track would needlessly duplicate offerings of the College of Education. Dr. Dabney expressed the opinion that the APRC report was fine in its proposed form. No motions to offer nay changes were offered.

Sociology

Dr. Renick acknowledged Drs. Pullman (chair), Dangel and Miller work on the subcommittee. Dr. Reitzes, Chair of Sociology, indicated on behalf of Sociology that his department was happy with this benchmark of peer institutions. This cycle of evaluation was particularly helpful the second time around. No motions to change the report were offered.

African American Studies

Dr. Renick: Acknowledged Drs. Brattain (chair), Brinton, Emshoff for their hard work. Dr. Umoja on behalf of African American Studies indicated his satisfaction with the APRC report as it stands. There were no motions for changes offered.

English

Dr. Renick: Acknowledged Dr. Hutcheson (chair), Nigro, and Miller, for their hard work. Dr. Roudane and Malamud (Chair and Associate Chair of English, respectively) were in attendance and indicated their support for the AOPRC report in its current form. No motions for changes were offered.
Dr. Netzel: Called the question regarding the motion to approve all five APRC reports. The reports were approved.

3. Consideration of APRC proposal to modify the Self-Study template for program review.

Dr. Borthick chaired the effort on behalf of the APRC to offer modifications to the template used by departments to produce their self studies. Dr. Borthick indicated that the proposed modifications attempt to address the university’s new heightened emphasis on such issues as a program’s strategic fit with other programs and its cost effectiveness.

A detailed discussion lasting over an hour ensued, with many changes and suggestions offered. All were accepted as friendly amendments by Dr. Borthick. (A full version of the document, with all changes in place is attached to the end of these minutes.)

Dr. Netzel: Called the question, which had already been moved by Dr. Borthick on behalf of the APRC.

The Motion passed with one dissention.

Implementation: It was decided to bring the revised template before the first Senate meeting of the Fall semester. If passed, departments currently under program review would be provided with the new template and given the opportunity to use it. (Whether to do so or not would be decided in consultation with Joan Carson.) Departments yet to initiate a cycle of program review at the time the changes are passes would, of course, have to conform to the new template.

Dr. Baumstark: Motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Minutes prepared by Donna Brevard
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Proposal from APRC to Amend the APR Self-Study Template

The CAP Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) recommends changing the 2003 version of the...
Academic Program Review (APR) Self-Study Template to make it consistent with the campus’s increasing emphasis on strategic planning and outcomes evaluation. Units that are preparing self studies for their programs should find the revised template helpful in terms of their presentations and as they prepare for the action plan stage. The specific changes are explained below.

1. The former section H on strengths, weaknesses, and their implications has been moved to the beginning of the self-study report as section A to indicate its importance in the overall process of academic program review and the increasing emphasis on strategic planning and outcomes evaluation. The section is now organized in the categories of quality, centrality, viability, strategic focus, and resource analysis. Because the former template prompted units for discussions of the first four of the categories in various sections under differing terminologies, the only new concept is resource analysis.

2. The former section A on historical context and section B on current context have been combined into one section to avoid duplication of text.

3. Section B has a new table for summarizing Faculty Numbers, Credit Hours, and Scholarly and Creative Productivity to give units guidance on presenting these measures.

4. The text has been edited for clarity throughout.

Revised Template as Approved by CAP, 6/7/05

(Note: this revision is intended to replace the self-study template only; other sections of the program review document remain in place an unchanged)

Purpose of Academic Program Review

The purpose of Academic Program Review (APR) is to evaluate academic programs to ensure their effectiveness and continuing improvement in support of unit, college, and university missions and strategic plans. The analysis in a unit’s APR Self-Study Report focuses on evidence of the unit’s effectiveness as an indicator of its ability to achieve the goals set for it in the next review cycle. More information about APR is available from the GSU APR web site at http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwapac/academicprogramreview.html.

Note: The Self-Study Report must be organized according to the following sections and include the required appendices.

Section A: Unit Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses

This section gives the unit’s assessment of strengths and weakness of the programs covered in the self-study with discussions of their implications for the programs. The portrayal of strengths and weaknesses in this section must be supported by specific references to information contained in other sections. The section should be organized by the following categories:

1. Quality of the instruction, research, and service associated with the programs.
2.  Centrality of the programs to the university: Alignment with and contributions to achieving the mission and goals of Georgia State, the college, and the unit.

3.  Viability of programs: Degree to which the programs are viable with respect to enrollments, graduates, and continuing availability of resources to support them.

4.  Strategic focus: Rationales for the choices of subject areas and degree levels in terms of the disciplines and the programs’ distinctiveness, demands for graduates, and contributions in the context of the university’s reach into local, state, national, and international communities.

5.  Financial resource analysis: An analysis of the resources expended in terms of the quality and quantity of instruction, research, and service contributions. When a self-study and an action plan exist for a prior cycle, the effects of changes in strategy and investment should be explained and analyzed.
5. A summary table for items 1-4 (Table B5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B5</th>
<th>Faculty Numbers, Credit Hours, and Scholarly and Creative Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three-Year Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average annual number of faculty members by rank and status**
- Tenured professors: x
- Tenured associate professors: x
- Tenure-track associate professors: x
- Tenure-track assistant professors: x
- Total tenure-track faculty members: x
- Non-tenure-track faculty members (fulltime): x
- Total fulltime faculty members: x
- Part-time instructors: x
- Graduate teaching assistants: x
- Total for part-time faculty: x

**Average annual number and type of staff**
- Administrative staff (fulltime equivalents): x
- Student assistants (half-time equivalents): x

**Average annual credit hours by level**
- Undergraduate: Core: x
- Undergraduate: Lower division: x
- Undergraduate: Upper division: x
- Graduate: x

**Average annual credit hours by faculty type**
- Tenured and tenure-track: x
- Non-tenure track (fulltime): x
- Total for fulltime faculty: x
- Part-time instructors: x
- Graduate teaching assistants: x
- Total for part-time faculty: x

**Scholarly and creative productivity**
- Total number of refereed publications: Unduplicated: 1 x
- Total number of refereed publications: By author: 2 x
- Total number of other scholarly/creative works: Unduplicated: 1 x
- Total number of other scholarly/creative works: By author or creator: 2 x
- Average annual number of refereed publications per tenure-track faculty: Unduplicated: 1 x.x
- Average annual number of refereed publications per tenure-track faculty: By author: 2 x.x
- Average annual number of other scholarly/creative works per tenure-track faculty: Unduplicated: 1 x.x
- Average annual number of other scholarly/creative works per tenure-track faculty: By author: 2 x.x

**Funding from grant and other sources**
- Total external direct funding: $x
1 For works with multiple authors from the unit, count the work only once.
2 For works with multiple authors from the unit, count the work once for each author in the unit.
3 For multi-participant grants, include only the amounts allocated to unit faculty members.

6. Evidence of program relevance and the degree to which community, student, and professional needs are served by the program.

7. Information on programs at other institutions needed to provide sufficient context for any comparative data presented in the Self-Study Report.

This section will also include the following:

**Required Appendices:**

- Appendix B1: Rationale for choices of peer programs.
- Appendix B2: Organization of unit governance and committee structure (an organization chart showing unit committees, key administrators, staff, etc.).
- Appendix B3: Unit bylaws if available.
- Appendix B4: Current faculty roster that indicates names, hire date, entry rank, current rank, tenure status, and full or part-time status of faculty members.
- Appendix B5: Center report(s) if relevant. The organization of the center report(s) should follow the format specifications in the attached Appendix E.

**Section C: Progress Toward Goals and Objectives**

This section offers a brief description of the goals and objectives, in priority order, established by the unit during the most recent previous academic program review for its graduate and undergraduate programs and affiliated centers. This section should focus on how progress toward accomplishment of the goals and objectives guided the unit’s program activities and resource allocations since its last review. Where possible, units should indicate how these goals have complied with and contributed to the College and University Strategic Plans.

**Required Appendix**

- Appendix C1: Unit’s strategic plan and goals as of the beginning of the self-study period

**Section D: Curricula Quality**

This section offers an evaluation of the quality of the unit’s degree requirements and curricula in light of the curricular goals and objectives described in Section C. The curricula for each program should be described and evaluated using the data listed below, as well as the information in Section B, including appendices. Where
appropriate, comparisons to similar programs at peer units at other institutions should be included. Evidence of student learning must be provided, and evaluative survey results may also be offered to attest to curriculum quality:

1. Evidence of student learning:
   b. Assessment plans.
   c. Analyses of student attainment of learning outcomes indicating how well learning outcomes are being achieved. Depending on the discipline, the kind and source of the evidence of learning will vary.
   d. Explanation of changes that have been implemented to improve learning outcomes.
   e. Explanation of the role of Writing Intensive courses in attaining learning outcomes.

   Guidance for developing and assessing learning outcomes is available on the GSU assessment web site at http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/outcomes.htm.

2. Evaluative statements about curricular quality based on surveys of current faculty, undergraduate students, and recent alumni. The unit will work with the Office of Institutional Research to specify and collect the required data. The unit will be responsible for analysis and interpretation of the data.

**Required Appendices**

*Appendix D1: Learning outcome statements and assessment plans*

*Appendix D2: Current course syllabi for all approved Writing Intensive courses*

*Appendix D3: Degree requirements for each program, which may be taken from catalogs*

*Appendix D4: A list of courses offered by the department for the past three years, with the frequency with which the courses were offered in the review period, the number of sections, the total number of students and the average number of students per section. Please indicate courses which are cross-listed. Information will be organized by the categories of undergraduate lower division, undergraduate upper division, graduate. The Office of Institutional Research will provide these data to units. The format for this Appendix is attached to this document as Table D-1.*

*Appendix D5: Summary results of surveys*

*Appendix D6: Undergraduate and graduate advisement procedures*

**Section E: Student Quality**

This section summarizes and evaluates the quality of incoming and graduating undergraduate and graduate students for the review period. Where feasible, data should be presented in tabular format with summary text. Evaluative statements, for example, may consider comparisons to peer programs, national or local trends with regard to quality of graduates, or similarly relevant information. Reference to data in Section B should be made as appropriate. Some examples of input and output quality metrics appear below. The appropriate metrics vary by discipline.

**Input Quality Metrics**
- Admission requirements for graduate programs.
- Minimum GPA requirements, if applicable, for undergraduate majors.
- **Average** annual SAT scores and Freshman Indexes by year for undergraduate majors.
- **Average** standardized graduate admission test scores and GPAs of applicants to graduate programs, all students offered admission, and matriculating students for each of the past three years. (Table E-1)
- Numbers of applicants to graduate programs and numbers of accepted students for each of the past three years (selection ratio). (Table E-2)

Output Quality Metrics

- Comparison of performance (standardized test scores) with students in peer programs at other universities.
- Analyses of student performance.
- Job placements/acceptance in graduate or professional schools.
- Scholarly presentations and honors.
- Publications.

**Section F: Faculty Quality**

The quality of the faculty for the three-year review period will be summarized and evaluated in this section. This section should reference, summarize, and evaluate faculty-specific data presented in Section B. Any relevant additional data should be provided in tabular form accompanied by summary text and evaluation. Comparisons with peer program faculties identified in Section B should be provided as appropriate. This discussion should include references to the following where relevant:

- Quality and quantity of scholarly and creative productivity.
- Results of promotion and tenure and reviews.
- Faculty honors.
- Dollar level and source of sponsored research (specify internal and external sources and direct and indirect funding amounts for the latter).
- Service and outreach contributions.

**Required Appendices**

- Appendix F1: Definition of graduate faculty and criteria for selection of graduate faculty
- Appendix F2: List of graduate faculty
Section G: Resource Adequacy

In this section, units will describe and evaluate the adequacy of resources available in specific areas during the self-study period as they relate to the goals and objectives specified in Section C. The discussion should be organized in the following categories.

1. Faculty Resources. The adequacy of faculty resources should be discussed with reference to student/faculty ratio data and credit hour generation data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research and, as appropriate, compared to similar data from similar units at peer institutions.

   Student (undergraduate major, master)/TT faculty ratio data will be given for academic programs for each of the past three years. These data will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research and will be arrayed according to the format provided in Table G-1.

   The credit hour generation data in Tables B-4a, B-4b, and B-4c will be summarized and analyzed for its relevance to the issue of adequacy of the size of the faculty.

2. Administrative Resources. Staff support per FTE faculty member should be indicated with any relevant comparisons made to similar academic units. These may be units within GSU or elsewhere.

3. Technological Resources. The adequacy and availability of technology for carrying out faculty and staff work, with relevant comparisons made to similar academic units.

4. Space Resources. Issues related to the adequacy of space should be addressed here, with relevant comparisons made to similar academic units.

5. Laboratory Resources. The adequacy of research and non-instructional laboratory space should be discussed here, with any relevant comparisons made to similar academic units.

6. GSU Foundation Resources. These resources should be discussed if available to the unit and/or programs during the review period.

7. Library Resources. The adequacy of library resources should be addressed. The University Library will provide a report on library holdings to the unit.

Required Appendices

- Appendix G1: Summary data on student/faculty ratios and credit hour generation from the Office of Institutional Research.

- Appendix G2: University Library report.
Section H: Goals and Objectives

This section presents the unit’s goals and objectives for the programs and evaluates them in the context of current strengths and weakness as presented in Section A. Goal statements should be given in terms of the ends toward which effort and resource allocations will be directed. Units will indicate how their program goals are consistent with college and university strategic plans, citing the relevant documents (college and university strategic plans). This section will set specific objectives that must be met in order to achieve program goals.

Program goals should be prioritized. The unit should provide rationales for each goal and objective, identify new resources needed to achieve the goals, and offer an implementation plan for achieving the goals by the next scheduled self-study. This discussion should indicate the magnitude of the new effort needed to implement unit goals, which may range from modest incremental additions to major alterations in program directions and resource allocations.

Any new data should be presented in summary form with tables and appendices as needed. Care should be taken to summarize and explain the relevance of all appendices. The organization of this section should follow the outline attached to this document as Table H-1.

This section should present goals and objectives in the context of the unit’s strategic plan for the next academic review cycle and be supported by the analysis in this self-study report.