University Senate Academic Policies Committee
Vol. 56, Meeting No. 8
Tuesday, February 18, 2020
Chancellors Room, 311 Davies

Present:  
Members: Robert Hooper, Marquell Johnson, Provost Kleine, Der-Fa Lu, Bill Miller, Vicki Samelson, Evan Weiher
Guests: Rose-Marie Avin, Margaret Cassidy, Manny Fernandez, Deb Jansen, Darrell Newton, Jim Phillips, Jill Prushiek

Presiding: Chair Marquell Johnson called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

1. Approval of minutes from February 11, 2020
   - Motion to approve the minutes of February 11, 2020, as distributed. Motion was seconded and approved unanimously (6-0-0).

   - Question 1 - What additional information can the APC provide during the program review process that warrants Academic Affairs to address areas of concerns highlighted in review letters?
     · Departments have some of the same recommendations every review. Would like to see higher standards in some areas. External consultants seem to always include a need for more faculty, greater program exposure, etc. Budget cuts affected this. What students want to major in changes over time. APC members view their role differently. Would hope recommendations are made that the committee will stand by, faculty own the curriculum. Almost all program reviews come through as “maintain current status,” may need to redefine standards/look at what is happening now. Would like all of Academic Affairs to have access to program reviews, make others aware of the recommendations, where programs stand or are headed.
     · How much written in APC’s report is given consideration—or is it just a small piece of a bigger amount of information being taken in? All APC information is reviewed; need to insure those impacted are aware, e.g., changes to PSYC course impact CoEHS
   - Question 2 - How can the program review process be less of an exercise in futility? Areas of concerns and/or issues requiring attention appear in multiple program review cycles.
     · Chairs have differing views. Other issues arise that aren’t on the review form and end up being what is discussed during the meeting with the chairs. APC has done a good job of not talking about personnel issues. How do we close the loop when it’s not on the review form? Teaching and learning used to be entire focus and needs to be brought to the forefront again. Issues need to be resolved surrounding advertising/visibility for programs.
   - Question 3 - What information (if any) from the program review process is utilized by Academic Affairs in making decisions related to resource allocation/reallocation?
     · Academic Master Plan’s effective structures and processes: Assessment – thankful for ULEC/APC/Mary Hoffman, everything good with HLC; Faculty Professional Development and Workload – report forthcoming from the workgroup; Undergraduate Program Array – Institutions need to report to UW System programs with fewer than 5 graduates during a 3-year time period and provide a descriptor of why the institution is defending them; Instructional Resource Allocation – Realign capacity with demand, need to increase capacity in high-demand areas, some capacity issues in terms of people being underutilized, course fill rates are being monitored, bottlenecks, faculty are wearing themselves thin.
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- Chemistry – Disagreement with No. 14 Hire more support staff, specifically a STEM-wide Instrument Technician/Coordinator
  - Take into consideration with new building, needed by other departments too, a good example is Materials Science Center
  - Jim Phillips noted a discrepancy with DEP between the memo and spreadsheet

- Communication Sciences and Disorders – Disagreement with No. 6 College and University should support the department with increased physical space
  - Not included on campus master plan, discussion surrounding space in HSS was discussed when departments moved to Centennial, but think it will be discussed further

- Latin American Studies – Disagreement with No. 5 Seek out support from IMC for promotional outreach materials
  - Other options? Hasn’t been IMC’s emphasis, web site focuses on recruiting now

- Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies – Disagreement with Nos. 1 Add another probationary faculty line in the WGSS program, 11 Hire 3 additional FTEs in the program, and 13 Separate the practicum/internship experience from the capstone experience
  - No 1 and 11 – Two hires in process
  - No 13 – The program has adopted Hmong Studies, department needs to get new hires in place first and then WGSS will re-evaluate entire curriculum, minors don’t want same experience as majors, students want to do more research as well

- Miscellaneous – CSD would like to recruit students of color but don’t feel they have the knowledge or cultural awareness to do it well. Is there a way to get departments together to provide support? For example, CSD majors may have interest in an LAS or WGSS minor
  - Go to communities to pitch the program, bring current student majors with, Rose-Marie has approached Admissions in the past and they prefer information is given to them to then do the recruiting.
  - Is also a workload issue, further discussions can take place within APC
  - Would be helpful to change web site images to include students of color, reinforce the direction we’re wanting to go

Chair Marquell Johnson adjourned the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Forcier
Secretary for the Meeting