WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COUNCIL
Tuesday, 9 October 2012, 3 p.m.
Brown and Gold Room, Bernhard Center

Members present: K. Ackerson, A. Anderson, N. Andreadis, R. Aravamuthan, K. Baldner, M. Kritzman, D. Reinhold, D. Sachs, V. Torano, D. Walcott, G. Whitehurst

Absent without substitution: K. Hillenbrand, A. Salvaggio, C. Thralls

Guest: Marilyn Duke, Director, Academic Resource Center

Also present: Janice Anderson, Faculty Senate; Jeanine Bartholomew, academic advising liaison; Betty Dennis, Associate Dean, Extended University Programs

Procedural Items

Council Chair Ariel Anderson called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

Acceptance of Agenda

Aravamuthan moved acceptance of the agenda, as amended, seconded by Andreadis. Motion carried.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of 11 September 2012 were approved without objection.

Chair's Remarks

Chair Anderson advised the council that the Committee to Oversee General Education (COGE) will provide the information we requested at our last meeting, and we should have this by our November meeting. She also noted that the Senate Executive Board has approved our June 2012 recommendations regarding the role of the Lee Honors College with respect to General Education and COGE and syllabi.

Action/Discussion Items

Intellectual Skills Advisory Committee – Marilyn Duke

Marilyn Duke spoke to the council about reconstituting the Intellectual Skills Program Advisory Committee (ISPAC). ISPAC is (or was) a standing committee of the Undergraduate Studies Council. This committee was established to oversee the Intellectual Skills requirements adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1983. This committee has been inactive for a number of years, and Duke is

seeking to reconstitute the committee. Andreadis moved, seconded by Kritzman, reconstitution of this committee and a re-evaluation of their charges by this council. Motion carried. The council asked Duke to examine the old charges and report back to the council with recommendations for how it should be revised. Council members were urged to communicate directly with Duke with any suggestions they might have on revising these charges. The council will formally re-constitute the committee after it reviews and approves the new charges.

Recommendations from COGE to USC (Proposed Changes to the General Education Policy)

David Reinhold reviewed proposed changes to Area VI, Natural Sciences with Laboratory and Area VIII, Health and Well-Being of the General Education Policy. COGE recommends changes to Area VI to allow for the possibility of on-line labs. The current language was written before this was possible. In Area VIII, COGE recommends changes that would indicate that courses in this area *should* rather than "must" include material discussing HIVAIDS. Language was also added to include study of "global" (as well as national) health priorities. Torano, seconded by Whitehurst, moved acceptance of these proposed changes. Motion carried.

November 1 Senate Forum on General Education and Assessment – David Reinhold

The Senate Executive Board is recommending having several faculty forums to get faculty input regarding questions concerning the assessment of our General Education Policy. One concern is that we currently have no mechanism to assess the effectiveness of our general education program. We will need to provide evidence of this kind of assessment for our next Higher Education accreditation. Reinhold will be organizing forums to get faculty input regarding these and other issues.

Academic Program Review and Planning Procedure

Council members received a final draft of the Academic Program Review and Planning Procedure. The Provost's Office is looking for recommendations from this council regarding possible changes to this document. Anderson asked council members to review the draft prior to our next meeting, when we will discuss any recommendations we might want to make. *A copy of this draft is appended to these minutes. Comments from any interested faculty member are welcome, either to members of this council, or directly to the Faculty Senate Office.*

Other

A discussion was held of the revised charges to this council from the Executive Board. Delores Walcott, our representative from the Senate Executive Board, reviewed the Board's revisions to these charges. The council discussed several minor revisions to these charges, and came to understanding with Walcott about how we might proceed with these charges.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kent Baldner

-FINAL DRAFT-

Academic Program Review and Planning Procedure
rev. 9/28/2012

The University Strategic Plan (USP) describes the institution as "learner centered." In order to accomplish this, the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan (AASP) states that we will offer distinctive programs at both the undergraduate and graduate level "that will prepare students to be successful in their lives and careers." We must continually review programs and plan for the future in order to maintain program relevancy for both students and the community. The following describes the process developed at Western Michigan University to achieve this goal.

Academic Program Review and Planning (APRP) is an opportunity to demonstrate responsibility for the quality of our educational programs. APRP also examines program alignment to Academic Affairs' strategy and resources. To that end, Academic Affairs will maintain a practice of regular program review and planning. This document is intended to accompany the graphic chart describing the time line for the process and provide detail as to the procedures, criteria, and outcomes associated with APRP.

To respect the context of multiple programs housed within one school or department, all programs within an academic unit will be reviewed during the same academic year. All programs, including interdisciplinary programs, will be subject to at least a 7-year review cycle.*

When appropriate, units will be given the option to coordinate the timing of program review with its corresponding re-accreditation schedule. If a unit has two accreditation visits within the 7-year cycle, it may elect one to coincide with the program review. If the unit does not have an accreditation visit within the cycle, review will be scheduled within the 7-year cycle.

The APRP process incorporates two phases: review and planning. Please note: The previous Academic Program Planning cycle will be revised into "Phase 2" of the APRP process.

Phase One: Program Review

Every program within an academic unit will be included in an inclusive review process. Graduate concentrations and undergraduate majors, minors, and certificates will be grouped as a cohort and reviewed in the same year. Review cycle will be determined by the deans and coordinated with program accreditation reviews when possible.

Step (1) The department, as a cohort set of programs, will prepare a self-study report containing the APRP criteria. The report will provide evidence that will serve as the basis for one of the following observations:

- The preponderance of evidence suggests that the program meets or exceeds criteria in categories (A), (B), and (C).
- The preponderance of evidence suggests that the program falls short in at least one category of the criteria, but shows potential.
- The preponderance of evidence suggests that the program falls short on at least one category of the criteria, and there is little likelihood of improvement.

Step (2) The self-study report will be sent to an external reviewer. Units will submit names of at least three individuals at peer departments at other institutions, and the dean will select the reviewer. Peer departments are those with similar size, programs, and mission. The reviewer will outline their observations in a narrative format, which will serve as the basis for one of the three observations listed in Step (1). Detailed instructions will be given regarding the review and report format. The external review findings will be added to the self-study and maintained as part of the report for the remainder of the review process.

Step (3) The self-study document (including external review findings) will be sent to an Academic Affairs Program Review and Planning (AAPRP) committee. The AAPRP Committee will be comprised of faculty appointed by the Faculty Senate from nominees provided by the deans who will serve in accordance with Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws. The AAPRP Committee will be charged with evaluating each program cohort for each of the criteria: strategic alignment, quality and distinctiveness, and resource management. The AAPRP Committee will outline their review in a narrative format, which will serve as the basis for one of the observations listed in Step (1).

Step (4) The AAPRP committee will provide a report of the noted observations to the respective dean of the academic cohort. Graduate programs will also submit a report to the Graduate College dean for review. The dean(s) will review the cohort self-study, external reviewer observations, and AAPRP

Committee report and observation, then send a recommendation to the Provost. Programs offered entirely through Extended University Programs (EUP) should also send reports to the associate provost of Extended University Programs for review, and for the opportunity to provide feedback to the Provost.

Step (5) The provost will consider the cohort self-study, external reviewer observations, AAPRP Committee report and observation, and the recommendation of the dean(s), then make a preliminary decision about each program within the unit. Upon request from the unit, dean, or provost, a meeting between the provost, dean, chair, and faulty of the unit will be convened to discuss any additional information that may be relevant regarding the decision. The provost will then make a final decision following this meeting. The recommendation will indicate the unit is a:
1) strong program encouraged to maintain excellence;
2) program showing potential, continue and enhance the program with the available resources; or
3) program needing improvement, but showing little likelihood of doing so, suspend enrollment, merge, or eliminate the program.

Phase 2: Subsequent program planning

Step (6) Following the results of the provost's decision, the faculty and chairs will incorporate the findings into annual strategic planning and assessment documents, or a separate program modification plan as warranted.
  A. Programs that have been recommended for continuation should address ways in which the program will enhance current quality or demonstrate increasing program distinctiveness through annual strategic planning and assessment reports.
  B. Programs that fall short of meeting the criteria, but show potential, are required to address the needed improvement(s) and challenges raised by the review as priorities in annual strategic plans and assessment reports. A summary of improvement strategies and outcomes will be examined during a 3rd year focused review by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
  C. Programs slated for modification (suspension, merger, or elimination) require a Program Modification planning report including course of action to pursue the necessary change. The modification plan will be given to the appropriate dean who will accept the plan or ask for revisions. In the years between formal program review, program modification plan updates will be reviewed on an annual basis, in addition to ongoing strategic planning and assessment *Programs identified for closure will need to report a teach-out plan to*

the OAA. A planning report will also need to be submitted to the OAA if the unit intends to maintain the resources that will be saved by the closure. In this case, they must write a plan that explains how the savings will be used.

Step (7) Dean of academic unit will review the planning document and send recommendation to the Provost.

Step (8) The provost accepts the plan or requests additional planning consideration.

Academic Program Review and Planning Criteria

Programs will address APRP criteria that are organized into three categories. The criteria are mission-based and connected to the indicators of the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan:

A. Strategic alignment: The report should describe how current programs align with the strategic plans of the University, Academic Affairs, college, and unit. The report should include mapping of relative strategic plans and unit level indicators only.

B. Quality and distinctiveness: The report should give evidence that the unit is delivering **exemplary** programs that lead to student success based on a model of continuous improvement. The report should also provide evidence that the unit provides a distinctive value to the University and/or college. The report should include two sections:

1)   Student Success and Continuous Improvement (Institutional Research or Office of Research will supply data sets unless otherwise noted.*)
  a) Student faculty profile and indicators of academic success
   - Five-year data on faculty gender and race, including graduate assistants and part-time instructors, with rank, tenure status;
   - Five-year data on enrollment per program, including data on the number of international and minority students;
   - Five-year data on student applications, including GPA's and admission test scores;
   - Undergraduate second-year retention rates;
   - Undergraduate four-year and six-year graduation rates;
   - Graduate six-year and eight-year graduation rates;
   - Data on time-to-degree for five spring award years; and

- Ten-year data on degrees awarded for each program within the unit.
    - b) Summary of improvements or changes since last Academic Program Review.
    - c) Summary of findings of most recent accreditation reports and/or annual reports of Student Learning Outcomes.
    - d) Summary and documentation of Annual Assessment Reports.

2) Distinctiveness and Value-Added
    - a) Prioritization of 2-3 significant value-added contributions to the University, community or academic field of study.

C. Resource management: Units are to respond to the data in narrative form providing further understanding that the unit efficiently uses its resources. Institutional Research will supply data sets for each unit containing the data below, which will also be viewed by the external reviewer, dean, and provost. Indicators to be examined include (Institutional Research or Office of Research will supply data sets unless otherwise noted*):
1. Cost of program,
    - a) Five-year data on faculty teaching loads, faculty credit hour production and class sizes,
    - b) Ratio of graduates per year to faculty,
    - c) Ratio of students per year to faculty,
    - d) Graduates per program per year,
    - e) Five-year data on annual general fund budget, and
    - f) Five-year data on the number of nonacademic employees;
2. Capacity for growth and cost benefit of growth ;
3. External funding for the program(s) from the Office of the Vice President for Research and the Office of Development and Alumni Relations; and
4. EUP annual maintenance data, where appropriate.