



APASP Task Force Meeting

Monday, February 26, 2018 | 1-3 p.m. | UC 225

MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order
2. Discussion of proposal for secondary charge to the APASP Task Force (incorporation of prioritization in other campus planning and review processes)

Provost Edmond asked whether the group that drafted the document thought about putting some guidelines for viability standards for academic programs into the plan. For example, knowing that the MUS uses performance based funding, for example, programs should be evaluated based on certain standards so that programs at or beneath the standards are reviewed so they can develop action plans before it's too late. Performance funding is real, and we should be 10 steps ahead of the resource allocation process.

UM has never been able to agree on what these standards might be.

UM needs to agree on some standards and enable programs to develop concrete action plans so as to become more proactive. There are best practices in the field that could help UM develop their own practices.

Provost Edmond described how other university systems (Alabama) ask institutions to develop program viability response reports.

Clarification: APASP TF should recommend that standards/benchmarks be found for program viability (not for TF to develop the standards/benchmarks).

Two concrete ways to achieve this: UM's program review process and UM's presentation to the BOR in November 2018 on prioritization.

Benchmarks/information gathered during prioritization are one thing – the other is what we do with the information gathered/ what action steps we take following prioritization.

Will this document be useful to the UPC? Yes

Add “set parameters on implementation of prioritization” to proposal

Add “distinguish role/roles of reviewers from role/roles of implementers”

Discussion of UM’s program review process. What is it for? Does any action come out of the program review recommendations? At UM, assessment of student learning outcomes is conducted separately from program reviews. Would there be a way to integrate assessment and program reviews? The rubber meets the road when students leave UM with degrees. We need to more clearly show how UM benefits students.

Programs that have accreditation standards are required to integrate this information as they are comparing their programs with programs in the field.

Other items: what are students doing after graduation? What kinds of grad programs are they getting into, what kinds of jobs are they getting...

UM needs to showcase the fact that we have accredited programs. UM’s budget process should support program accreditation centrally, not leave payment of accreditation expenses to individual departments.

Sub-committee chairs ask for more input on the document, request edits by Monday of next week. Then bring to closure and deliver to UPC. Request input on admin services analysis...

3. Review of meeting procedure
4. Approval of February 5, 2018 and February 12, 2018 meeting minutes
5. Continued review of Discussion Agenda from February 5, 2018 prioritization meeting, including items moved from Consent Agenda to Discussion Agenda, and Votes – APASP Task Force

No	UnitOfAnalysis
65	65 Enroll&SA Auxiliary Administration
107	107 Provost Natl Native Childrens Trauma Ctr
156	156 Provost UM OnLine
42	42 A&F Adams Center
149	149 Provost Legacy Seasonal Programs

6. Public Comment (10 minutes)
7. Next steps on Phase 2 prioritization

Same as before. Get input from sector heads on all programs in category 3. Gather together to develop recommendations.

8. Adjourn Upon Completion of Business