

Academic Planning Council Minutes

A regular meeting of the Academic Planning Council was held on March 27, 2009, Strosacker Room, Park Library. A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

Present: C. Riordan (Chair), R. Coles, P. Gates (for HSBS), T. Hartshorne, K. Koch, T. Masterson, J. Matty (for CST), L. Orf, P. Ross, D. Stairs (for CCFA), S. Stan, W. Zhou // **Absent:** R. Christie, R. Francis, D. Green, M. Fields, T. Moore, B. Roscoe, R. Stecker, P. Williamson, D. Wisner, J. Wallace, // **Guests:** Lisa Boyd-Devers

New Business

I. Approval of Minutes: Orf motioned to approve minutes of February 27, 2009. Carried.

II. Discussion Items:

- A. **Review of programs on ‘hiatus’ and procedures for hiatus.** The new process for putting undergraduate and graduate programs on hiatus has been used successfully for one year. The programs on hiatus will get a reminder each fall and when the two years are over they will have to delete or revamp and re-launch. No additional requests/advice from the group was offered.
- B. **Discussion of revised proposal for the online course and program approval process.** The process for developing online courses as adopted in 2008 has been revised and can be accessed at: <http://academicaffairs.cmich.edu/APC/PDF/BuildingPortfolioQualityOnlineProgramsMar2009.pdf>. The Academic Planning Council will no longer be asked to help prioritize programs for the development process. In reality, progress has been so slow, that no prioritization has been necessary. However, to assure the alignment of expectations and resources, before a course or program is offered online, the department, dean and ProfEd must approve the movement of the course or program to an online format and agree on specific timelines. There must be sign-off by all three units.
- C. **Review of the enrollments of programs approved by APC in past 8 years.** Annual enrollments projected in the new program proposals are usually much greater than actual annual new student enrollment. This calls into question the university’s ability to conduct sound market analysis. We need to do a better job at having accurate enrollment figures and cost data.
- Very few new programs are being developed – is the innovation not there or is there a lack of support (time, money, department on board)? Claims were made that departments are taking current courses and repackaging them to attract more students.
- D. **Review of programs that are coming out of other MI state universities.** Riordan encouraged members to check out the link in the agenda that shows the new programs that have been created at other MI universities. A case study to see how another institution implemented those programs and what kind of leadership/resources were available would be very helpful.
- E. **Consideration of CMU’s Vision.**

Riordan engaged the Council in an evaluation of CMU’s current vision statement as part of the work of the Ad Hoc Task Force on the Vision. The following questions are prescribed and representative comments summarized.

What is in the vision statement? Members identified the following items in the vision statement: national prominence, excellence in teaching, research, service, integrity and diversity. Members thought they could identify the items through multiple choice, but probably not through an essay.

When was it adopted? 4-5 years ago.

Who adopted it? Board, Senate.

Have we moved toward this vision in the past 3 years? Several members thought we had, but also noted that it is hard to judge from the inside.

Has this vision statement impacted things that we do? The group thought the national prominence phrase has had an impact – it sets a template for the kinds of things we want to do. Every academic university has these priorities (except for maybe integrity) – it’s not unique.

Has CMU become more nationally prominent? Members thought CMU has become more nationally prominent in the past 10 years. Not every program is going to be nationally prominent nor should/can it be. What does nationally prominent mean?

Is the vision statement serving us well enough right now or should we be considering revising it? Members didn't have a strong feeling toward public service, perhaps just take the service things that we are currently doing and not do anything new. The group thought revisiting the meaning of national prominence would be helpful. It is currently worded that CMU "will be" nationally prominent, so if we keep it, we still "will be" nationally prominent in 5 years. US World News and Report could be used as a rough measure of national prominence (purely perception). Members were comfortable keeping the current vision statement.

Other Comments. Members agreed that the vision statement is very generic and would fit any university. For the most part, our KPIs support the belief that CMU 2010 funds have stimulated growth and have helped produce nationally prominent programs. Investing money in centers that will help students succeed can ultimately bring money to the university – students stay here.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.