

Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee

1. Continue with regular annual reports to the Faculty Senate on
 - 1.1. Curricular proposals
 - 1.2. Foundational Studies
2. Work with the Provost's Office and the Colleges to explore alternative means to graduation for students who are within a year of graduation but (for whatever reason) find the conventional route impossible.
 - 2.1. Ensure that such programs do no harm to existing programs.
 - 2.2. Ensure that such programs have appropriate integrity.
3. Work with Colleges and the Foundational Studies Council to ensure that programmatic assessment is continuing at an appropriate pace to allow the University Assessment Council to write the required accreditation report on program assessment for to the Higher Learning Commission to the North Central Association.
4. Respond to last year's joint charge to CAAC and GC to establish processes and procedures for regular program review.

Charge to CAAC and Graduate Council;

The Executive Committee recommends to CAAC and GC that procedures be established to enable those bodies to review the success of newly-created programs. The Executive Committee also proposes that the CAAC body and the GC body make recommendations to the Senate via the Executive Committee, as to the future of those newly created-programs on the basis of its conclusions of these reviews. It may very well be that the manuals and procedures will have to be changed in order to accomplish these goals. The Executive Committee finds these needs to be imperative.

The following is our suggested charge to CAAC and GC: (which they may certainly modify):

All proposed programs that are applying for approval through the Faculty Senate will have specific review dates assigned at approximately three and six years in the future, established from the time at which the final approval of the program is given.

At these dates, the program will be required to demonstrate to the University CAAC or GC body, the viability of the created program. That report will include:

- 1) *The number of majors and minors currently enrolled in the program;*
- 2) *The average number of courses offered during the academic year supporting the program. In the case where a specific course is required for more than one major, fractional weights (based on percent enrollment) will have to be assigned and justified;*
- 3) *The average number of FTE faculty assigned to this program per semester, as well as the average SCH's generated per semester associated with this program;*
- 4) *Other resources which have been acquired to support the program, including FTE faculty;*
- 5) *The value of the program to the identity of the College;*
- 6) *The opportunities for graduates of the program, and the expected salary level of first- year graduates. The sixth year report should have actual, rather than projected, results.*

After reviewing the report and speaking with the champion(s) of each program, the CAAC or GC council will submit an evaluation of its findings to the Executive Committee, as to the program's viability.

Hopefully, the above will provide guidance when GC and CAAC construct their report delineating this additional duty, by Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate. It would probably be helpful for those bodies to review the guidelines constructed by the Program Review Process in its deliberations a few years ago. Our collective advice is, however, "keep it simple."

5. Read, comment, and make recommendations as appropriate with regard to the Distance Education Taskforce Report.
6. Establish criteria and a process by which an academic unit can be judged to be “not conventionally governable” understanding that this could be used to allow the administration to appoint leadership for that unit from personnel outside that unit.
7. Establish guidance for departments so they can review all courses in their inventory and eliminate courses no longer used as well as those on the backed inventory.
8. Consider revising protocol and documentation required for NEW programs to include submitting the Commission report with the proposal to be considered.
9. Review the enrollment of all programs established since Fall 2009 and compare the enrollment results with those anticipated at the time of their approval. (See charge number 4)