Academic Planning Council Minutes
Meeting of December 2, 1999

Present
Stephanie Branson, Ken Buttry (Chair), Carol Sue Butts, Tamer Ceylan, Marie Erdman, Roger Fidrych, Mittie Nimocks, Barbara Parsons, Marc Shelstrom, Ray Spoto, Kathleen Tigertnan

Visitors
Caroline Bloede, David Van Buren, Michael Penn, Lisa Riedle

The meeting came to order at 4:02 p.m.

Parsons moved and Nimocks seconded to approve the minutes from the 11/11/1999 meeting. The minutes were approved without dissent.

Audit/Review Schedule, Spring 2000:
February 17 Civil Engineering, Environmental Engineering, General Engineering
March 2 Electrical Engineering, Industrial Engineering, Foreign Languages
March 23 Library, Mechanical Engineering
April 6 Biology, Engineering Physics

Master of Engineering Proposal, Second Reading: Riedle discussed several changes in the proposal since the first reading and answered questions from Branson (money for computers), Parsons (Sections 5.3 and 4.8), and Spoto (copyright issues). UWP is working with Learning Innovations. University ownership and possible options for the faculty were discussed to clarify various issues. Fidrych stated that, as far as he knows, he is not aware of any UBC concerns. Penn indicated that UBC passed the proposal in its last meeting. Parsons moved and Spoto seconded to accept and forward the document to the Faculty Senate. Motion carried without dissent.

For information, Buttry mentioned the latest revision of the guidelines for "Chancellor's Plan".
This was approved in a previous APC meeting.

Spoto's memo dated 1/8/1999 was discussed. Spoto discussed a number of cost parameters used during the UWP reorganization in 1993-94 to better assess program costs and expressed a desire for such additional data. Butts indicated that the official source for such data would be John Adams and Steve Zielke. Buttry will contact them to see what could be made available to us.

Butts distributed a draft handout for discussion. She referred to the UWP reorganization and indicated that the question of "Are all the programs where they should be?" arises from time to time. Butts emphasized that the questions she has are for discussion and to understand the situation better. After a review, we might determine that everything is fine the way it is or a
better arrangement might emerge. The first page of the draft lists some programs. As of Fall 1998, Communication Technology Management has 175 majors and seven emphasis areas, some of them lowly subscribed. Are all the emphasis areas still needed? Computer Science, which is in the same department, has experienced tremendous growth. It has 143 majors as of Fall 1998. Should it be a separate department? Graphic Communication is one of the emphasis areas in Communication Technology Management. Graphic Design is an emphasis area in Art. What is the difference? Do we need both? If they are really different, should we consider changing the names? Can they work together more closely? According to her numbers, Speech had 60 majors in 1992 (before the reorganization) and has 5 majors as of Fall 1998. Nimocks explained that, before the UWP reorganization, Speech included other emphasis areas that are elsewhere now. There was brief discussion on the Speech program and how it needs to be included in APC's 5-year audit/review schedule. The second page includes questions grouped in seven categories and numerical data that would be useful. Butts asked if APC can think of additional questions. She asked about the best way to proceed. APC was not sure about the names of the seven emphasis areas in Communication Technology Management. The APC members will review the draft provided by Butts, do some preliminary work, and deal with this issue in its January 2000 meeting. In the meantime, APC will receive statistical information from John Adams. Butts plans to eventually give the questions to the deans/chairs and ask for their responses. She indicated that APC might want to interview the appropriate people in Spring 2000.

Recently Spoto sent a memo with a questionnaire on distance education. Spoto provided information about his memo and the questionnaire. The questionnaire is for those who have taught a distance education class, web-based or not. Butts asked Spoto to send a copy of the questionnaire to Dawn Drake. Spoto moved and Parsons seconded to forward the questionnaire to the appropriate persons, receive their responses, and send the responses to the association in Washington. Motion carried without dissent. APC will be given a list appropriate people for the questionnaire. Butts indicated that Drake could come and answer questions concerning distance education at UWP.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m..

Respectfully submitted,

Tamer Ceylan