Minutes of the Academic Planning Council Meeting
October 25, 2006

Members present: Laura Anderson, Carol Sue Butts, Christina Curras, Tim Deis, Osama Jadaan, Brian Peckham, Donna Perkins, Jennifer Snoek-Brown, Jason Thrun, Amanda Trewin, Sheryl Wills, Phil Young

Guests present: Abulkhair Masoom, Sue Price, Doyle St. John

I. Chair Wills called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. A motion to approve the minutes of the October 11, 2006 meeting was moved by Anderson and seconded by Trewin; motion passed.

III. Announcements:
A. The updated Project Management Self-Study is on the S: drive; corrections have been made to the assessment information.
B. The letter from Dean Mittie Nimocks in support of the Fine Arts program has been received and is also on the S: drive. (See V. c. in October 11, 2006 minutes)
C. No reviews are scheduled for the November 8 meeting; we will discuss requests from Criminal Justice and Agriculture, and summaries from today’s program reviews.

IV. HLC Report: Tom Nelson is not present; no report.

V. Old Business:
A. APC Summary for Project Management
   1. Perkins questioned whether a sentence should be added on PMI accreditation as discussed on October 11. Its omission was an oversight; Wills will add one.
   2. Peckham moved to accept the summary with the change, Thrun seconded; motion passed.
B. Criminal Justice proposals for a new minor and three new emphases need to be discussed at UUCC before coming to APC. These will be discussed in our November 8 meeting.

VI. New Business: (changed order of the agenda)
A. Review of General Engineering: Abulkhair Masoom presented the GE self-study, reviewing the department’s mission as non-degree granting, relation with other academic programs in the UW System, educational goals and objectives, assessment, faculty, students, activities for students outside of coursework, enrollment, needs of the department, facilities, budget, resources, strengths, problems, and future plans.
Strengths
• Faculty and staff are excellent instructors with a deep commitment to students, and have an impressive record of professional development and service.

Weaknesses
• Dependence on support from degree granting departments in the college to teach courses that cannot be covered by existing GE faculty.
• Lack of time for scholarly and professional development activities, particularly research.

Future
• The department is pursuing the possibility of the development of new interdisciplinary and inter-institutional programs in areas of cutting edge technology.

B. Proposal for new emphasis in Agriculture: Sue Price presented a proposal for a new international emphasis in agriculture, summarizing the required and elective courses, justification, goals, objectives, and learning outcomes. This is the first reading of this proposal; second reading will be on November 8.


Strengths
• The breadth of the curriculum and its emphasis on fundamental principles.
• The flexibility of the curriculum to accommodate students with a range of interest.
• Dedicated faculty.

Weaknesses
• Need courses that reflect the strengths of the EP faculty rather than the strengths of the EMS College departments.
• Need improved facilities.

Future
• Will be moving into the new engineering building in Spring 2009.

D. Discussions and Recommendations by APC
1. General Engineering:
• The faculty is at the forefront and serves as the entry point for all engineering students.
• Their professional development is diversified and at a level comparable to the degree granting departments in engineering (who get release time for this whereas GE faculty do not).
• There are no funds coming back from alumni for support of professional development because there are no alumni in GE (it is not degree granting).
• GE is currently “borrowing” faculty from other engineering programs to cover the number of sections of courses needed. In addition, class sizes are quite large.
• An additional faculty position has been approved, so this will alleviate some of the “borrowing” of faculty resources, but it will not necessarily alleviate the large class sizes.
• **Recommendation**: As outlined in the UW System Academic Planning and Program Review Document, Anderson moved to recommend that the program be continued and be augmented with additional resources, with a) EMS being encouraged to investigate the possibility of “taxing” the funds donated by alumni to degree-granting programs and give that money to GE, and b) class sizes being monitored and not allowed to get any larger than 40 for introductory courses and 30 for more advanced course. Motion seconded by Peckham; motion carried.

2. Engineering Physics:
• The assessment plan and process are excellent.
• Facilities will improve when the program moves into the new building.
• **Recommendation**: As outlined in the UW System Academic Planning and Program Review Document, Curras moved to recommend that the program be continued in its present form and at its current resource level. Motion seconded by Anderson; motion carried.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Donna Perkins