In attendance were: Laura Anderson (Faculty Senate), Mittie DenHerder (Provost), Mark Evenson (LAE), Lisa Landgraf (AITC), Mark Meyers (UUCC Rep) Regina Pauly (Karrmann), Lisa Riedle (EMS), Ray Spoto (LAE), Jessica Symons (Student Senate), Jason Thrun (At-large), and Tim Zauche (EMS). Guests were Dominic Barraclough, Cameron Corwin, Andrew Fox, and Ryan Strich.

1. Regina Pauly volunteered to take minutes today.
2. Tim Zauche moved to approve the minutes from last meeting and Jason Thrum seconded. Minutes were approved
   a). Minor change under item 7 UBC to UABC. Mittie’s name was corrected, and Mark Meyers from UUCC was missing on the list.
   b). Lisa clarified what a dashboard is (small sets of data) by showing us an example from page 20 of Alumni Today.
   c. Mittie DenHerder passed out a sheet of students enrolled in majors (10th day figures).
   Discuss followed on coding of majors, but this is what is sent to the UW-System.
3. Lisa Landgraf recommended there is no need for an APC representative on AITC since they send a representative to APC. It was felt that no motion was needed since we could not find this in the by-laws on the web page.
4. Old Business item. Tim Zauche went over the handout of the New Program Approval and Review Process. There is no systems’ rep, so the department chair would send on. Discussion ensued but it is assumed that items are for review and recommendations. People wanted Acronyms written out. Tim offered to make changes and we will review again again on October 24th.
5. Jason Thrun handed out his plan for APC review by colleges, not by departments. Each college could have four meetings and that would be 12 meetings a year. Discussion ensued. The roles of Assessment Oversight Committee and APC were discussed as well as what happens at the department level. Are four meetings enough? What about review of the library? Since APC turns over every three years can we ever get a long-term view? Is there a disadvantage to looking at colleges? What level of detail do we want? We still need to align our review/evaluation with strategic plan. Will anyone be evaluating the non-academic side? Can we become more efficient? Where do the Deans fit in? Can one understand and recommend a program in three pages? What criteria would we use? Where, who, and how should we recommend cuts?
Discussion ended at 5:25.
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