Academic Information Technology Commission Meeting
Thursday, December 12, 2013, 4:00 p.m. Gardner Hall Room 156

Agenda

I. Call to Order
II. Approval of Minutes of October 24, 2013
III. Approval of Minutes of November 14, 2013
IV. Announcements

V. Committee Reports
   1. OIT (S. Traxler)
   2. MTS (C. Garrity)
   3. ICET (R. Nelson)

VI. New Business (K. Wright)

VII. Unfinished Business (K. Wright)
   1. Status update on IT Prioritization process
   2. AITC Roles and Responsibilities
      a. Goal is to get revision completed next semester
   3. APC Review
      a. Meeting with APC to address our questions (see attached) Wednesday December 18, at 2:00 (room TBA)
      b. Draft overall comments summarized by Jeff at the 11/14 meeting

VIII. Next Meeting Date Thursday, January 24, 2013

IX. Adjournment
QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO APC regarding program review

1) Is APC going to look at the Form Bs from the individual programs or is APC just intending to look at the summary Evaluation Forms provided by each review commission?

2) Assuming APC is only going to consider the Evaluation Forms, and therefore assuming that the critical piece of information is whether or not each program "meets expectations in regard to their level of resources", is there any reason AITC couldn't just request the programs to fill out their own Evaluation Form with respect to Information Technology? (perhaps with some modifications) In a sense, is there something "more" that should be occurring at the intermediate (i.e. commission) step? (This plays into the next set of questions)

3) What if the AITC report to APC was less a packet of individual program reviews, and more of a collective evaluation of the Information Technology from all the programs within any given year? So for example, AITC would identify and articulate those issues shared by all/most programs under review. These are the "big picture" issues, the shared concerns, the problems affecting the most students and/or programs. Then we would also point out the other issues that may be affecting just 1-3 programs. In a sense giving APC a more inclusive tool to evaluate resources at many scales. Individual programs would still submit a self-evaluation.

4) Does the APC wish for the program reviews to also include evaluations/assessments of either the barriers or potential solutions identified by the programs? That is, if a program identifies a barrier to meeting their expectations, should the AITC consider the validity of this barrier or leave it to the discretion of the program?

5) Does APC wish for the review commissions (i.e. AITC) to pose our own "solutions" or "options" to address the barriers/problems indicated by the program(s)? Or is the objective mostly information gathering, such that solutions will be explored and offered at a future time by the programs and other entities?

6) Lastly, may the review commissions request all the individuals within a program to respond to a survey, or if this is solely limited to the program heads?