

Institutional Program Review Steering Committee Meeting February 27, 2017

	Members		Members	Guest
P	Stephen Bentivenga	A	Susan Jaeke	Marci Hoffman for Sue
P	Chad Cotti	P	Jaime Page-Stadler	
A	Donald Hones	P	Jenny Borgmann	
P	Karl Loewenstein	P	Pat Juckem	
P	Christine Roth	P	Anne Milkovich	
P	Judith Westphal	P	Merlaine Angwall	
P	Courtney Bauder		(Student)	

P=Present; A=Absent

Agenda

1. Review notes from previous meeting
2. Report on homework - does definition of "program" effect the outcomes (academic/administrative)?
 - i. Great Falls MSU - Anne
 - ii. Montana State University - Chad
 - iii. University of Alabama Birmingham - Courtney
 - iv. Northern Illinois - Karl
 - v. Appalachian State - Jenny
 - vi. University of Alaska Anchorage - Jaime
 - vii. Western Carolina University - Sue
 - viii. Lewis and Clark State College - Merlaine
 - ix. Indiana State - Pat
 - x. Snow College - Judith
 - xi. University of Nebraska - Stephen
- b. Best feature of process on campus you reviewed
- c. Worst feature of process
- d. Most important take-away
 - i. Great Falls MSU - list of programs and timeline
 - ii. Montana State University - Good job of creating balance
 - iii. University of Alabama Birmingham - Process is needed but the goals need to be communicated throughout the process
 - iv. Northern Illinois - Diversity measure

- v. Appalachian State -
 - vi. University of Alaska Anchorage - Very transparent with all information/templates, etc.
 - vii. Western Carolina University - transparent with charge and representatives on website - easy to understand and easy to follow
 - viii. Lewis and Clark State College - Website stated clearly the good and bad points of the process
 - ix. Indiana State - 214 programs down to 150 - reallocate resources to invest in their top programs
 - x. Snow College - quintiles - only top and bottom mentioned - top given funding and bottom was reduced or even eliminated
 - xi. University of Nebraska - Deb Smith-Howell - worked well in STEM education with multi college units - Global Engagement did not work well because of individual pieces - encourage collaboration across college units if doing again - frame as a positive for the common good; not a zero sum game (no winners and losers) - don't duplicate what the colleges are doing; align with them
- e. Continuous and not a one time process
 - i. Ability to do this once a year to be able to continually evaluate - process that is continual
 - 1. Annually probably not going to be informative; look at a longer time frame such as 5 years
 - 2. Manage programs like a portfolio
 - f. Decide the definition of what a program is
 - g. Strategic Plan - Diversity and Sustainability
3. Name our Process
- a. University Resource Assessment and Planning
 - i. Run past Chancellor and Provost along with the list
4. Next Steps
- a. Timeline -- report on my discussion with Chancellor
 - b. Campus forum(s)?
 - c. Criteria development
 - d. Building Academic and Administrative sub-teams?
 - e. Announcements to campus/website
5. Next Meeting: March 13, 2017
- a. Look at the criteria that the Universities and Colleges had used to assess their programs
 - b. Add information obtained from research to the resources folder or send to Jenny to organize