

## Chair's Report on the Academic Planning and Review Committee

2009-2010

Sue Scheibler (SFTV), Chair

Members: Rebecca Crawford (spring) (Seaver), James Devine (BCLA), Philip Dorin (Seaver), Elizabeth Drummond (spring) (BCLA), David Mathison (CBA), Cathleen McGrath (CBA), Bo Oppenheim (fall) (Seaver), Kyra Pearson (CFA), Jonathan Rothchild (fall) (BCLA), and Ana Serrano (SOE)

*Ex officio members:* Margaret Kasimatis, V.P. for Academic Planning and Effectiveness; Tobeylynn Birch, Library

Administrative Assistant: Jose Rimon

Over the course of the year, the committee accomplished the following:

- Initiated the next round of program reviews with the following programs: African American Studies, Chemistry/Biochemistry, Classics/Archaeology, English, and Theological Studies
  - Subcommittees were formed and worked closely with the departments, providing encouragement, advice, and feedback on each component of the process
- Guided the Communication Studies, Mathematics and Political Science programs through the final stages of their program reviews
- Completed the APRC review of the Mathematics and Political Science program reviews
- Reviewed and acted on the following new or modified program proposals:
  - Film and TV Studies Minor
  - CBA revised Minor
  - Political Science Pilot Program
- Revised the program review guidelines in light of what we've learned this year in debriefing the Math and Poly Sci faculty as well as from feedback from faculty beginning the next round of program reviews
- Worked with the office of Institutional Research to develop a set of standard data for each program review

In addition, the chair has accomplished the following:

- With Margaret Kasimatis:
  - Organized and conducted orientations with each program beginning the review process
  - Worked closely with the chairs and point persons for each review as well as with each APRC subcommittee assigned to programs undergoing review
  - Met with the external evaluators for the Math and Communication Studies program review

- Worked closely with IR and the Assessment Office to align the efforts of the programs with these offices
  - Drafted a template for the Memorandum of Understanding to be used by the CAO and Deans
  - Scheduled an orientation for all programs starting the review process next fall
- As chair:
  - Worked with the administrative assistant to set up an APRC website on mylmu, complete with resources for faculty, chairs, and Deans involved in program reviews and considering new programs
  - Established an APRC site on mylmuconnect to provide the committee with easier access to all documents and to provide a space within which the committee can work on reports, communicate with one another regarding proposals and program reviews, and, in essence, use our time more efficiently and productively
  - Oversaw the completion of the APRC Lionshare files; all APRC files are now posted electronically in Lionshare files, accessible to the Chair and to the VP for Academic Planning and Effectiveness
  - Saw the transition to a paperless process; all program reviews and new program proposals will be submitted electronically, and filed on the APRC mylmuconnect page as well as in Lionshare
  - Provided the Associate Deans and Deans with all the APRC documents and informed them of the Web site
  - Contacted Deans, Associate Deans, and Chairs in preparation for the next group of program reviews (History, Physics, Production, Psychology, Sociology), including announcement regarding the August 24, 2010 orientation
  - Met with the History Department faculty and the Production Department faculty to introduce them to the program review process
  - Met with the faculty from the Dance department to provide guidance on a proposed new program
  - Met with the chairs in Engineering to discuss modification of the Engineering program
  - Met with the chairs and point people from Math and Poly Sci to get feedback as to our program review process

In summary, I have attempted to bring what I learned last year from my mistakes and successes to the committee and to the program review process. I believe that our program review guidelines and support material have been made much clearer, thanks to the feedback we received from faculty going through the process.

As I stated in my report last year and re-iterate here, If I have succeeded as chair, it's been due in great part to two things: the faculty serving on the committee, all of whom have put in long hours of dedicated work, and Margaret Kasimatis's patient guidance, both to me as chair and to the committee as a whole. Her experience, good humor, dedication, and willingness to devote huge amounts of time to the committee has been the bedrock for any of our accomplishments. She is a real asset to the committee and to the University.

In addition, Tobeylynn Birch, from the Library, has been an incredible asset. We added a librarian as an *ex officio* member as a means of guaranteeing that new program proposals adequately address library resources. Tobeylynn has proven to be much more than an *ex officio* member. She has willingly served on our APRC subcommittees, in spite of her other responsibilities to the Library and the University and has brought a depth and breadth of experience as well as thoughtful insight to all of our deliberations. I have come to depend on her suggestions as well as her patience, and regret that she will be leaving the committee next year. Through my work on this committee, the Senate, and the UCCC, I have become convinced that LMU is very well served by its librarians, many of whom I have had the pleasure of working with and all of whom I have found to be extremely dedicated, thoughtful, insightful, and good humored.

Sincerely,

Sue Scheibler