

No. 3- Eliminate BUAD 1000 course requirement in undergraduate business core. A PPR approved this recommendation.

No AcA comments.

No. 4-

No. 3 (C) Phase out via merging of the Anthropology and Sociology majors into a single interdisciplinary major APPR approved this recommendation.

retention of both disciplines, streamlined into one major. Program leader also raised that Sociology has not struggled with enrollments according to the program data; however, Anthropology has struggled. CAS proposed this to the Dean with the understanding that this is an ongoing process. Faculty would like to come to an agreement on a program that CAS can be proud of and that can be redesigned not only as a cost saving endeavor but as a successful, thriving program. Faculty have not committed 100% to making this happen, because the faculty would need to vote and approve a revised and yet to be developed curriculum first.

Program leadership would like to suggest a rewording of the last bullet point on the APPR

department in any way that they can in order to move this process forward in a timely and efficient manner.

It was reported by the program leadership that the department has an agreement with the CAS Dean that the curriculum would be developed in a calendar year and be ready for implementation in April 2022. The department is working to schedule a vote on a curricular plan with the department faculty. It was pointed out by AcA members that delaying the changes may reduce the potential cost savings.

Concerns were raised about the timeline of implementation. Further details on the future timeline and their feasibility were raised by AcA CAS members.

No. 4 (D) Phasing out via merging of the Visual Art and Art History Majors into a single Visual Arts and Culture major APPR approved this recommendation.

Some AcA CAS members expressed concerns about the timelines (similar to those in No. 3 (C)). It was noted that other AcA CAS members cautioned against unilaterally imposing uniform timelines, which could result in rushed and poor curricular redesigns.

No. 5 (E) Phase out of the Arabic Minor APPR did not approve this recommendation.

AcA members are pleased to see that non-western language education is being retained.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

No. 1 More efficient delivery of the curriculum in Teacher Education APPR approved this recommendation.

This programmatic change would involve lowering the number of sections and not relying on as many adjunct faculty members

Question was raised on what the proposal means. COE AcA members clarified that there are currently two cohorts that would be combined into one group so as to not have to teach as many sections. The program is hopeful that enrollment numbers will increase, but it is difficult to attract students during COVID and SU is in a hugely competitive market for this kind of education. Impact on the potential shift to the semester based instructional calendar was also cited.

No. 2 t Suspension of the Masters in Educating Native English Speakers APPR approved this recommendation.

No AcA comments.

No. 3 t ^ μ • % v •] } v } (š Z D • š CE [• P CE t APPR approved this proposal.

No AcA comments.

No. 4 t Move the Educational Administration Program from the Teaching Learning and Social Justice

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

No. 1 t Permanently reduce the direct cost of instruction in Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Mechanical Engineering by increasing maximum section size. APPR did not approve this recommendation on the grounds that this is not an APPR related action.

No AcA comments.

No. 2 t Elimination/Sunset of M.S. and Structural Engineering (MSST) t APPR approved this recommendation.

Question was raised on the main reason for sunsetting this program but not the Mechanical Engineering M.S.? Structural Engineering has had lower enrollment rates, historically. Recent changes had been made to the program to improve enrollment, but these were unsuccessful. The structural engineering market has less room for growth, while the M.S. in Mechanical Engineering is a new program that has not had a chance to get off the ground yet. There is an unhired position in MSST, and technically does not negatively, or minimally, affect the faculty.

Question by AcA members. These recommendations are based not only on projections but also on poor enrollment numbers, correct? There were projections about future revenue generated between the two programs, but it is hard to see where the breakdown is between the cost of direct instruction of the programs, which makes it hard to see why one program was chosen over another. Further, it did not appear MSST was given time to see their new cost improvement initiative take effect.

No. 3 t Elimination/Sunset of Master of Mechanical Engineering t APPR did not approve this recommendation.

No AcA comments.

General Discussion and Comments

These are feedback from AcA members. They are not listed in any order.

a. The faculty would highly recommend that there is more conversation, like the ones taking place with CON, to demonstrate to other university stakeholders that everyone is trying to help the university

c. Faculty strongly feel that new programs need to be evaluated regularly that it can be made aware if they are hitting their benchmarks. The university should communicate with the new program leadership directly on their performance so that the program faculty and leadership know if they are holding up to university standards.

d. How does all of this work ensure that commitments made to LIFT SU will be met and how will this work incorporate an antiracist curriculum back into the portfolio? Do the APPR reports involve any suggestions for antiracist curriculum or pedagogy? Programs will need ample time to implement changes like these in a mindful and intentional manner.

e. Faculty expressed caution about building too much of a financial commitment into the APPR process. There may be good reasons to have programs that must be subsidized. Some AcA members expressed not wanting to see every program (such as philosophy) being required to maintain an undue financial standard.

f. Should the AcA call for a greater visibility and transparency regarding the data that informed these decisions?

g. Moving forward, part of the report should include some information on how the schools/colleges and university communicate the elimination of programs to students, especially programs where students are still being admitted where

n. It does not appear the curriculum committees of some schools and colleges, which are charged with degree program elimination decisions in the school/college level governance, were engaged as part of the APPR process. This was an issue raised by stakeholders of the program.

p. AcA is looking forward to APPR reports on lessons learned and on how things can be better in the future that would be more helpful to the institution.

q. The direction of decision making is unclear in some schools and colleges. There was confusion over