**Attendance:**

Hockenberry [] Horst [X] Jones [X] Mangruem [] Nichols [X]

Smith [] Stewart [X] Villalobos [X] Kramer [] Braswell [X]

Catanzaro []

**Absences:** 5

Meeting called at 6:04pm

Committee members and guests introduced themselves to each other. Guests attending: J. Cooper Cutting (Assistant Vice President for Academic Planning) and Dallas Long (Dean of Milner Library).

Since no minutes from the 01-20-21 meeting have been submitted, we did not approve minutes.

**Item 1:**

Policy 9.7.1 (Policy and Procedures for use of Mass Electronic Communication). Horst summarized some minor new changes. Stewart pointed out that the current policy was stated in such a way that it would only apply to emails sent to literally all students, or all faculty, etc., and that mass communications might sometimes go to smaller groups. Horst suggested adding “potentially all” to fix the problem. The committee then voted unanimously to approve the changes along with the new “potentially all” language.

**Item 2:**

Discussion of proposed changes to Academic Planning Committee charge. Horst reviewed the major changes proposed. Long supports the idea of replacing the faculty member of the APC with the Dean of Milner or designee. Cutting pointed out that the APC is running two committees this year, and wondered how this would affect the addition of the Dean to the APC. Horst is going to investigate how the doubling of the APC occurs, and how this might affect adding the Dean as a member.

Functions 1 and 2: Rules has accepted all of the proposed changes. Cutting indicates that he too supports the changes.

Function 3: Rules would like some feedback from David Marx on this change. Cutting is uncomfortable with adding additional review duties to the charge of the APC, especially because of their already heavy workload. It is also not clear how the APC would review facilities reports, what their exact responsibilities would be in doing so, etc. Nichols suggested modifying function 3 into something like that the APC would consult with the AABC as needed regarding facilities needs.

Function 4: Dean Long favors the idea of initiating some sort of self-study for Milner/a program review and reports that it is fairly common for libraries to do something like this, but that there are many competing models for how to do so. He would like to initiate a discussion with the Milner faculty about these issues, and what they would hope to learn from a review. This change has also not been discussed with the Provost yet. So, it might be premature to add function 3. Horst points out that taking out function 3 could delay the implementation of a self-study for a long time, even years. Nichols suggested revised language which gives Milner faculty control over the timing and goals of the self-review, but tasking the APC with helping Milner with this process. Cutting and Long both say they find the new looser language acceptable.

Function 5: Horst reports that she met with Amy Hurd. Hurd explained that there are several different kinds of curricular review. Hurd thinks that we do already review general education (e.g., CGE), and that since general education belongs to the “whole university,” there is also no clear way to perform a more general review. Cutting says that he agrees with this position. HLC does want assessment of ISU’s general education program, and which we already do complete, but a program review would be much broader still. After this discussion, the committee agrees that it makes sense to delete this proposed APC function.

Function 6: Cutting asks how many interdisciplinary programs the APC would have to monitor if this function is added. This could potentially generate much more work for the APC. Braswell reports that many interdisciplinary minors already do program reviews; CGE examine program reviews from all IDS minors, for example. Horst asks whether CGE reviews all interdisciplinary minors, or whether some do not provide program reviews to the CGE. Horst will try to determine if all interdisciplinary programs do report to the CGE. If so, it perhaps makes sense to cut function 6. As another option, function 6 could be qualified so that the APC will only be responsible for setting the parameters of self-studies for minors that do not provide program reviews to the CGE.

**Item 3:**

Discussion of Milner bylaws. Dean Dallas reports that Milner is in the process of a 5-year strategic plan project. A review of internal committees will be a part of this planning, and some old committees might be eliminated, and new ones created, like a diversity committee. The committee voted to approve all changes to the Milner bylaws.

**Updates:**

Horst reported that the Executive Committee had 50+ suggested revisions for CAS bylaws. CAS has addressed these suggestions, and a revised copy of the CAS bylaws will be sent back to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also suggests that Rules further investigate the original charge of the CGE and the history of its past chairs in relation to whether the CGE charge should allow only faculty members of the committee to be elected Chair. Nichols volunteered to undertake this task.

**Meeting Adjourned 6:50pm**

Prepared by Todd Stewart,

since the Secretary was unable to attend