Academic Program Review Council
Report to the Senate 2010

Date: November 16, 2010
To: Academic Senate
From: Academic Program Review Council
Subject: Recommendations to the Academic Senate

In accordance with the guidelines set out in Academic Program Review: A Guide for Participants, the Academic Program Review Council (APRC) presents these recommendations for Senate consideration.

Academic program review began at Ferris in 1988, and has continued uninterrupted since 1995. This year we present the fifteenth continuous year of program review recommendations, and the thirteenth year of Council reviews. This is an impressive record that speaks well of the long-term commitment of Ferris faculty and administration to comprehensive program assessment and improvement.

These recommendations are the product of a year’s work done by over one hundred faculty members, Ferris administrators, and loyal friends of degree programs. Seventeen degree programs and four pre programs and non-degree entities in eighteen program review panels produced self-study reports which were submitted to APRC in August. In addition, two panels produced focused reports on aspects of degree programs reviewed in the 2008-2009 cycle. Beginning on the day after Labor Day, APRC has met for three hours every Tuesday and Thursday evening for ten weeks—reading, analyzing, meeting with program review panels, and formulating recommendations. The reports submitted by the panels have been on reserve in FLITE since September. It is our belief that these steps make academic program review valuable for the entire University community.

The recommendations are in two categories—general and program-specific.

After the Academic Senate acts on these recommendations, they will go to the Provost, the University President, and the Board of Trustees for action and implementation.

All faculty members bear a responsibility not just for their own courses and programs, but also for the integrity and value of the University’s entire curriculum. By our participation in this process this year, we affirm once again the importance of the faculty’s role in decision-making about academic programs.

Members of the 2010-2011 Academic Program Review Council

Roger Daugherty, Allied Health Sciences
George Nagel, At Large
Gregg Potter, Pharmacy
Frances Rosen, FLITE
Gary Todd, Engineering Technology
Helen Woodman, University College
Lisa Eshbach, Business
Brad Isler, Arts and Sciences
Matt Wagenheim, Education and Human Services, Chair
Suggestions for APR Process Improvements

These recommendations are designed to make the academic program review process more efficient and effective. Recommendations come from council members who have gone through the APR process themselves (as program representatives or PRP chairs) in addition to serving on the APRC for many years.

1. As stated in the “Academic Program Review: A Guide for Participants” (which is the guiding document for the APR process), “The organization’s ongoing evaluation and assessment process (will) provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.” (p2) In addition, the document states that the APR process is, “an opportunity for faculty and administration to evaluate the goals and effectiveness of the program and make appropriate changes that will lead to improvement” (p4) To this end, programs (on a six year cycle) have been required to submit a program review report as outlined in the Guide. In many instances, programs under external accreditation have been forced to produce an accreditation report and a program review report (oftentimes, in the same calendar year). It is the opinion of this council that programs who have produced an accreditation report within the twelve months prior to the August APR report submission deadline be allowed to reference that accreditation report in response to Guideline questions. All sections outlined in the Guide must be addressed.

2. One part of the Ferris mission is to serve a, “rapidly changing global economy and society.” One of those changes is a move to a paperless workplace. The academic program review process has been using the same report requirements since its inception. Program review panels are required to submit a binder with printed pages outlining the results of their program evaluations. One copy is required for each of the council members, one copy is required for the library, and one copy is required for the Senate office. In total, program review panels are required to submit approximately fourteen hard copies of reports. The submission and review of paper copies is labor intensive and inefficient for the program, the council members, and the university. It is the recommendation of this council that the APR process move to electronic submissions and review.

   The challenge lies in the sheer volume within each report multiplied by the number of reports council members are required to review each cycle. It is the consensus of council members that submission of reports to a central web location for reading on a desktop or laptop computer is insufficient. In the 2009/2010 APR cycle the Council piloted a fully electronic submission to Ferris Connect. Council members attempted to read the volume of material required for effective review on a computer screen and it is too much in terms of ease and effectiveness of review (related to seating position and eye strain). In addition, in order to provide an effective review, it is necessary that council members have access to their individual reports during the face-to-face review sessions.

   It is the recommendation of this council that program review panels be required to submit their final report in PDF format. Each council member should be supplied with a 9” Kindle e-reader. Consensus is that the Kindle e-reader will allow the council members to adequately complete their responsibilities while saving money
for the university. At present, it costs the university approximately $300.00 per program report for copy costs, binders, and flash drives. Each APR cycle reviews approximately 18 programs (18 x $300.00) costing the university approximately $5,400 per review cycle for a total cost of $16,200 over a three year cycle. The costs associated with a fully electronic review process would be purchase of 11-9” Kindle e-readers (at a cost of approximately $450.00 each) on a three year cycle for a total cost (every three years) of $4,950. A fully electronic submission process will save the university more than $11,000 every three years.

3. An important part of the academic program review process is the review of pre-programs, minors and other non-degree programs (Honors or General Education as an example). However, minors, pre-programs, and non-degree programs do not require the same level of review as degree programs. In most instances, minors, pre-programs, and non-degree programs do not have the same access to information required of degree programs (employer surveys, as an example). It is the recommendation of this council that pre-programs, minors, and non-degree programs be allowed to submit a condensed version of the materials required in the Guide. A new Guide designed specifically for pre-programs, minors, and non-degree programs should be developed.

4. In order to better satisfy its mandate regarding program review, the APRC should be kept abreast of past recommendations (both general and specific). It is the recommendation of this council that no later than October 1 of the academic year, the Academic Senate president receive and post a progress report from the Provost’s office regarding disposition of recommendations made during the previous APR cycle.

5. The quality of many of the reports received this cycle has been poor, with many submissions submitted late. This has created a challenge for the council to conduct its business in an effective and timely manner. It is the recommendation of this council that the Academic Senate in cooperation with the office of the Provost devise a way to ensure quality written reports submitted according to established deadlines.

November 16, 2010
General Recommendations

These recommendations accompany and complement the recommendations for specific degree programs. They also address policy issues broadly relevant to program review.

1. In accordance with the mission of Ferris State University, and in order to produce consistent, quality instruction the University needs to ensure an adequate number of faculty for effective program operation. A pattern of not replacing lost tenure track faculty lines due to transfer or retirement has negatively impacted faculty forced to carry the remaining load (typically in the form of overloads). Faculty are stretched to the point where they are having a difficult time maintaining academic integrity, program stability, program promotion, advising, research and publishing, and other university obligations (including quality committee representation). In addition to supporting tenure track faculty lines, the university must ensure adequate funding for adjunct and/or temporary positions.

2. The University needs to develop comprehensive and ongoing equipment replacement and maintenance schedules on behalf of the many academic programs that rely on equipment for instructional purposes. It is true that many programs are successful at securing equipment donations, but these donations do not always occur when they are needed. And a program that relies on equipment for instruction should not be penalized because donations are not available. Any approach should be pro-active and take into account the multiple sources of equipment, including Perkins funds and industry-institution partnerships.

3. An effort needs to be made to assure that institutional data is of a more uniform quality. In a number of instances in this review cycle, disparities existed between the data provided by the program and the data provided by Institutional Research and Testing. The source of institutional data presented in the programs’ report must be accurate, and consistent in quality as reported to all university units.

November 16, 2010
MEMORANDUM

DATE:  16 November 2010
TO:  Academic Senate
FROM:  Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT:  Recommendations for B.S. in Accountancy and Accountancy / CIS
CC:  Stephen Jakubowski, Thersea Cook, Jim Woolen, Dave Nicol, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I.  IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:

B.S. in Accountancy and Accountancy / CIS

II.  RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Re-submit for the 2011/2012 APR cycle: Due to lack of quality information in the program review report, the B.S. in Accountancy and Accountancy / CIS program review panel has been asked to re-submit their report for the 2011/2012 review cycle.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:  16 November 2010
TO:  Academic Senate
FROM:  Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT:  Recommendations for Art History Minor
CC:  Ted Walker, Grant Snider, Reinhold Hill, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTIFY OF PROGRAM:

Art History Minor

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- **Relationship to FSU Mission:** The Art History minor aligns to the FSU mission by contributing to a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- **Program Visibility and Distinctiveness:** The minor works in close relationship with the Graphic Design program within the College of Business. The minor gives students a valuable study abroad opportunity.
- **Program Value:** The minor provides students an opportunity to acquire a diverse skill set.
- **Program Enrollment:** Approximately ten students enroll in the Art History minor annually. The minor has graduated approximately forty students since 1999.
- **Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students:** The Art History minor provides a complementary set of skills applicable in a wide variety of careers.
- **Quality of Curriculum and Instruction:** Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- **Composition and Quality of Faculty:** The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- The minor has a strong relationship with the Graphic Design program within the College of Business.
- The minor offers a unique study abroad opportunity for students.
- The minor is cost efficient for the university.
- The minor contributes to well-rounded education that aligns closely with the FSU mission.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The Art History minor should develop a more substantial assessment plan and begin to collect data for more useful program evaluation.
- The Art History minor should develop a formal program of promotion.
- The Art History minor should work toward increasing collaboration across departments.
- The Art History minor should develop a way to formally track participants and graduates.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:  16 November 2010
TO:  Academic Senate
FROM:  Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT:  Recommendations for B.S. in Biotechnology
CC:          Brad Isler, Karen Strasser, Reinhold Hill, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I.  IDENTITTY OF PROGRAM:

   B.S. in Biotechnology

II.  RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

   Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III.  RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

   • Relationship to FSU Mission: The program aligns to the FSU mission by providing a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
   • Program Visibility and Distinctiveness: The program was the first in the state of Michigan, and continues to educate students for careers in the field, or for placement into graduate programs.
   • Program Value: The program offers an extensive lab component and internship requirement that fully prepares students. Graduates report feeling prepared for their careers, or course of study as a result of completing the Biotechnology program.
   • Program Enrollment: In Fall 2009, the Biotechnology program had 31 students enrolled.
   • Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students: Graduates of the program find employment in Michigan and throughout the United States.
   • Quality of Curriculum and Instruction: Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
   • Composition and Quality of Faculty: The faculty are well qualified.

IV.  APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

   • The program has a close working relationship with the colleges of Pharmacy and Optometry.
   • The program has a high placement rate for post graduation employment and graduate school.
   • The program offers a low faculty to student ratio in lab courses, allowing for greater hands-on learning.

V.  APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

   • The Biotechnology program should develop formal guidelines for acceptance into the program.
   • The Biotechnology program should develop a stronger working relationship with their advisory committee.
   • The Biotechnology program should develop a stronger working relationship with industry.
   • The Biotechnology program should develop a stronger working relationship among faculty within the College of Arts and Sciences.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for Directed Studies and Career Exploration
CC: Helen Woodman, Gloria Lukusa-Barnett, Bill Potter, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:

Directed Studies and Career Exploration

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The programs’ status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- **Relationship to FSU Mission:** The programs align to the FSU mission by contributing to a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- **Program Visibility and Distinctiveness:** The programs service students across campus, and perform a valuable retention function.
- **Program Value:** The programs function to provide students the necessary direction when unsure of a choice of study, and/or when they struggle academically.
- **Program Enrollment:** In Fall 2009, the programs combined enrolled a total of 113 students.
- **Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students:** Graduates of the programs are directed to continue within their chosen program, or encouraged to choose a major course of study.
- **Quality of Curriculum and Instruction:** Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- **Composition and Quality of Faculty:** The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- The programs serve a vital student retention function.
- The programs are operated at relatively low cost to the university.
- The programs have dedicated faculty and administration.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The Career Exploration and Directed Studies programs should evaluate expanding the pilot program developed with the College of Business to other programs across campus.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for B.S. in Digital Animation and Game Design
CC: David Baker, Don Green, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTIFY OF PROGRAM:

B.S. in Digital Animation and Game Design

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- **Relationship to FSU Mission:** The program aligns to the FSU mission by providing a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- **Program Visibility and Distinctiveness:** The program is distinctive in its location in the College of Professional and Technical Studies in Grand Rapids. The program has a close working relationship with Grand Rapids Community College.
- **Program Value:** The program prepares graduates for work in a number of areas, including entertainment, education, industry, and healthcare.
- **Program Enrollment:** In Fall 2009, 134 students were enrolled in Digital Animation and Game Design.
- **Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students:** Graduates of the program find employment in Michigan and throughout the United States.
- **Quality of Curriculum and Instruction:** Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- **Composition and Quality of Faculty:** The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- The program has an engaged and innovative faculty.
- Graduates work in a variety of fields, including entertainment, education, industry, and healthcare.
- The program enjoys a unique position within Grand Rapids and a close working relationship with Grand Rapids Community College.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The DAGD program should continue efforts regarding course and program level assessment.
- The DAGD program should explore the establishment of a faculty tenure line.
- The DAGD program should develop a closer working relationship with programs and institutional support units on the main FSU campus.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:  16 November 2010
TO:  Academic Senate
FROM:  Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT:  Recommendations for Film Studies minor
CC:          Susan Morris, Grant Snider, Reinhold Hill, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger,
             Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I.  IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:
   Film Studies minor

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

   Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the
   report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

   • Relationship to FSU Mission: The Film Studies minor aligns to the FSU mission by
     contributing to a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
   • Program Visibility and Distinctiveness: The Film Studies minor provides students an
     opportunity to acquire a diverse skill set. The minor has a close working relationship with the
     Television and Digital Media Production program.
   • Program Value: The Film Studies minor is operated with negligible costs to the university
     while providing a unique program offering attractive to prospective students.
   • Program Enrollment: Reliable information not available.
   • Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students: The Film Studies minor
     provides a complementary set of skills applicable in a wide variety of careers.
   • Quality of Curriculum and Instruction: Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
   • Composition and Quality of Faculty: The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

   • Strong relationship with the Television and Digital Media Production program.
   • Provides students a complementary skill set applicable to a variety of careers.
   • The minor is cost efficient for the university.
   • Graduates feel minor has provided a good complement to their education.
   • Graduates are satisfied with the minor.
   • The minor contributes to a well-rounded education that aligns closely with the FSU mission.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

   • The Film Studies minor should develop a more substantial assessment plan and begin to collect
     data for more useful program evaluation.
   • The Film Studies minor should develop a formal program of promotion.
   • The Film Studies minor should work toward increasing collaboration across departments.
   • The Film Studies minor should develop a way to formally track participants and graduates.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for B.S. in Finance
CC: Vivian Nazar, Stephen Jakubowski, Thersea Cook, Jim Woolen, Dave Nicol, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:

B.S. in Finance

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- **Relationship to FSU Mission:** The Finance program aligns to the FSU mission by providing a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- **Program Visibility and Distinctiveness:** In addition to preparing students for financial careers in a variety of settings, FSU offers the only dual enrollment opportunity in Finance and Accounting in the state of Michigan.
- **Program Value:** The programs provide graduates for business careers.
- **Program Enrollment:** In Fall 2010, the Finance program had 52 students, and the Finance and Accounting dual enrollment program had 22 students.
- **Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students:** Graduates of the program find employment in Michigan and throughout the United States.
- **Quality of Curriculum and Instruction:** Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- **Composition and Quality of Faculty:** The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- The only dual degree program in Finance and Accounting in Michigan.
- Variety of curricular tracks within the program.
- High employment rate post graduation.
- High faculty support from within the College of Business.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The Finance program should consider the implementation of a required internship.
- The Finance program should explore certification options as part of the curriculum.
- The Finance program should develop stronger relationships with industry.
- The Finance program should develop stronger ties with their advisory board.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for A.A.S. in General Business
CC: Lynnae Selberg, Shirish Grover, David Steenstra, Dave Nicol, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:

A.A.S. in General Business

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- Relationship to FSU Mission: The General Business program aligns to the FSU mission by providing a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- Program Visibility and Distinctiveness: The program is accredited through the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs and serves as a stand-alone degree or as a gateway to a bachelor’s degree in business.
- Program Enrollment: In Fall 2009, 46 were enrolled in General Business, and 89 enrolled in Pre-Business.
- Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students: Graduates of the program find employment in Michigan and throughout the United States.
- Quality of Curriculum and Instruction: Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- Composition and Quality of Faculty: The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- The General Business Program is accredited through ACBSP.
- The program serves as a standalone degree or as a gateway toward a bachelor’s degree in business.
- The program allows business students an opportunity to explore areas of study while acquiring transferable credit.
- The program is cost efficient for the university.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The General Business program should continue exploration of a name change from ‘General Business’ to ‘Business Administration’.
- The General Business program should develop a formal plan to track current students and alumni.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for B.S. in Heavy Equipment Service Engineering Technology and A.A.S. in Heavy Equipment Technology
CC: Matt McNulty, Greg Key, Ron McKean, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTIFY OF PROGRAM:

B.S. in Heavy Equipment Service Engineering Technology and A.A.S. in Heavy Equipment Technology

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- **Relationship to FSU Mission:** The programs align to the FSU mission by providing a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- **Program Visibility and Distinctiveness:** The B.S. in Heavy Equipment Technology is the only four year program in the country.
- **Program Value:** The programs graduate students in great demand in the heavy equipment industry.
- **Program Enrollment:** In Fall 2009, 40 students were enrolled in the B.S. in Heavy Equipment Service Technology program and 65 were enrolled in the A.A.S. in Heavy Equipment Technology program.
- **Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students:** Graduates of the program find employment in Michigan and throughout the United States.
- **Quality of Curriculum and Instruction:** Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- **Composition and Quality of Faculty:** The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- The Heavy Equipment Service Technology program is the only accredited four year program in the country.
- The programs align with the career education mission of the university.
- Labor market demand for Heavy Equipment graduates is good.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The Heavy Equipment programs should continue to strengthen industry relationships.
- The Heavy Equipment programs should continue to strengthen their relationship with College of Engineering Technology administration.
- The Heavy Equipment programs should continue to explore ways to increase diverse enrollment.
DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for B.S. in Manufacturing Engineering Technology, A.A.S. in Manufacturing Technology, and B.S. in Quality Engineering Technology
CC: Bruce Gregory, Doug Chase, Mark Rusco, Gary Ovan, Pat Klarecki, Ron McKean, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:

B.S. in Manufacturing Engineering Technology, A.A.S. in Manufacturing Technology, and B.S. in Quality Engineering Technology

I. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Re-submit for the 2011/2012 APR cycle: Due to lack of quality information in the program review reports, the B.S. in Manufacturing Engineering Technology, A.A.S. in Manufacturing Technology, and B.S. in Quality Engineering Technology program review panels have been asked to re-submit their reports for the 2011/2012 review cycle.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:  16 November 2010
TO:  Academic Senate
FROM:  Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT:  Recommendations for B.S. and A.A.S. in Mechanical Engineering Technology
CC:  Tom Hollen, Debbie Dawson, Ron McKean, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I.  IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:

B.S. and A.A.S. in Mechanical Engineering Technology

II.  RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program with Enhancement: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation with enhancement. The Mechanical Engineering Technology programs are in need of additional lab space as required for continued TAC-ABET accreditation.

III.  RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- **Relationship to FSU Mission:** The Mechanical Engineering Technology program aligns to the FSU mission by providing a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- **Program Visibility and Distinctiveness:** The program is distinctive in preparing graduates for work in the classroom and through a variety of projects and competitions, including the Rube Goldberg and the Human Powered Vehicle competitions.
- **Program Value:** The programs are accredited through ABET and provide students an opportunity for experience in the classroom and through national and international competitions.
- **Program Enrollment:** In Fall 2009, MET programs had 121 students enrolled.
- **Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students:** Graduates of the program find employment in Michigan and throughout the United States.
- **Quality of Curriculum and Instruction:** Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- **Composition and Quality of Faculty:** The faculty are well qualified.

IV.  APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- The programs closely align with FSU’s mission of a career oriented education.
- The programs represent the university through national and international competitions, including the Rube Goldberg and Human Powered Vehicle competitions.
- The MET program has the highest number of applications within the College of Engineering Technology.

V.  APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The programs need to continue efforts in regard to recruiting a diverse student body.
- The programs need to continue efforts to strengthen ties with industry.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:  16 November 2010
TO:  Academic Senate
FROM:  Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT:  Recommendations for Pharm. D. in Pharmacy
CC:          Steve Durst, Greg Wellman, Michael Bouthillier, Adnan Dakkuri, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I.  IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:

Pharm. D. in Pharmacy

II.  RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III.  RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- **Relationship to FSU Mission:** The Pharmacy program aligns to the FSU mission by providing a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- **Program Visibility and Distinctiveness:** The Pharmacy program is distinctive in that it is only one of three in the state of Michigan and has expanded extensively into the Grand Rapids market.
- **Program Value:** The Pharmacy program enjoys a regional reputation and draws students from across the United States.
- **Program Enrollment:** In Fall 2009, the Pharmacy program had 550 students enrolled.
- **Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students:** Graduates of the program find employment in Michigan and throughout the United States.
- **Quality of Curriculum and Instruction:** Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- **Composition and Quality of Faculty:** The faculty are well qualified.

IV.  APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- The total number of applications exceeds the capacity of the program.
- More than half of Michigan’s pharmacists are graduates of the FSU program.
- Labor market demand for pharmacy graduates remains strong.
- Graduates typically score at or above state and national averages on the NAPLEX licensure exam.
- Addition of a face-to-face interview requirement has increased the quality of admitted students.

V.  APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The Pharmacy program should explore opportunities regarding basic and clinical research.
- The Pharmacy program should explore opportunities for collaboration with other health care programs on the FSU campus.
- The Pharmacy program should explore the possible addition of a sterile room and associated equipment for the main FSU campus.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for Philosophy Minor
CC: John Gray, Grant Snider, Doug Haneline, Reinhold Hill, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTIFY OF PROGRAM:

Philosophy Minor

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- **Relationship to FSU Mission:** The Philosophy minor aligns to the FSU mission by contributing to a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- **Program Visibility and Distinctiveness:** The minor is distinctive in that the teaching perspectives of faculty are diverse, including feminist theory, ancient philosophy, and applied ethics.
- **Program Value:** The Philosophy minor is operated with negligible costs to the university while providing a unique program offering attractive to prospective students.
- **Program Enrollment:** Reliable data not available.
- **Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students:** The minor provides a complementary set of skills applicable in a wide variety of careers.
- **Quality of Curriculum and Instruction:** Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- **Composition and Quality of Faculty:** The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- Provides students a complementary skill set applicable to a variety of careers.
- The minor is cost efficient for the university.
- The minor contributes to a well-rounded education that aligns closely with the FSU mission.
- Provides students a broad set of perspectives from an active faculty.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The Philosophy minor should continue to explore the B.S. in Religious Studies and Philosophy.
- The Philosophy minor should develop a formal program of promotion.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for B.S. in Professional Tennis Management
CC: Derek Ameel, Matt Pinter, Dave Nicol, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:

B.S. in Professional Tennis Management

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- **Relationship to FSU Mission**: The PTM program aligns to the FSU mission by providing a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- **Program Visibility and Distinctiveness**: The program is distinctive in that it was the first four year program in professional tennis management in the country and currently enjoys a national reputation.
- **Program Value**: The program provides graduates a unique skill set that prepares them for a hands-on teaching career combined with a business degree.
- **Program Enrollment**: In Fall 2009, the PTM program had 51 students enrolled.
- **Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students**: Graduates of the program find employment in Michigan and throughout the United States.
- **Quality of Curriculum and Instruction**: Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- **Composition and Quality of Faculty**: Those teaching within the PTM program are qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- The program has a dedicated program champion in Derek Ameel.
- The program is one of only three in the country.
- The program consistently maintains a 100% placement rate for graduates.
- The program provides a community service and exposure for the university through hosting a summer tennis camp.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The PTM program must consider the addition of any type of faculty line within PTM classes (currently, all PTM classes are taught by an administrator).
- The PTM program should explore a closer relationship with the FSU tennis coach.
- The PTM program should implement a formal recruiting and marketing effort.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for Religious Studies Minor
CC: Grant Snider, Reinhold Hill, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTITIY OF PROGRAM:

Religious Studies Minor

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

Continue the Program: The program's status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:

- Relationship to FSU Mission: The Religious Studies minor aligns to the FSU mission by contributing to a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
- Program Visibility and Distinctiveness: The Religious Studies minor is distinctive among Michigan institutions in that it requires two courses in the history of philosophy, mythology, or ethics.
- Program Value: The minor provides students a broad understanding and appreciation for the cultures, thoughts, and feelings of people around the world.
- Program Enrollment: Reliable information not available.
- Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students: The Religious Studies minor provides a complementary set of skills applicable in a wide variety of careers.
- Quality of Curriculum and Instruction: Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
- Composition and Quality of Faculty: The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:

- Provides students a complementary skill set applicable to a variety of careers.
- The minor is cost efficient for the university.
- Graduates feel minor has provided a good complement to their education.
- Graduates are satisfied with the minor.
- The minor contributes to a well-rounded education that aligns closely with the FSU mission.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:

- The Religious Studies minor should continue exploring the establishment of course and program-level learning outcomes specific to the minor.
- The Religious Studies minor should continue exploring the potential B.S. in Religious Studies and Philosophy.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 16 November 2010
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT: Recommendations for B.S. in Television and Digital Media Production
CC: Fred Wyman, Michelle Johnston, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I. IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:
   B.S. in Television and Digital Media Production

II. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:
   Continue the Program: The program’s status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

III. RATING BASED ON CRITERIA:
   • Relationship to FSU Mission: The TDMP program aligns to the FSU mission by providing a career education and opportunities for lifelong learning for FSU students.
   • Program Visibility and Distinctiveness: In addition to serving students within the program, TDMP provides a valuable university function producing a variety of media content.
   • Program Value: The TDMP program works in partnership with industry in a variety of settings, including government, community, and commercial ventures.
   • Program Enrollment: In Fall 2009 the TDMP program had 113 students enrolled.
   • Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students: Graduates of the program find employment in Michigan and throughout the United States.
   • Quality of Curriculum and Instruction: Curriculum and instruction are of high quality.
   • Composition and Quality of Faculty: The faculty are well qualified.

IV. APRC NOTES THE FOLLOWING STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM:
   • The program serves both students in the program as well as other departments across campus and the university as a whole.
   • Program requires a six month internship which provides students an extensive hands-on learning opportunity.
   • Employers consistently remark that graduates are of high quality and have an exceptional work ethic.

V. APRC OFFERS THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT:
   • The TDMP program should pursue collaboration with programs across campus.
   • The TDMP program should explore the possibility of operating and maintaining their own server space.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:  16November 2010
TO:  Academic Senate
FROM:  Academic Program Review Council
SUBJECT:  Recommendations for B.S. in Printing Management, B.S. in New Media Printing and Publishing, and A.A.S. in Printing and Digital Graphic Imaging
CC:          Bill Papo, Pat Klarecki, Ron McKean, Doug Haneline, Donald Flickinger, Roberta Teahen, Fritz Erickson

I.  IDENTITY OF PROGRAM:

B.S. in Printing Management, B.S. in New Media Printing and Publishing, and A.A.S. in Printing and Digital Graphic Imaging

II. THE PROGRAM WAS REVIEWED DURING THE 2008/2009 CYCLE AND ASKED TO SUBMIT A REPORT TO APRC, DUE 1 OCTOBER 2010, FOCUSING ON THE FOLLOWING ISSUES:

- Results of recruiting efforts
- Curriculum update results
- Update on merger possibilities with other departments across campus

III. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

- APRC thanks and commends the Printing faculty and CET administration for the update, which details the response to the above issues. Progress has been made in all these areas: in the 2009/2010 school year 450 students attended the printing program’s open house, 25 high schools were visited, and 18 high school teachers attended a one day printing industry symposium; in the 2010/2011 school year, Dennis Smith was given release time to promote the printing program; program faculty have engaged in discussions with their advisory board regarding curricular changes; meetings have been held with representatives from the TDMP and Graphic Design departments regarding possible merger or other joint ventures.
I. IDENTITTY OF PROGRAM:

B.S. in Rubber Engineering Technology and A.A.S. in Rubber Technology

II. THE PROGRAM WAS REVIEWED DURING THE 2008/2009 CYCLE AND ASKED TO SUBMIT A REPORT TO APRC, DUE 1 OCTOBER 2010, FOCUSING ON THE FOLLOWING ISSUES:

- Decision by the University and CET regarding continuation of programming in this area.
- Potential program re-alignment if it is decided that the Rubber program cannot sustain themselves as a B.S. degree program.

III. RECOMMENDATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL:

- APRC thanks and commends the Rubber faculty and CET administration for the update, which details the response to the above issues. Progress has been made in all these areas: A.A.S. degrees in Rubber and Plastics have been combined into a single A.A.S. degree in Polymers Engineering Technology, discussions have begun regarding a similar combination within the Plastics and Rubber programs at the B.S. level, the program has enjoyed continued support from CET administration.