I. Call to Order - Chair, John Koshel called the meeting to order at 11:08 AM.

II. Approval of December 17, 2019 Meeting Minutes
Motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and approved. One abstention.

III. Consent Agenda
a. Sub-Plan: MS in Pharmaceutical Sciences –Non Thesis (Pharmacy)
 b. Change after CAAC: Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (CAPLA)
 c. Change after CAAC: BAS in Intelligence and Information Operations (CAST)
Changes were made to proposals after CAAC approval. Martin sent an email to that effect. Committee Chair moved them to consent agenda for today or a future meeting.

IV. Academic Program Proposals and Procedures
BAS in Applied Computing (formerly BAS in Informatics) (Paul Wagner, CAST)
The meeting between units was successful. CAST will work with iSchool. Parties agreed that the name does encompass the heart of informatics and discussions opened the door to future collaborations and utilizing the resources of the iSchool. Amy shared that they are looking forward to working with CAST and will make changes to some of their courses, so they do not look like INFV courses. Paul did reach out to Computer Science and they did not contest the use of “Computing” in this new title.

Amy Kimme Hea moved to approve the motion. The motion was seconded and approved with one abstention.

V. Updates and Discussion
Greg Heileman, Provost Office
letter sent out explaining progress to make sure it was all okay. Have multiple representations and descriptions of program, from a computing perspective. Pulls from multiple places house of truth will be in Registrar. Colleges responsible for verbiage in the description, should not be external party. Casual astronaut working with marketing group in the Enrollment office. So far just for undergrad.

a. Degree Search. There was a letter sent out to all Deans explaining the progress with Degree Search. It was found that from a computing perspective there are multiple representations and descriptions of programs. Degree Search pulls from multiple places and would like to house the definitive, true representation in the Registrar’s Office. Colleges are responsible for verbiage in the descriptions, not a consultant. Departments will be approached with suggestions but ultimately it is your decision to use the suggestions or not. Casual Astronaut is the agency working with the UA Enrollment Office marketing group. Work is being done in the undergrad sector for now.

b. CIP codes. Updated every ten years. Departments can expect to receive a message about what is changing or new. Review and see if any need updating.

c. CLAS as a College. Officially no longer exists as a unit and students were dispersed between the two colleges except undeclared. The A Center declared they would still like representation so Liesl asked
that Greg serve as their representative. There are also changes to student government so that there is a student rep for undeclared students as well.

d. **Course and Program Approvals.** Liesl and Greg have talked about course and program approvals previously. Have reviewed the process and quite complicated, at least 15 steps. Faculty presentations is a time-consuming process. There are complaints from colleagues about the process and the issue of their programs not getting approved or slow moving. Trying to involve faculty in conversation. So far, provost council has been removed from approval list. They are reviewing up front. Greg has written a preliminary document that outlines six items: 1) Is there enough demand? 2) Are new resources required? Facilities and faculty? 3) Does it create duplication either internally or in state? 4) Are there synergistic programs that should be included? 5) Does the program meet various academic and policy standards? 6) Are there any gifts or external funds that might influence the production of education? (transparency)

Discussion brought up the issue of language used for the sixth question; it should be phrased more neutrally so it’s more about finding out about influence. Perhaps more of a standalone issue/question or should it be embedded in the evaluation at the Provost Office level? There were some concerns about elements of program review such as budget and enrollment goals (which are a challenge with declining student body). Greg will send the document out for review and feedback.

e. **Trellis.** Permissions have been an issue. There is discussion about who should have access to what and who shouldn’t have access. Users need proper training and there needs to be a clear definition of what should and should not be in advisor notes? If private/personal issues are not noted in Trellis, then where does the advisor keep private info? Trellis hasn’t been fully rolled out; there are quasi advisors in SALT and Athletics that do not have all access but perhaps should? There are interest groups and restrictions (HPPA) and frustration about two-way communication. We cannot legally do all that we want. There is a group of faculty that will be getting together to discuss these issues headed by Meredith Aronson. The committee would like to have roles established by end of June. John, from CALS, is part of group and will report back to general committee.

VI. **Student Success & Retention Innovation Summary, A Center – Cynthia Demetriou and Leticia Soto-Delgadillo**

Two representatives came to give a thorough summary of resources and initiatives being offered by the A Center. They provided handouts and visuals that they give out to campus units. The Graduate College also has initiatives to help with units/aid during the dissertation phase. Feel free to reach out to Grad College if have questions.

VII. **Meeting Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 1:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Liz Sandoval