PAC
June 13, 2012

Present: Theo Addo, Xudong An, John Anderson, Heather Honea, Kathy Krentler, Lois Olson, Amy Randel, Patricia Van Damme, Nik Varaiya

Absent: Annette Easton

The PAC met in special summer session to review a proposal for a joint PhD program in Information Systems.

The committee discussed the joint PhD program proposal. It was noted that feedback from the Steering Committee (SC) indicates that the SC has reviewed the proposal with regard to resource implications and approved it. The PAC’s primary focus in consideration of the proposal was on its assessment plan however broader discussion of the proposed program also took place.

Questions raised with regard to the proposal in general were:

- There appears to be a contradiction in whether or not there is release time for faculty – the proposal indicates that there will be none however the program budget appears to have a line item for it.
  - Does this release time include teaching courses with doctoral students in them (since there are no specific doctoral courses) or is it for serving on or chairing dissertation committees?
- Price point to students – the proposal indicates that the program will be priced at approximately $60,000 for the entire program. Is this realistic?
- Is there a minimum number of students required to launch the first year of operations?

Discussion and recommendations for changes in the Assessment Plan:

**BENCHMARKS**

1. Benchmarks should be set with consideration of 20 students as a steady state figure for the program. Hence a benchmark indicating that “99% of students will . . . “ should be adjusted. Given the steady state figure this should be 100% or it should be lowered to reflect that an actual number of students might be expected not to achieve the benchmark.

2. The committee encourages a rethinking of the first benchmark – is it realistic to expect that 90% of all students in the program will successfully complete qualifying exams on the first attempt?

3. The committee encourages a rethinking of the fifth benchmark – is it realistic to expect that 99% (i.e. 100%) of all students in the program will successfully complete their dissertations?

4. Benchmarks should reflect the hierarchal nature of the accomplishments. For example, if only 75% of all students are expected to successfully complete and defend dissertation proposals (Benchmarks #2 & #3), then 99% (100%) of all students cannot be expected to successfully complete and defend their dissertations (Benchmarks #5 & #6). The 5th and 6th benchmarks should be stated relative to the earlier benchmarks.
PORTFOLIOS

The committee noted that there is some redundancy in using portfolios as an assessment measure for the three programmatic SLOs as each SLO is also covered by other measures. It was further noted, however, that the requirement of portfolios early in the program is likely to be very valuable in allowing the faculty to review the extent of rigor that exists in the program. The PAC recommends that portfolios remain in the assessment plan initially and be reviewed for usefulness after a few years.

The proposal was unanimously approved by the PAC.

Additional Items:

1. **Change in Program – Real Estate Major**
   The committee reviewed and discussed a proposal from the Finance Department to change requirements for the Real Estate major. The proposal calls for an increase from 40 to 46 units, the deletion of FIN 438 as a required course and the addition of FIN 433 and ACC 326 as required courses. Changes were also proposed to the list of elective courses. The proposal was unanimously approved by the PAC.

2. **Annual Assessment Reports**
   The committee discussed progress toward meeting the June 15 deadline for having annual program assessment reports input into WEAVE. Krentler offered to help any PAC members who had challenges in using the software.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.
Regularly scheduled meetings will commence at the beginning of Fall semester 2012.