



Strategic & New Program Development Committee

Friday, March 22, 2013

1:00 pm

TRF 545; EGF 301

Members Present: Jason Pangiarella, Al Shervold, Mary Fontes, Brian Huschle, Jim Retka, Anne Temte, Dan Klug, Steve Crittenden

Members Absent: Justin Berry, Don Fischer, Sherry Lindquist, Shannon Jesme, Terry Wiseth

Recorder: Anne Temte

Committee Purpose Statement: *Identify and develop partnerships and financial support to support existing programs and services and the development of new programs and services.*

Topic	Responsible Party	Discussion/Outcome
Process of vetting and approving academic program proposals		<p>The only topic covered during this meeting was the process for vetting and approving academic program proposals. The flow chart and plan that Anne had developed was reviewed in detail. The following recommendations were made and will be incorporated into the next version:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Broaden the scope of the process to include non-credit offerings• Part I provides the identification of the program and Part II (items 6-8) provides general concept information. These two parts comprise the “idea” phase of the proposal and will come to the Strategic Development and New Program Committee in a first review.• Part II (items 9-12) provides information that substantiates the need for the program; this will be reviewed at the 2nd meeting of the SDNP Committee.• Part III, IV, and V reflect planning for the proposed program. Directions will be provided to the proposer to complete this section to the best of his/her ability. These parts will be reviewed in the 3rd meeting of the SDNP committee.• Part VI will present other considerations and will be considered by the SDNP Committee for its final review.• Additional items that should be added to the proposal are:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Will the program require collaboration with other departments,

		<p>interagency agreements, or articulations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is the success and/or implementation of the program dependent on approvals, articulations, or other factors external to the college? • System Policy 3.36.31 should be reviewed. • More work needs to be done on the connector between this process and the curriculum development and approval process of AASC.
Next Meeting Date		To be scheduled by Dan Klug.

ccedergren/Committees/2012-13/Strategic & New Program Development 13_03_22