



Academic Program Review Committee

MINUTES

November 9, 2020

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/7075323837>

2:30 pm – 3:00 pm

1. Call to order	Coordinator called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.
2. Roll Call	<p>Committee Members: Ferdinanda Florence (Coordinator), Nick Cittadino (Counseling/Library), Curtiss Brown (Health Science), Chris McBride (Liberal Arts), Dmitriy Zhiv (Math & Science), Rachel Purdie (Social & Behavioral Science); Ex Officio: Sandy Lamba (Dean, Social & Behavioral Science)</p> <p>Absent: Vacant Position (Applied Technology & Business),</p>
3. Agenda approval	Dmitriy Zhiv motioned to approve the agenda of November 9, 2020. It was seconded by Curtiss Brown. The motion passed unanimously.
4. Approval of Minutes	Rachel Purdie motioned to approve the minutes of October 26, 2020. The motion was seconded by Dmitriy Zhiv. The motion passed, with Curtiss Brown abstaining.
5. Comments from Public	None.
6. Discussion/Information Items	<p>6.1 Proposed revision to process to place committee feedback before Dean feedback.</p> <p>Committee discussed the proposed revision to the program review process, to provide feedback on the report to faculty prior to seeking feedback from the Dean. The Coordinator noted that the dean has the most direct power over programs (advocating for faculty/staff hiring, determining resource allocation, etc.) and so faculty might find peer feedback more useful before they make their case to their dean. Nick Cittadino suggested that the committee and the dean could provide their feedback at the same time. The Coordinator noted eLumen allows all parties to view the report at any point, so that the dean could see the report at the same time as the committee and offer feedback, unless eLumen were set to require approvals before moving forward. The Coordinator noted that, if faculty received committee feedback before “sending” the report to the dean, they might also be more inclined to use Committee feedback to modify their reports, in order to make the most complete, persuasive argument possible to the Dean regarding programmatic needs. The eLumen module is set so that faculty can modify the report at any point, and also can write a response to feedback at any level.</p> <p>The committee discussed the overall purpose of the program review process, and how peer feedback came to be incorporated into the process. The Coordinator noted that the overall tenor of program review has shifted from</p>

faculty feeling obliged to present a rosy picture in the report to using the report as a means to identify areas of need and attention. The Coordinator further noted the committee's ongoing efforts to ensure that the reports are indeed used by administration to identify needs, and used to base planning and allocation decisions on those identified needs.

7. Action Items

Vote to recommend proposed process revision to Senate

Curtiss Brown motioned to approve the proposed revision to the program review process, placing committee feedback before dean feedback, for presentation to the Academic Senate for review; if approved by the Senate, the handbook would be changed to reflect the new process. The motion was seconded by Nick Cittadino. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Adjournment

Dmitriy Zhiv motioned to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Chris McBride. The motion passed unanimously.