ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Solano Community College
Minutes – Monday February 24, 2014, 2:30-4:00pm Room 444

Attendance: Amy Obegi (Faculty coordinator), Kevin Anderson, Lue Cobene, Joseph Conrad, Ferdinanda Florence, Tonmar Johnson, Steven Springer, Pei-lin Van't Hul

1. Updates on status of self-studies: For those CTE programs that weren't completed, a due date was set by VP White for the end of February. Faculty coordinator met with Auto, Aero, and feedback sent to Fire. Also met with Nursing and will be meeting with EMT and Welding. Coordinator still awaiting revisions from Accounting, Cosmetology, Criminal Justice, Drafting, and Mechatronics. Self-studies accepted by VP White: Interior Design, ECE, Human Services (pending). Waiting for Photography and OCED feedback from VP White.

2. The committee discussed the "next steps" in the program review process. After being issued an "accept" from the VP of Academic Affairs, the reviews get signed by the Academic Senate President, Faculty Program Review Coordinator, the VP of Academic Affairs and the Superintendent/President. They will then be presented to the board and posted on the website. The committee agreed that the self-studies should be saved in Institutional Research and Planning in both hard copy and scanned into a .pdf. The website should only include the final self-study (not the supporting documentation, such as feedback from the program review committee, dean's narrative, etc.).

3. Committee members expressed concern that as we start to develop a process it will be changed by the next VP. Some faculty feel frustrated by repeated changes and we want to develop a process and keep it consistent (with minor changes as needed). The goal is that once a published system is in place in won't be changed by administrators since this falls under the purview of Academic Senate and is intended to be a faculty driven process.

4. Institutional Research and Planning updated the database for the 2014-2015 reviews.

5. The question came up of how to define a program. While faculty have considerable say in how they want to structure the review (include multiple programs under one document (example several foreign languages), all programs leading to a certificate or degree should be reviewed. The Title 5 definition should be the guide which allows for a broad interpretation. Disciplines that do not lead to a degree are encouraged to do a review. The self-study provides an opportunity to analyze data on student success in classes, and trends related to equity and

access. Further planning and resource allocation will be linked to program review findings such as hiring, strategic proposals, etc.

6. Program Review Database. A discussion was had about whether a program review database should be created where faculty input their self-studies into the database. The database then could be used to retrieve information needed for other reports (accreditation, hiring requests, etc.). The Academic Senate feedback was passed on - they had expressed concern about using a database as it may be seen as a obstacle to writing the report for some faculty. Many faculty are comfortable writing in "Word" format and it is easy to share information with other faculty who are writing portions of the document. They believed a .pdf published online would be sufficient for the final presentation of reports.

7. CIS was reviewed.

8. The next set of self-studies (Fire, Welding, Aero, and Auto) were distributed to committee members for review.