

# ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Solano Community College

Minutes – Monday April 28, 2014, 2:30-4:00pm Room 444

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

1. Copies of VP White's feedback for Cosmetology, Occupational Education, Criminal Justice, Drafting, and Photography were distributed. Committee members suggested the major themes of VP White's be compiled by the faculty coordinator to help reviewers understand the institutional goals.

2. The committee discussed the most effective ways of providing faculty with data needed to complete a program review self-study, namely should data be analyzed just by discipline or by courses in that constitute the degree or certificate (sometimes outside the discipline). Pei-lin said courses could manually be put together so reviews could be done by program but the challenge is when students have choices of what classes to take (the "Ors"). Committee thought it would be okay to analyze all of the classes that a student could possible take as options.

Another question was should success in courses be analyzed just by majors or by anyone taking the course (analyze by majors v. non-majors). Committee thought it would be ideal to be able to see both, however the challenge is many students don't declare a major until they are about to graduate so the numbers might be inaccurate. Committee wondered if you could retroactively go back and review anyone who graduated in the last 5 years to see their success rate in classes to analyze major trends.

3. The committee discussed who was planning on serving on the committee next year and the possibility of being able to pay adjuncts who wanted to serve in disciplines that need a representative. Committee members expressed interest in staying on the committee, but again stated that some form of compensation would be ideal for the amount of time spent on committee work. There are benefits to having low turnover on the committee as there is a learning curve to get familiar with the process.

4. Union representatives voted in agreement that the faculty program review coordinator position should be a .40 reassigned position (rather than .20). A discussion with the VP of Academic Affairs is schedule for 5/19 to discuss the additional release time.

5. A discussion was held about some faculty's uncertainty about the timeline of planning processes, and how each of the planning tasks (program review, curriculum review, PLO assessments, educational master plan, etc. are related and for what purposes). It was suggested that a flex day presentation be given to faculty (by the VP) about how all of these planning processes (the hows and whys). It was also suggested that a timeline of the year be created with due dates for all these planning processes so that faculty know what to expect and when. The faculty coordinator said she would bring these ideas to the assessment committee.

6. A fall flex program review workshop is being planned to help programs who are currently undergoing review. The benchmarks that should be completed this semester are student surveys and completion of sections 1.1 and 1.2.

7. In order to review the effectiveness of the Program Review Committee, a survey will be developed so committee members can share their thoughts/experiences.