

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Solano Community College

Minutes – Monday September 8, 2014

2:30-4:00pm Room 445

APR Coordinator Amy Obegi called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

Attendance: Kevin Anderson, Curtiss Brown, Lue Cobene, Joe Conrad, Ferdinanda Florence, Tonmar Johnson, Leslie Minor, Amy Obegi, John Yu, Pei-Lin Van't Hul

1. Approval of Agenda

Moved by Kevin and seconded by Curtiss to approve the September 8, 2014 agenda.

Motion carried unanimously.

2. Approval of Past Minutes: 1-27-14, 2-24-14, 3-10-14, 4-28-14, 8-18-14

Members agreed to approve the minutes via email by the end of the week.

3. Program Review Updates:

- *VP White's response about adjunct pay:* In programs that have only adjunct faculty, three hours allowed by contract is not enough compensation for program review work. Since funds have been frozen, IVP White had suggested categorical or other funds could possibly be used or a fulltime liaison from another school might be adopted to shepherd some of the load. John suggested division coordinators could do that and/or use Perkins funds. Amy's noted everyone's plates are full, there are not enough funds to do more, and more creative ideas are needed.
- *Upcoming reviews:* a team is working on the auto body self-study that is almost completed; CIS will be done by the end of September. There will be a lot of programs to review in the spring. Kevin noted information in his department isn't all current due to no advisory committee meeting last spring. Amy suggested it is virtually impossible to keep completely current and what is available should be submitted.
- *AS Agenda:* The Academic Senate September 1 discussion item, The Yearly Status Report for all Planning Processes and Subcommittee Evaluation Form, was deferred to the September 15 agenda.
- *Program Review Report in Database:* Tabled until next meeting
- *Open Office Hours:* Inform colleagues there will be set office hours to have questions answered.

4. Discussion of APR process when it gets to the VP level (attachment)

At the last meeting concerns about the review process being stalled were discussed along with mechanisms to help move self-study reviews forward. Amy brought Committee ideas to IVP White for

feedback and she shared some of that conversation with members to seek solutions: IVP White does not want a review going back and forth if faculty don't want to make changes; Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) feedback, given at the beginning and the end, should be published. The following comments and suggestions were made:

- Self-studies would be published on the web and the VPAA feedback and Committee comments on the process would be in an electronic copy filed by the Institutional Research & Planning Office. This would acknowledge input from the VPAA and allow faculty to make adjustments or not as they choose.
- APR should have consensus from the Academic Senate to state the procedures that have to be followed, possibly in a one page discrepancy form, to include in the minutes so there are no loose ends. The form could include a simple column for what the VPAA suggests, what faculty put in Program Review, and a simple check with everyone signed off at the end.
- Every review could end with a final document showing changes suggested, what wasn't changed, and unresolved differences with serious red flags.
- Create a procedure to document outstanding issues to be completed by the Committee, rather than one person.
- Create a list of reasons for rejection and limit the number of submissions and returns.
- Send a rejected review to the dean to be forwarded to every faculty member in the department. The Committee should have a process to follow for unusual situations.
- All full-time faculty should sign self-study reviews and all adjuncts should be invited, not required, to sign.
- Adjuncts could get three hours of pay if they want to read and give input.
- Similar to the Curriculum process, require signatures from the department chair, the program writer, and two additional faculty members.
- Even if something fails, ACCJC mainly wants to see discussion and improvement.
- This revised process will result in a better product and adding follow-up steps and more people together for discussion will be more meaningful and productive.

Amy summarized the discussion points: crystalize everything earlier in the process; bring documents back to be in line with the template up to a couple times; work with deans to have the rubric followed; ensure faculty reviewed data and filled it in; reviews are not about the program quality; create a form to be part of the file when there are strong concerns of unresolved issues, that information would provide a starting list for new faculty members to know where challenges were. Pei-Lin offered to create a flow chart.

5. Action Item: APR Committee Membership (attachment)

When the Committee approves membership, discussed at the last meeting, the Academic Senate will vote on it. Amy reminded members the idea was to have student participation in an advisory capacity and not involved in program evaluations. The proposed change will ensure the actual self-study reviews are faculty driven. Advisory only members will be involved in other Committee business. Ferdinanda added that student reps should be notified if only reviews are on an agenda so they won't

need to come. **Moved by Curtiss Brown and seconded by Joe Conrad to accept the proposed membership change. Motion carried unanimously.**

6. Assessment Tool for Subcommittee Evaluation – Ideas to bring forward to Senate

Ferdinanda found various ACCJC rubrics online for Program Review, planning, student outcomes that could be used for inspiration. She distributed documents and suggested they could be used as a starting place to create a rubric that could be presented to the Academic Senate to serve as a model. Members agreed this was a good starting point and would offer consistency along with the potential for committees to individualize items as needed.

7. Creation of a program review yearly status report- Ideas to bring forward to Senate

Rather than asking faculty for reports, updates could be on one form for all assessments. A common form would give people, including ACCJC, a clearer way to see how everything is tied together. Clear timelines are needed to show when things are due. A common form will help faculty tie things together with a simpler reporting process. This idea will be presented to the Academic Senate. Add a Flex Cal activity next spring for faculty to learn about a new form.

8. Midterm Accreditation Report (attachment)

One of Amy's tasks was to show what APR is doing. She showed how Program Review has changed since the 2011 planning objective. She provided lots of evidence and is working to ensure it is all in the shared drive. She read a summary of the many accomplishments that exceeded the Committee's goals. Members suggested a few minor changes for clarity.

9. Guidelines for Dean and VP Narratives (attachment)

At the last meeting standardizing was discussed and how feedback on the self-study can be improved. Suggestions included: tying in to the third box what makes the specific program so different; more adherence to State standards, some programs have other boards or agencies to comply with; a statement about an aspect of the program, program specialties or hot spots; asking where something would fit in that is unique about a program; also give an area for feedback on special considerations. Amy suggested bringing all deans together to review the items.

10. Goals/Future Directions for APR Committee? Future directions?

Lue suggested the Committee should have a presence on the website for what is open to the public and faculty might participate more if they didn't feel lost in the process. Amy stated that there is a web page in progress under "Administration" that needs additional information. Joe suggested Committee could be linked under Academic Senate committees and show the process, who is doing what when, etc., to be parallel to the Curriculum Committee.

It was moved by Lue Cobene and seconded by Ferdinanda Florence to accept the document with minor adjustments as suggested. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:01 PM.