

# ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Solano Community College

Minutes – Monday September 28, 2015

2:30-4:00pm Room 445

In Attendance – *Voting Members*: Amy Obegi, Joseph Conrad, Kevin Anderson, Lue Cobene, Vitalis Enemmuo

*Ex-Officio* – Neil Glines, Robert Gabriel, John Yu, Pei-Lin Van't Hul

Meeting began at 2:32pm

Approval of agenda: First Joe Conrad, Second Lue Cobene, approved unanimously

Approval of minutes for 3-9-15, 3-23-15, 4-13-15, 4-27-15, 5-11-15. First Joe Conrad, Second Lue Cobene, approved unanimously

Discussion/Information Items:

1. Introductions and welcome – new Health Sciences faculty representative, Vitalis Enemmuo and dean, Robert Gabriel welcomed to the committee. Brenda Tucker (not present), will be serving as the Student Services representative.
2. Brown act compliance – In accordance with state mandates and by the request of the Academic Senate president Michael Wyly, all Senate subcommittees are to make sure they are Brown Act compliant, which means doing such things as posting agendas at least 72 hours before meetings, posting timely minutes, not operating unless there is a quorum, not conducting decision-making over email, etc. To this end, Amy Obegi recommended making changes to membership so that a quorum is more easily established. Since current committee membership is 1 to 2 committee members per school, we would have to calculate quorum according to 2 members per school. Last year, we only had one school with more than one member and several schools with no representatives. To simplify membership and to make quorum, I am proposing the following Academic Program Review Committee membership changes:

**Current Committee Membership (Academic Year 2014-2015):**

- Chair, Academic Program Review Faculty Coordinator with reassigned time
- 1 or 2 standing faculty representatives from each school (Liberal Arts, Math/Sciences, Health Sciences, Social/Behavioral Sciences, CTE and Business)
- Student Services Faculty Representative (Counseling or Library)
- Curriculum Committee Chair

- Advisory: Member of Office of Institutional Research and Planning\*
  - Advisory: Dean(s) of programs under review\*
  - Advisory: Vice President of Academic Affairs\*
  - Advisory: ASSC Student Representative\*
- \*Not involved in the faculty led review component of the committee.

### **Proposed Changes to Committee Membership for 2015-2016 (Brown Act Compliance)**

#### **Voting members (8):**

- Chair, Academic Program Review Faculty Coordinator with reassigned time (vote in tie)
- 1 faculty representatives from each school (Liberal Arts, Math/Sciences, Health Sciences, Social/Behavioral Sciences, CTE/Business)
- Student Services faculty representative (Counseling or Library)
- 1 At-large faculty representative (from any school)

#### **Advisory members:**

- Curriculum Committee Chair (ex-officio)
- Advisory: Member of Office of Institutional Research and Planning (ex-officio)
- Advisory: Dean(s) of programs under review (ex-officio)
- Advisory: Vice President of Academic Affairs (ex-officio)

Advisory Members do not participate in the faculty review of the program review self-studies by the Academic Program Review Committee

Key changes are one 1 faculty per school, the addition of an at-large faculty representative, Curriculum Committee Chair changed to ex-officio, and student representative omitted. Quorum would be 5 faculty members in attendance

Joe Conrad suggested that if the goal is to make quorum we may consider not adding an at-large representative, unless we are actively recruiting for it. He also proposed that if other faculty wanted to be part of the committee, it is an open meeting and they wouldn't necessarily need to be voting members. Amy Obegi said she would consult with SP Wyly to confirm whether that was the case.

Members thought old agendas and minutes (2013) could be posted online even though they weren't originally voted upon.

3. Spring 2015 accomplishments – A list was provided of the major accomplishments last semester. See below (1-11):

## Accomplishments of the Academic Program Review Committee Spring 2015

1. Provided feedback to the following programs:
    - a. Anthropology
    - b. Biology Non-Majors
    - c. Chemistry
    - d. Computer Information Systems (not to the rubric stage yet)
    - e. Geography
    - f. Interdisciplinary Studies (not to the rubric stage yet)
    - g. Physics
    - h. Pre-Allied Health
    - i. Psychology
  2. Changes to the APR template were approved by Academic Senate 2-2-15. The changes include changes to the basic skills language, change from Program Level Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes, and more details about the dean's input in the Program Review process.
  3. APRC Coordinator release time was increased to .4 for the next couple semesters to support the increased workload due to trying to get multiple schools reviews completed before the next Accreditation self-study
  4. Improvements made by Peter Cammish, Dean of Institutional Research and Planning to the Program Review data to include more discipline transfer data
  5. Presentation to the Solano College Board about the status of the Program Review Process and specifically the CTE programs that had completed reviews
  6. A list of facility needs presented in program review committee reports was compiled and sent to the AS president to share with the College President
  7. Website was updated so that Program Review is listed under the A-Z menu under "P" and there are live links between the Program Review website under Institutional Research and Planning and Academic Senate
  8. Revised the two year-abridged program review process for CTE programs to become Ed Code compliant (met with committee, Perkins coordinator, VP, and deans – obtained AS approval for changes)
  9. Provided flex training and open office hours. Office hours were held: Program Review Office Hours Room 503: February 10 1-2pm, February 23 2-3pm, March 10 2-3pm, April 20 2-3pm
  10. APRC Coordinator met individually with discipline faculty to support them in their work (Kinesiology, Sports Medicine, Real Estate, Non-major Biology, Social Sciences, Political Science), and at a school meeting for the school of Liberal Arts
  11. APRC Coordinator and committee member, AS President, and VP of Academic Affairs met with Counseling faculty member to discuss Interdisciplinary Studies Program Review
- 
4. A status of programs in the school of CTE & Business, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Health Sciences, and ½ of Math/Sciences (those previously due). It was a concern to committee members that the VP of Academic Affairs had not provided any feedback on program reviews that had been submitted to her. Amy Obegi said she had contacted VP Minor on several occasions to get a status on the program review feedback but had yet to receive any. There is discontent among faculty that they have worked hours on the program review, but the process

has been stalled by several months. Amy Obegi will contact Leslie Minor again to ask for a timeline of completion. Neil Glines said his faculty members were looking for additional samples to be posted online, which can't happen until VP feedback is provided.

Kevin Anderson expressed his difficulty in getting faculty members to come together to collaborate on the CIS program review. The APRC initial feedback was distributed, but he hadn't received any assistance. He mentioned that when full time faculty's offices are on 3 different campuses, it is a challenge to come together.

The committee addressed the needs of the Nursing Program. Since the Nursing program requires a large BRN report, it was decided that the abridged program review would be appropriate to their area with the addition of distance education and possibly resource needs. Since the Certified Nursing Assistant program is only one year old, it was recommended that they conduct the abridged review now, and then a full review in the next program review cycle.

5. Amy Obegi shared a draft of goals for the 2015-2016 academic year and solicited feedback. The committee members thought the goals sound good, particularly in relation to "closing the gap". Joe Conrad mentioned that during the Spring flex training, it was clear that faculty are wanting to see that the work they are doing will translate into practice/action and not just sit idly on a shelf. Vitalis Enemmuo suggested there is benefit in providing feedback even if all resources are not achieved. Dean Yu said that even if just a percentage of desired changes are achieved, progress is still being made and faculty have a means of advocating for their needs. Pei-lin Van't Hul suggested that we create a survey to see how Program Review information has been translated into practice. The goals are listed here:

## **Academic Senate & Subcommittee Committee Goals for Academic Year 2015-2016**

**Committee Name: Academic Program Review Committee**

**Committee Roles and Responsibilities:**

Provide feedback on Academic Program Reviews, make policy recommendations on the Academic Program Review processes, provide training and support to faculty, deans, and the administrators undergoing the program review process, and shepherd Academic Program Reviews through the various stages of feedback until they reach publication

**ACCJC Standard(s) Addressed:**

X Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

\_\_\_ Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services

\_\_\_ Standard III: Resources (Human, Physical, Technology, Financial)

\_\_\_ Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

**Committee Members:** Amy Obegi (Faculty Coordinator), Lue Cobene (Liberal Arts), Joseph Conrad (Math/Science), Vitalis Enemmuo (Health Sciences), Tonmar Johnson (Social & Behavioral Sciences), Brenda Tucker (Counseling)  
 Ex Officio: Peter Cammish, Pei-Lin Van't Hul, John Yu, Robert Gabriel, Neil Glines, Maire Morinec, Keydron Guinn, Leslie Minor, Jocelyn Mouton

Identify the initiatives/goals this Committee will undertake.

Committee chairs are responsible for completing reports after dialog with committee members.

Assessment of committee progress is integral to SCC's continuous improvement process.

	<i><b>Initiative / Goal</b></i>	<i><b>Description for this Initiative / Goal</b></i>
1	Brown Act compliance	Make changes to membership and to operating procedures to ensure Brown Act compliant
2	Timely feedback to faculty undergoing program review	Review discipline program review self-studies and provide feedback as they are completed by discipline faculty
3	Style sheet	Create a "style sheet" to add to the handbook and distribute to faculty undergoing review in an effort to make reports more uniform
4	Individual and group support/training	Provide support and training to those undergoing the program review process (faculty, deans, etc.)
5	Committee self-assessment	Undergo self-assessment of the Academic Program Review Committee
6	Refine/clarify 2 year abridged program review process	Determine how 2 year abridged program reviews for CTE programs integrate with the Academic Program Review committee and its processes
7	Website updates	Ensure the Academic Program Review website is up-to-date
8	Support accreditation self-study	Work with faculty accreditation co-chairs and administrators to integrate program review information
9	Closing the loop	Support in the development of processes that link program review recommendations with institutional short and long-term planning
10	Update By-Laws	Work with Academic Senate to ensure the mission and membership of the committee are accurately reflected in the Senate by-laws.
11	APR process assessment	Develop an assessment to be given to stakeholders (faculty and administration) about the program review process to use to revise the Academic Program Review template and handbook as part of a continued cycle of subcommittee improvement

6. The Academic Program Review Committee members discussed their role in the abridged program review process. It was agreed that while a review of all could be beneficial, the committee members with no release time, would be overwhelmed by both full program reviews and abridged reviews. It was also believed that most abridged reviews would not need extra support. Lue Cobene wondered if there was a way to identify programs in extra need of support. Dean Gabriel suggested that when deans are provided the abridged reviews and they recognize the need for additional support, they can turn to the committee to provide that support. The faculty committee members agreed that we could provide this support.
7. Pei-Lin Van't Hul reported that Peter Cammish had worked a tremendous amount of hours to compile data on Tableau and labeled the sections that relate to program review. She expressed that there is a lot of detailed analysis – almost anything you want to analyze you can. Amy Obegi suggested Peter come to an upcoming meeting to show us how the Tableau works. Lue Cobene showed the Tableau data to the school of Liberal Arts at a school meeting. Dean Yu invited Peter to a future school meeting in Math and Sciences.

#### Self-Study Reviews:

1. The Horticulture program review was analyzed by a team of faculty reviewers. Feedback to be compiled by the Academic Program Review coordinator and submitted back to the discipline faculty within the next week.

A team of faculty were assigned to the Political Science Program Review for the October 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Future meetings for this semester (Mondays 2:30-4:00pm, Room 445):

October 12

October 26

November 9

November 23

#### Attachments:

Accomplishments of the Academic Program Review

APR Committee Proposed Membership

Goals for Academic Program Review 2015

Status Update