

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
Solano Community College

**Minutes – Monday, January 23, 2017
2:30-4:00 pm, Room 902**

In Attendance: Ferdinanda Florence (Committee Chair), Vitalis Enemmuo, Ruth Fuller, Dmitriy Zhiv, Robert Gabriel, and David Williams.

1. Approval of Agenda: 1st Dmitri, 2nd Vitalis, and it was approved unanimously.

2. Public Comment: none

3. Minutes: none to approve at this meeting.

4. Coordinator's report (information and discussion)

a. Welcome to members, new and returning!

b. Review and overview of Program Review:

How we got here and where we're going. Coordinator reviewed old and new templates, and discussed goals for Spring 2017 semester (based on Mid-Year Committee Evaluation Report for Academic Year, Dec. 2016). Coordinator noted Goal 2, "Create a yearly follow-up process," which is in progress and linked to the creation of a Program Review Module in CurriUNET Meta (see item d, below). She also noted Goal 10, "Update By-Laws;" Coordinator will ask Sheila Kaushal (Academic Senate – Administrative Assistant) or Michael Wyly (AS President) for old by-laws, to be addressed by the committee in a future meeting.

c. Status update for programs

Coordinator noted that programs who are overdue will use the old template; CTE programs will use the new (2017) template approved Dec. 2016 by the Academic Senate. There is also a third template, the abridged program review for programs that receive CTE funding (but are not part of the School of Applied Technology & Business, formerly Career Technical Education and Business).

d. Moving forward on CurricUNET Program Review Module (designed by Governet) to fulfil process outlined in handbook.

David shared a status update regarding the implementation schedule. The Assessment Module sandbox has not progressed as expected; a meeting is scheduled for Feb. 13, and if all goes well, data will be migrated after that meeting, with implementation in March. Funding for the Program Review Module (\$30,000) was approved by the Board of Trustees.

Committee members reviewed Table 4 in the 2017 Program Review Template, which will be the framework for the Program Review CurricUNET Module. David noted that, for the information to be useful to various decision-making bodies on campus, some

categories should be split into subcategories. For example, Hiring Goals might include separate fields for Staff, Adjunct, and Full-Time, so that when college-wide hiring decisions are to be made, all Full-Time requests can be selected, and pulled from the database easily.

5. Discussion items (old business)

a. Concerns related to report items

David asked why some programs were overdue for review. Committee members discussed multiple causes for delays: the old template had redundancies that made the document onerous, cumbersome; some programs are big, with multiple parts, and division of duties leads to delays, especially since there is no department chair to take responsibility; faculty couldn't see connection between process and outcomes—without clear integrated planning, there appeared to be little impetus to complete such a demanding document.

Robert noted that the new, streamlined template, along with a more logical and reasonable 6-year cycle and increased familiarity with the process, should lead to more timely completion. Ruth asked why there is no compensation for the lead writer, which would ensure accountability and encourage timeliness.

The committee further discussed ways to get overdue programs to complete their reviews this semester. Open workshops were not well-attended last year; Ruth noted that Saki Cabrera's approach to gather evidence for the Accreditation Report was particularly effective: asking for documents, following up personally, sending a note of thanks when the work was done. Some faculty have a lot already completed, and just need to meet with the Coordinator to diagnose where the obstacles lie. Coordinator noted that the plan this semester is to focus on setting meetings with faculty groups, rather than focus on workshops.

b. Changes to Spring 2017 committee goals: no changes recommended.

6. Discussion items (new business)

a. Updating handbook: could/should we get Academic Senate to OK periodic updates (non-substantive changes) without having to go through AS approval each time?

Committee noted that the new Handbook needs to be reorganized, so that the substantive, procedural language, approved forms, etc. are in front, and the back contains information that might be updated without Senate approval (e.g., sample survey, links to data, etc.).

b. Kinesiology self-study is ready for committee review. Committee discussed the review process, and the procedures from start of the process to the end.

7. Action items

a. Team will review Kinesiology self-study: Ruth, Dmitriy, and Vitalis.

8. Action items requiring approval: none

9. Adjournment: 1st Ruth; 2nd Vitalis, and the motion passed unanimously.

Related documents: Old template and Old handbook, New template and New handbook, Mid-Year Committee Evaluation Report for Academic Year 2016 (Dec. 2016), Academic Program Review Status Update (2013-16)

Future meetings this semester:

February 13

February 27

March 13

March 27

April 24

May 8