

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
Solano Community College

Membership:

Chris McBride – School of Liberal Arts
Vitalis Enemmuo – Health Sciences
Ruth Fuller – Library/Counseling
Maureen Powers – Social and Behavioral Sciences
Kevin Spoelstra – Applied Technology and Business
Dmitriy Zhiv – Math

Ex Officio:

Robert Gabriel – Dean of Health Sciences
Office of Research and Planning: Peter
Cammish and Pei-Lin Van't Hul
Consultant for VPAA matters—David
Williams

Minutes – Monday, March 27, 2017
2:30-4:00 pm, Room 1301

1. Approval of Agenda—vote for approval as amended: 1st Chris, 2nd Ruth.
2. Public Comment—none.
3. Minutes from 3/13/17 –vote for approval as amended: 1st Ruth, 2nd Chris.
4. Coordinator's report/Discussion items:

a. Status report on programs:

The coordinator noted programs for which faculty had not responded to requests for information, and suggestions were given for reaching out to Nursing for feedback. General Science faculty indicated a desire to have Dean Minor (once interim VPAA) provide feedback in lieu of current VPAA, to speed the process. The committee responded that the report should go to Dean Minor, but then it should go to the VPAA.

b. Report from the Task Force on “general degrees.”

Robert, Peter, and the coordinator attended the March 21 task force meeting regarding the general degrees (University Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies, and General Science). The committee discussed the issues raised at the meeting. Committee members noted that the term “interdisciplinary” is inaccurate, and that those degrees (if preserved) should be called “multidisciplinary.” The coordinator shared the contents of an email message sent to all task force members on 3/27/17. Committee responses to the email content are boldfaced.

Last week, we explored several avenues, and came away with a few general areas of consensus:

1. Some students come to Solano to get their feet wet with college-level courses, and some get an associate's degree, without additional educational goals. But many students come to Solano with the **vague** idea of transferring, and get lost along the way. **“Vague” infers uncertainty, which isn't indicated by the data.**
2. Most SCC students who graduate do so with at least two degrees, and 60% of all graduating students are awarded at least one general degree each year. **Need data to explore how many students who graduate are transferring to a four-year school.**
3. Students need to have choices, but they get easily confused with the choices, and require more counseling and support to find their way. Even with counseling, students may make course and degree choices that don't serve their academic needs. Receiving multiple degrees with little difference between them reflects badly on students and the

college alike, though students are sometimes under the impression that more degrees will impress prospective employers/admissions people. Restrictions could be placed on how many degrees students get, to avoid overlap and multiplicity, but that still leaves students with confusing choices about which degree to pursue and why.

4. The General Science, University Studies, and Interdisciplinary Studies programs were developed to fulfil student needs and statewide mandates that are often changing, and so require revisiting; while "interdisciplinary" is the ideal, discipline faculty have rarely met to review these degrees across disciplines, are largely uninformed about these degrees, and have little investment in, or ownership of them.
5. In a climate of increased expectations for evidence-based decision making, Program Reviews and Program Learning Outcome Assessments must be completed by discipline faculty; so, going forward, discipline faculty should be doing Program Reviews and PLO assessments for relevant IS and US degrees, and must take responsibility for decisions related to degree modifications or deletions.

Last Tuesday, David proposed the idea of a Friday working meeting, to which all faculty would be invited to examine the US, IS, and General Science degrees. Note that the degrees in the catalog are very outdated and include deleted courses. Marianne has created modifications to US and IS degrees in CurricUNET (not submitted or pending at this point), so faculty should look at these modified degrees, so as not to be distracted by outdated stuff.

I met with Michael and David this morning, to discuss possible next steps and explore further the idea of a working meeting. We picked **Friday, April 21, from 10-1:00, location TBD.**

In advance of this meeting, I'll send later this week **an invitation to all relevant discipline faculty**, attaching the updated degree(s) that pertain to their area. I'll note that faculty who can't attend the meeting, but have comments, should send them to me and CC Marianne. We'll then compile these comments, and use them, in conjunction with 4/21 feedback, to inform our next task force meeting.

If you have concerns or further ideas about this, please contact me as soon as possible. If it all sounds OK, **I hope to send mass emails to relevant faculty on Weds. or Thurs.**

c. Report from Senate meeting (3/20/17) at the Aeronautics building in Vacaville.

At the Senate meeting, the coordinator raised the three issues of concern to the committee: the yearly Program Review update; the possibility of using baseline data for template; and the need for a policy for programs that want to move to a different school within the college. The Senate needs time to look over the update. The consensus from senators was that baseline data should indeed be used instead of raw data to inform the program review analysis. The Senate will also put the development of a policy for "moving schools" on their list of future goals.

5. Review of handbook.

The committee revisited the handbook in its revised form. Areas of the "preamble" should be deleted, as they provide a history of (and justification) for a robust program review, but aren't necessary to informing faculty about how to complete the template. This information should be preserved in a separate document/online.

The committee discussed at length the program review process (which follows the assessment schedule in the handbook). Questions arose regarding the feasibility of the timeline, and ideas were posed

about condensing the timeline so that the process doesn't end in May. The discussion addressed the ways the process could or should relate to integrated planning. The college still needs to establish timelines for resource allocation, so that program review can inform the decision-making process. The implementation of Program Review updates (perhaps during Fall Flexcal) should help with resource allocation decisions, and the use of CurricUNET Meta may streamline the process. However, the resource allocation process specifically, and integrated planning generally, are still needing clarity at the college-wide level. The Education Master Plan should set the goals for the college, and the program review report should address those goals. Currently, the report addresses the mission of the college, which is very broad and doesn't give faculty a sense of what the college wants to focus. The alternative is a kind of identity crisis, where faculty make proposals for new programs without a sense of what direction the college wants to go, and what kind of college we want to be.

The committee suggested changes to the report finalization section, eliminating the part about the VPAA creating an executive summary for college governance.

6. Action items: Foreign Languages faculty were unsure which document was the correct report for review. The committee decided to use the most complete-looking document for feedback, and Kevin and Dmitry will review that report for the next meeting.

8. Adjournment – 1st Ruth, 2nd Chris