

# ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Solano Community College

Minutes – Monday September 26, 2016

2:30-4:00pm Room 444

In Attendance: Amy Obegi, Lue Cobene, Ferdinanda Florence, Robert Gabriel, Virginia Guleff, Maureen Powers and from 3:40-4:00pm Celia Esposito-Noy, Michael Wylly

Approval of Agenda, 1<sup>st</sup> Ferd, 2<sup>nd</sup> Lue, approved unanimously

Approval of Minutes from 9/12/16, 1<sup>st</sup> Lue, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ferd approved unanimously

No public comment

Action Items – Lue Cobene made a motion to approve that Geography, Business/Marketing/Management, and Sports Medicine have gone through the program review process and should be considered complete. Ferd 2<sup>nd</sup>, approved unanimously

Discussion/Information Items:

1. Membership – still need a CTE and Math/Science representative, Maureen Powers from CDFS will join us as the new representative from Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Ruth Fuller will serve as the Library/Counseling representative
2. Status of programs under review, Math and General Science feedback have not yet been written. Geology and Engineering have been printed and published on the website. There are still formatting changes to make for Biology and Chemistry. When they are complete they will be submitted for publication.
3. Evaluation of program review process and template
  - a. *Administrative feedback of program review process.* Virginia Guleff commended the committee on a thorough program review document. She, without wanting to overstep, suggested changes to the timeline of VPAA feedback, a new template/form for VP feedback, and agreed with the committee that a more robust integrated planning process is needed with program review at the heart of the process. VPAA Guleff said she would craft a template to share with us at our next meeting. She was interested in not only reporting on program strengths and weaknesses but a way to provide suggestions for supporting the program.

V. Guleff agreed that a VP timeline would need to be added (either 30 or 45 days). We talked about delays at multiple levels (faculty, dean, committee,

VPAA) and consequences for being late. V. Guleff suggested that an email sent to the VPAA or the Superintendent President if reviews are delinquent and that after a certain amount of overtime, they should be passed forward. If the process is to be meaningful and linked to planning, it must be expedient. She suggested we wait on adjusting timelines in the document to ensure the due date of the report corresponds with the other planning items on campus. M. Wyly, F. Florence, and V. Guleff talked about the need to make a campus-wide calendar that lists all due dates so that faculty can plan ahead, know the process, and the importance of being timely for meaningfully integrating program review ideas/goals into college planning.

The committee and VPAA Guleff talked about how important it is that the program review is linked to the planning process, so decisions about resource allocation are linked to faculty's work and the report is meaningful. All agreed that faculty's goals should be connected to decisions about resource allocation, and she suggested when resource allocation occurs (instructional equipment, hiring, technology, etc.), there should be rubrics utilized that include information from the program review. We also talked about the desire to have a yearly update form on CurriCUNET where faculty can list their goals and link to college planning processes such as the technology plan, hiring requests, etc. In the interim, she said she would draft a form that would provide an overview of the most current and pressing issues gleaned from program review reports to share with administration and the board.

Superintendent-President Esposito-Noy said she is in favor of a stronger integrated planning process, particularly in relation to the faculty hiring process. She is also in favor of eliminating any redundancy in the report and making the analysis meaningful for program improvement.

*b. Faculty feedback on the program review process and template*

Faculty's feedback was shared from an online survey. Results leaned toward the positive, however there were some important themes that emerged. One was the length of time it took to write the report (requests that it is shortened with less overlap). Second, that it took too long to get feedback. Third, the concern that the report isn't being meaningfully incorporated into the College's planning processes. The full feedback is attached.

4. Yearly program review follow-up page on CurriCUNET, brainstorm content – Tabled due to lack of time

The next meetings are:

October 10

October 24

November 14

November 28