

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
Solano Community College**

Membership:

Ferdinanda Florence—Coordinator
 Chris McBride—School of Liberal Arts
 Vitalis Enemmuo—Health Sciences
 Katherine (Kitty) Luce—Library/Counseling
 Maureen Powers—Social & Behavioral Sciences
 Kevin Spoelstra—Applied Technology & Business
 Dmitriy Zhiv—Math

Ex Officio:

Robert Gabriel—Dean of Health Sciences
 Peter Cammish—Dean of Research and Planning
 David Williams—VPAA

Absent: Kevin, Peter

Minutes—Monday, January 22, 2018
 2:30-3:40 p.m., Room 902

1. Approval of Agenda—1st Dmitriy, 2nd Kitty
2. Public Comment—none
3. Minutes from 12/11/17 for approval, as amended—1st Dmitriy, 2nd Chris
4. Coordinator’s report and discussion items

a. Review of Spring 2018 goals—current status and discussion

| | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| i. | Timely feedback to faculty undergoing program review | IP | Committee ready to receive the School of Applied Technology and Business reports (English is the last report from Liberal Arts to move through the process, and will be sent to the VPAA at the end of the month). |
| ii. | Yearly follow-up process (closing the loop) | IP | Yearly update forms have been largely ignored, due to lack of impetus (no established procedure for integrated planning, esp. resource allocation). See item b., below. |
| iii. | Revisions to template and handbook | IP | Handbook and two-year template were revised and approved by the Senate; the six-year template will be revised after AT&B programs have submitted their reports in Spring 2018. |
| iv. | Update By-Laws | IP | Committee members reviewed a draft of the proposed bylaw language in the Academic Senate constitution, and recommended changes to the wording of the committee’s charge. Committee members questioned whether the Senate meant to change the single library/counseling position to a dual library and counseling position, or if this was a mistake. The committee also questioned whether the coordinator/chair was a voting member, or only voted in case of a tie. The coordinator will present the proposed changes to the Senate, and also ask for clarification. If a vote is required to authorize a change from one position to two, the committee will do so at the next meeting. |
| v. | Create module for PR in CurricUNET | IP | See item b., below. |

vi. **Create a standard set of survey questions for the handbook.** This is a new goal, requested by the Senate in December, in response to David’s suggestion. David explained that many program review reports lack a survey analysis, which should be an integral part to any program review. Reports cite various obstacles, such as technical issues or procedural hurdles.

The committee discussed various uses of a survey, including assessment of (and promotion of) student awareness, measuring to what extent students understand and feel they have mastered PLOs, and exposing gaps between student perception and reality. Committee members questioned whether surveys, or particular survey questions, could be targeted to students majoring in a given program. Members also discussed the types of questions that might be asked, and whether some questions might fall in the category of course evaluation rather than programmatic assessment. David gave an example of a college that didn’t allow deans to read survey results, to prevent evaluation concerns—yet an essential component of the program review process is for faculty to dialogue with deans, and barring deans or VPs from the survey contents seems unhelpful.

The committee also discussed the ways in which the survey might be delivered. The college has an account with Survey Monkey, but currently individual faculty and programs are administering their own, independent surveys. Vitalis noted that the Nursing courses always conclude with a survey, each semester. David noted that, in other colleges, the Dean of Institutional Research and Planning would oversee survey administration, to ensure well-worded questions and also to manage the number surveys students encounter (to prevent survey fatigue), as well as manage delivery method. Since the goal of creating a standard survey is wrapped up in the problem of procedures in administering the survey, the coordinator will ask the Senate for further guidance on this issue.

- b. CurricUNET Meta and program review. The coordinator noted that the bylaws of Senate constitution include an “essential goal,” within the charge of the Program Review committee, “to facilitate integrated, long-range planning.” Maureen questioned whether the committee’s “realm of influence” extended to the formulation of an integrated planning process. Committee members discussed the current lack of connection between SLO/PLO assessment in Meta and resource allocation decisions; for example, when a faculty member clicks a box indicated the need for a computer lab for students to meet SLO 1 in Class X, there is no procedure in place for the Assessment coordinator to gather that request and send it to the relevant party. The mechanism for reporting does not exist, nor has the “relevant party” been identified. In program review, the problem is the same—at this point, only deans will see the yearly update form, as well as the final table in the program review report, in which goals and needs are itemized by category. These needs do not get forwarded by the Program Review coordinator to a single resource allocation body, nor to various “relevant parties,” because the procedure doesn’t yet exist. With a new Finance VP, procedures may be put into place for resource allocation, but they must still get connected to Assessment and Program Review. The creation of a CurricUNET Meta module for Program Review hinges on the creation of an integrated planning and resource allocation system.

- c. Sample surveys for handbook—next steps. Members of the committee will forward sample surveys used in their schools, so that committee members can craft standard questions for the handbook, with Peter's assistance. As noted above, the Senate may discuss the procedural aspects of survey administration, and advise the committee.
 - d. Management/Marketing/Business ready for review (without Dean feedback, as of yet). Assigned to Maureen and Chris for discussion at the next meeting (2/12/18).
5. Adjournment—1st Kitty, 2nd Maureen