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

Minutes—Monday, February 12, 2018
2:30-4:00 p.m., Room 902

1. Approval of Agenda, as amended—1st Maureen, 2nd Dmitriy
2. Public Comment—none
3. Minutes from 1/22/18 for approval—1st Dmitriy, 2nd Chris
4. Coordinator's report and discussion items
   a. Compiling resource needs documented in program review reports. Kitty suggested that an Excel spreadsheet might be used, instead of a Word document, to allow reviewers to pull faculty request data. Themes emerge as committee members review reports, but a spreadsheet would help identify common requests more effectively. The coordinator noted that a CurricUNET module for Program Review would allow for data compilation, but that module still needs to be created and implemented. An Excel spreadsheet might be an effective replacement for the yearly updated forms, in the interim.

   b. Current status of AT&B programs, and the issue of "teeth" for portions of template that require specific actions (contact the dean of counseling to speak with counsellors at their School meeting, meet with Librarians to complete the library holding review form, and conduct a student survey).

   Applied Technology & Business program reports are being written now, but faculty in these programs have generally not utilized the lead time to conduct formal surveys, or meet with the dean of counseling or librarian, as directed in the handbook. The revised handbook specifies that students must "create and administer a student survey" and "meet with an SCC librarian," but doesn't note scheduling a visit to a counseling meeting. Committee members discussed to what extent the committee could or should hold faculty to these three requirements (with the alternative being rejection of the report as incomplete), and whether the directives should be modified or eased in some way.

   Committee members noted the importance of all three components in the program review process. The wording of the Counseling section (4.2) could be modified to direct faculty to consult with a Counselor and report on the results of the consultation (which would allow flexibility in the manner of consultation; e.g., email

or phone might substitute for an in-person meeting). The library form could be streamlined. Discussion of the survey component was continued in Item f., below.

c. Bylaws updated and approved by Senate at 2/5 meeting. The updated bylaws specify that a Counselor position should be added to the membership of the Program Review committee; the Coordinator has contacted the dean of Counseling, who has asked for a volunteer to serve on the committee. The position is currently unfilled.

d. Developing a form, based on the Assessment model, to pay adjuncts for PR work. The Coordinator noted that there were uncertainties about the extent of compensation for adjunct faculty for Program Review work. The Coordinator met with Faculty Association president Erin Farmer, and together they reviewed the relevant language in the newly-approved Contract. The Contract notes that adjunct faculty are eligible for up to seven hours, per semester, of compensated assessment, professional development, and related work, but there are no contractual limits within those allocations. The Coordinator will develop a Program Review adjunct payment form, modelled on the Assessment form, reflecting the new contractual language.

e. CurricUNET Meta Program Review module: it's paid for; now for next steps. The program review coordinator will work with the assessment coordinator to work out the overall construction of integrated assessment-program review modules. The Program Review Coordinator will share key issues and questions with the committee, over the course of the development process, so members can make informed decisions along the way. The Program Review cycle allows an entire academic year, following AT&B, for CurricUNET module development, before the next set of Schools' reports are due.

f. Sample surveys for handbook. Committee members reviewed sample surveys from Child Development and Family Studies, Nursing, and Art, and identified nine essential question areas/categories that should be included in a standardized survey. Currently, the survey is addressed in the template in the section regarding course scheduling (3.3). However, the survey should encompass a much broader set of student concerns. Committee members discussed modifying the template, so that the survey is addressed earlier in the report, in broader terms, and/or addressed routinely throughout the report, in various sections.

5. Adjournment—1st Kitty, 2nd Chris

6. Discussion of Management/Marketing/Business report—Maureen and Chris