

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:**

Damany Fisher—Research & Planning  
David Williams—VPAA

Absent: Dmitriy, David

Minutes—Monday, Sept. 10, 2018  
2:30-4:00 p.m., Room 902

1. Approval of Agenda—1<sup>st</sup> Kitty, 2<sup>nd</sup> Chris
2. Public Comment –none
3. Approval of Minutes, 8/27/18—1<sup>st</sup> Maureen, 2<sup>nd</sup> Kevin
4. Coordinator’s report and discussion items
  - a. Status of Applied Technology & Business reports –Coordinator noted that faculty had been contacted regarding the four remaining AT&B programs that have pending report submissions.
  - b. Review of modified template, Program Review CurricUNET module, and general discussion regarding the Program Review process, procedures, and Committee purview
    - i. Coordinator noted that no meetings with Natalie Rasmussen of Governet (CurricUNET’s parent company) had taken place since the last Program Review Committee meeting.
    - ii. The committee reviewed the template in its current form, and discussed ways to **ensure that reports are submitted on schedule, and reviewed by deans and the VPAA in a timely way.**
    - iii. The committee discussed various ways that the report might be **connected to integrated planning**, with budgetary consequences (or bonuses) used to encourage timely report completion. Committee members noted that, if the college were to have **Departmental Chairs**, they could be held accountable and would be in a better position than coordinators to get reports complete (as well as assessments and other program- and departmental-level work).
    - iv. The Committee discussed faculty’s **difficulty in reading and interpreting data charts**, which can be daunting and inhibit report completion. While consistent formatting of data might be helpful, and faculty might receive training in the use of data, the Coordinator is typically most familiar with the data and its use, and should be on-hand to clarify and explain data for faculty members. Once the Coordinator explains what the data shows, faculty can then focus on planned actions

based on that data analysis. The Coordinator's experience working with AT&B and School of Liberal Arts faculty last year indicates that trainings and workshops are not helpful; **it doesn't make sense to train people for a process that only occurs once every six years.** By sitting down with faculty and working through the report together, step by step, the Coordinator can ensure that the document is correctly and fully completed. This meeting eliminates wasted time and potential frustrations; there is reduced risk of having to substantively rework a submitted report, based on Dean or Committee feedback.

- v. The committee recommended that **meeting with the Coordinator to work through the report should be mandatory**, rather than recommended. The Coordinator would work with the faculty members' schedules to set aside an adequate block of time, but if a meeting doesn't take place by a specified date, the Dean might step in, to make sure the meeting is scheduled. Most reports would require one to two meetings to complete, for a total of two to three hours of work.
- vi. Since mandatory meetings will consume a large portion of the Coordinator's allocated release time, **the current Assessment Schedule must be revised**, as it calls for Program Review in both the Social Science and Health Science Schools in 2019-2020. Given there is a six-year cycle, and there are fewer than six schools, there is no reason why schools should be double-booked for Program Review in any given year of the cycle. The committee further discussed how various portions of the recently-revised Schedule are already out-of-date and have not been followed. For example, the School of Liberal Arts has not yet conducted its scheduled 2017-2018 Curriculum Review.
- vii. Once in place as an online module, relevant portions of the Program Review report could be pulled to **take the place of Human Resource and Instructional Equipment request forms**; these forms currently provide only a box to check, indicating that the requests are documented somewhere in a Program Review report. In the current (non-integrated) planning process, hiring and financial decision-makers can't rely on data and requests from Program Review reports alone, because the report can't be kept consistently up-to-date. This problem should be eliminated in CurricUNET Meta, as information can be easily updated yearly.
- viii. To speed up the review process and ensure that decision-makers see and use the report information while it's still relevant, **Deans and the VPAA might be given an "executive summary"** of the report, rather than the entire 40-page document. The summary could be pulled from a limited selection of pages/tabs in the CurricUNET Meta module (for example, 1.1 Description, 1.4 Program History, 1.5 Future Outlook, 1.6 Enrollment, and 7.1 Goals and Planning). The entire document would be available for review on CurricUNET, if the reviewer wished to see more information.
- ix. The **VPAA might appoint one or more designees**, perhaps selected from the Financial Advisory Committee, to share the burden of program review

report-reading (though the VPAA might be expected to read all “executive summaries”).

5. **Revision of 2018-2019 Goals**—based on the discussion outlined above, the Committee **added two goals** to the list created at the last Program Review meeting. The complete list of six goals will be shared with the Academic Senate on 9/10 during the Coordinator’s Report.
  - a. **Goal 5: Revisit assessment schedule** to eliminate doubling-up of schools for program review;
  - b. **Goal 6: Create mandate for sit-down meeting with PR coordinator** as prerequisite for report completion.
6. Assignment of Real Estate report—Vitalis, Dmitriy (volunteered via email)
7. Adjournment—1<sup>st</sup> Kevin, 2<sup>nd</sup> Chris
8. Review of Occupational Education report (Chris, Kitty)