

# ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Solano Community College

Minutes – Monday November 21, 2016

2:30-4:00pm Room 444

In Attendance: Amy Obegi, Peter Cammish, Lue Cobene, Celia Esposito-Noy, Ferdinand Florence, Ruth Fuller, Robert Gabriel, Maureen Powers, and Pei-Lin Van't Hul.

Approval of Agenda, 1<sup>st</sup> M. Powers, 2<sup>nd</sup> F. Florence, approved unanimously.

Public Comment – None.

Discussion/Information Items:

Special Meeting to Focus on:

1. *Findings from Integrated Planning Meeting 11/18/16.* A summary of the integrated planning meeting was shared. Administration and faculty committee/subcommittee chairs came together to discuss how to integrate the program review findings into the college's planning process. From the perspective of A. Obegi, some of the key takeaways were: support (from faculty) for compensation for program review lead writers; support for program review yearly updates on CurriCUNET Meta that can be shared with appropriate committees (technology, professional development, hiring, etc.) for planning decisions; a need to reactivate some committees that haven't met in a while such as SSSP and the Equity Committee; need for two required flex days per semester so that faculty have more time to work on planning; need for more discussion and to find ways to integrate the academic and non-academic sides of the college into a similar process. At the conclusion of the meeting C. Esposito-Noy and M. Wyly suggested the program review committee go ahead and approve a new process and template for program review with the understanding that some changes will need to be made in the future.
2. *Modifications to Program Review Template.* Suggested changes included:
  - a. In 1.5, changing yearly updates to "at least yearly" or calling them more generally "program review updates" to acknowledge that faculty may need them to update them more regularly if there are new needs that come up "off-cycle" and that should be considered in planning.
  - b. 2.5, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point, ask to attach as an appendix the discipline's calendar of assessments. Last bullet, give examples of disaggregation of assessment

- results such as how scores are differentially impacted by such things as attendance, use of support services, etc.
- c. In 5.1, change wording of bullet 3 to address the potential impact on student success. It was suggested to add another bullet point about analyzing efficacy of placement assessments when they are required. It was suggested to contact Josh Scott about the wording.
  - d. In the signature page, it was suggested to change the wording to say faculty had the opportunity to read and provide feedback, rather than say they “concur” with the findings.
3. *Modifications to Academic Program Review Handbook*. The following suggestions were made to the handbook:
- a. Add a short mission or introductory statement that addresses the goal of student success and the collaborative aspects of the process.
  - b. Change to a six year program review cycle. With that change it was suggested to alter the assessment schedule so that there is a year between program review and curriculum review. This would provide time to complete any needed revisions to the program review document based on APRC and VP feedback, and give some time to reflect before moving into curriculum review.
  - c. Add page numbers.
  - d. Add to the spring benchmarks, meeting with the librarians to look at the collection.
  - e. Suggest that the deans may want to use outlook reminders or other calendaring efforts to help faculty monitor their progress.
  - f. Include a statement that the document is subject to change in the event of external mandates or internally observed need for alterations.
  - g. Clarify that the program review committee reviewers are faculty members giving feedback.
  - h. Make clear the timing of the feedback requirements and shorten the time periods so that the review can be completed more quickly and integrated into the planning process. In most cases 15 days for feedback – the VPAA is allotted 30 days.
  - i. Change the title from Annual Updates to *Program Review Updates*. Insert a statement that most changes are not going to require financial resources, but will be faculty driven changes (curriculum, assessments, etc.).
  - j. Change the due date of abridged program reviews to March 1<sup>st</sup>.
  - k. Add information about Cal Pass.

- I. It was suggested to show an example of a correct page and an incorrect page on the style sheet.
  - m. It was suggested to have a sample made to show faculty what a completed review would look like utilizing the new template.
  - n. It was suggested that faculty could put the pdf of the raw data in an appendix rather than adding it into the document.
  - o. Change the format of the VP feedback so that it more closely resembles the dean's form.
  - p. Add that the dean may want to meet faculty in person when reviewing the document.
- A. Obegi will integrate these changes and send a draft for the committee to review ahead of the Nov. 28<sup>th</sup> vote.

The next meeting is:

November 28