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: Chris, Kevin, and David

Minutes—Monday, December 11, 2017
2:30-3:15 p.m., Room 712

1. Approval of Agenda—1st Maureen, 2nd Kitty
2. Public Comment—none
3. Minutes from 11/27/17, vote for approval—1st Dmitry, 2nd Vitalis
4. Coordinator's report and discussion items

   a. Report on programs' status in the program review process. The 2016-17 cycle is now complete. English has submitted the final report from the School of Liberal Arts; Philosophy will not be submitted due to lack of faculty (only one adjunct available).

   b. Academic Senate vote (scheduled for today) on mid-year goals, 2-year template and handbook. Coordinator noted that Senators had suggested at the 12/04 Senate meeting that the handbook specify "calendar days" wherever deadlines and numbers of days are mentioned.

      The Senate also charged the Program Review committee on 12/04 with developing a standard survey to which programs could add questions. The Program Review committee members discussed the types of questions that might be included, noting that programs have very different needs and therefore would require different types of questions. Surveys should be short, to encourage the maximum number of respondents, and questions for online students should also be considered. Institutional Research and Planning already collects data on students, so surveys should inquire about issues, concerns, and needs that official data doesn't capture. Maureen suggested that surveys ask about the PLOs—whether students feel they are learning each PLO (this would apply particularly to surveys conducted in capstone/mastery-level courses).

   c. Status of CurricUNET Meta Assessment module implementation and future plans for Program Review module. The coordinator expressed uncertainty regarding the college's financial commitment to the Program Review module, to what extent the commitment by Governet and the college is binding, and what was promised and intended regarding the

extent of the module (was a full program review module, or just a yearly update, paid for?). The coordinator noted that needs identified in SLO and PLO assessment (via checked boxes) should be connected to needs identified in the Program Review yearly update module, and would ideally auto-populate in the yearly update. However, this linkage would not answer the integrated planning question, "what happens next?" The college has not yet determined where this information would go, and how it would be used for integrated planning. The question also applies to the current program review update forms, in Word format. Most programs have not submitted the form; however, the impetus for them to do so is unclear; the connection of the update forms to integrated planning is vague, as are the consequences for not completing the form.

Committee members discussed the challenges of developing and implementing a new tool when the integrated planning process itself is not yet in place. Maureen noted that leadership on this issue is required from administration, and that issue is exacerbated by the lack of leadership at the CFO level (with the current absence of a permanent financial officer).

Peter confirmed that CurricUNET does not have the capacity to imbed data, so relevant charts would have to be "pre-loaded" as attachments, if the entire program review report were to be completed in CurricUNET.

The Coordinator will follow up with David to get a fuller picture about the college's options, regarding the Program Review module in CurricUNET Meta, so that the committee can make informed decisions about development and implementation.

d. Discussion of procedures when a program review report contains a misinterpretation of data or factual errors. The handbook clarifies under what circumstances faculty might be asked to revise the report, and when an additional note of discrepancy might be added to the official report. Maureen noted that faculty might benefit from training regarding how to read and interpret data. In a Flexcal workshop, a sample set of data might be used, with the name of the program omitted (or a fake program invented); in group discussions, faculty could analyze the charts provided to see if there is consensus in their conclusions. As no programs are slated for program review in the 2018-19 cycle, there is time for more data analysis training for programs slated for 2019-20 program reviews (Schools of Health Sciences and Behavioral Sciences).

e. Program review in Spring semester (Applied Technology and Business). The coordinator noted the Spring meeting dates at the end of the day's agenda, and noted that the meeting room would be the conference room in the 900 building. The times would remain 2:30-4:00 pm. Spring Flexcal includes two workshops—one for AT&B faculty to get assistance completing their reports, and one for faculty to complete their update forms.

5. Adjournment—1st Dmitiry, 2nd Kitt.

6. English program review report for review (Vitalis and Kitty)