

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
Solano Community College

Membership:

Ferdinanda Florence—Coordinator

Kevin Spoelstra—Applied Technology & Business

Nick Cittadino—Counseling

Myra Kargbo—Health Sciences

Chris McBride—Liberal Arts

Katherine (Kitty) Luce—Library

Dmitriy Zhiv—Math

Maureen Powers—Social & Behavioral Sciences

Ex Officio:

Damany Fisher—Research & Planning

David Williams—VPAA

Absent: Nick, Myra, Damany, David

Minutes—Monday, Nov. 26, 2018
2:30-4:00 p.m., Room 902

1. Approval of Agenda—1st Dmitriy, 2nd Chris
2. Public Comment –David stopped off, on his way to the special Academic Senate meeting to discuss hiring priorities, to note that he had completed several reviews of program review reports, and had sent the coordinator his feedback.
3. Approval of Minutes, 10/22/18, as amended—1st Dmitriy, 2nd Maureen
4. Coordinator’s report and discussion
 - a. **Follow-up regarding VPAA and Committee feedback:** The committee discussed the current status of report feedback. Kitty asked that, when reviewing reports, committee members might note which reports gloss over the resources section related to library holdings. Kitty requested that, in addition to giving faculty feedback about meeting with librarians (as directed by the template instructions), committee members might **put those faculty in contact with librarians**, so that there can be follow-up. Maureen noted that a checklist might be created to help guide committee members as they read through reports. Rather than try to create such a checklist in retrospect, the committee agreed that, when the last outstanding Applied Technology and Business program reports are submitted for review in the Spring, committee members will **consider what kind of checklist items would be helpful** as they read through the report, and build a checklist organically, through the course of the semester.
 - b. **Follow-up after Guided Pathways** discussion at last meeting: Having reviewed the minutes from Oct. 22, the committee discussed what Guided Pathways-related items might be shared in the coordinator’s report to the Senate. Chris noted that one idea raised at the last meeting had been discussed in the past by the Basic Skills Committee, that students dropping a course might encounter a pop-up window, offering options as to why the student was dropping. Peter Cammish, who was the head of the Office of Research and Planning at the time, had stated that creating a pop-up query would not be technically difficult in the Banner system. However, there has been no further discussion or pursuit of this option at the college. The

committee decided that this **pop-up query idea might be raised at Senate**, to see if there might be further traction. This option may be easier to implement with the new Banner 9 system.

- c. **Updates on Program Review module in CurricUNET:** The coordinator shared the current “sandbox” status of the PR module, through the Assessment portion, noting areas that were marginally, and substantively, different from the template sent to Governet’s representative, Natalie Rasmussen. **The “sandbox” version currently lacks basic functionality in critical areas.** This module represents work from May through December, with the coordinator meeting regularly (by remote conferencing) with Natalie, who acts as a go-between with the developers. The status of this module is linked to several concerns:
- i. **The assessment schedule.** The coordinator will meet again with the various coordinators and LaNae Jaimez, President of the Senate, to continue discussions about the schedule, which needs to be revised. The committee members noted that, giving the current state of the module, it would likely not be functional for Fall 2019, when faculty in the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences were scheduled to write their reports. The committee agreed that the reports should not be further delayed, and that **Social/Behavioral Science reports should be submitted by December in Microsoft Word** format, following the same template used by Applied Technology and Business. **The coordinator will meet with Damany** in Research and Planning, to see what data might be provided to inform the writing (and in what timeframe), with the understanding that the **coordinator will sit down and walk faculty through the data in a required meeting**, rather than leave the faculty to sort through the data themselves.
 - ii. **The possibility of the college switching to a new platform for Curriculum, Assessment, and Program Review.** The committee discussed the potential risks and benefits of switching to a new system, particularly related to data transfer. **David has invited eLumen to give a presentation to the Assessment Committee at their Dec. 5 meeting.** The coordinator noted that our switch from eCollege Learning Management System (LMS) involved demonstrations from multiple, competing companies, who were asked questions by various campus groups. The Canvas LMS was selected after a fairly rigorous process. Committee members noted that Solano College should investigate what other colleges have made a switch to eLumen (particularly from CurricUNET), to find out just how easy, or difficult, the transition turned out to be. All committee members stated that they were unavailable on Dec. 5 for the eLumen presentation, though the coordinator will attend. The committee decided that the **eLumen representatives should be invited to give a separate presentation for Program Review** at our usual meeting day/time, early in the Spring semester.
 - iii. **The implementation of a yearly or bi-yearly update.** Until a functional online option is available, the implementation of an update, submitted in Word format (via email) for every program, in every school, would be too

cumbersome –especially given the current lack of a chain of command or process through which such information would be sent.

- d. **Integrating Program Review with the current Hiring Process:** The committee reviewed the current **Faculty Staffing Request Form**, which faculty requesting new or replacement FT faculty are required to submit for consideration by the deans, Senate, and Superintendent/President. The current form includes a chart which asks for a substantial amount of data, to be provided by the Office of Research and Planning. Some of the data (FTEF, FTEs, enrollment/headcount, number of sections offered) is also required in the Program Review template. However, the form also includes a series of seven questions, the answers to which may or may not be addressed in a given program’s report. The committee decided that, given the focused and time-sensitive nature of hiring requests, the college should continue to use a separate form—rather than try to integrate the form with the Program Review template—in order to keep all the relevant information in one place for the stakeholders’ ease of reference. However, the committee members noted that the current form insufficiently links the hiring process to Program Review. **A single question regarding Program Review appears at the end of the form (Question 7), but should be the first question.** Further, the question currently asks, “Was this position requested in your Program Review/Annual Program Review update?” and provides follow-up instructions to include the relevant passage (if so), or explain the omission (if not). The committee noted that **the question should ask specifically, by date, in which program review report(s) the staffing concern was raised, and/or how long this concern has been documented.** Faculty might address this issue elsewhere in the question/answer section of the form, but having dates attached to this question would help verify the history of a particular staffing request.
- e. **Mid-year goals.** The committee will review their goals at the next, final meeting of the semester.

5. Adjournment—1st Kevin, 2nd Chris