ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
Solano Community College

Membership:
Ferdinanda Florence—Coordinator
Kevin Spoelstra—Applied Technology & Business
Nick Cittadino—Counseling
Vacant—Health Sciences   **Ex Officio:**
Chris McBride—Liberal Arts   Damany Fisher—Research & Planning
Katherine (Kitty) Luce—Library   David Williams—VPAA
Dmitriy Zhiv—Math
Maureen Powers—Social & Behavioral Sciences

Minutes—Monday, Jan. 14, 2018
2:30-4:00 p.m., Room 902

Absent: Kevin, Damany, David

1. Approval of Agenda—1st Dmitriy, 2nd Nick
2. Public Comment—none
3. Approval of Minutes, 11/26/18—1st Dmitriy, 2nd Kitty
4. Coordinator's report and discussion
    a. Reflections on **presentation items to Senate** re:
        i. **Pop-up query upon dropping in Banner**: VPAA agreed to talk with Banner and has sent a query to Jim Petromilli; Senate will make it an action item. Committee discussed the need to keep this item on the Senate's radar and ensure action is taken, so this simple but potentially indispensable mechanism for student feedback doesn't fall through the cracks.
        ii. **Plan to have Social/Behavioral Sciences submit reports in 2019-20**, with **mandatory sit-down** with Coordinator and **data from Research and Planning:** Senate asked Coordinator/committee to come up with sample questionnaire and process for Senators to discuss with constituents and vote on. Senators suggested that, rather than make a sit-down meeting with the coordinator mandatory, such a meeting might be triggered if faculty fail to meet deadline.
            1. The committee reviewed the template (approved by Senate in Dec. 2016), and considered the kinds of questions that might appear on a questionnaire, to prompt critical thinking and discussion among discipline faculty as they respond to the instructions in each section.
            2. After discussion of various options, including whether the questions would precede the instructions or appear in a separate form, the committee members decided that these critical-thinking questions would be less confusing or distracting if they followed the instructions in boldface, in parentheses. For example:

> *1.1 Introduction.* Introduce the program. Include the program's catalogue description, its mission, the degrees and certificates offered (including the courses required for the degrees). Include the names of full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and classified staff. Give a brief history of the program and discuss any recent changes to the program or degrees (Limit to 2-3 pages). **(Specific questions to consider as you answer: What degrees and certificates do you offer? What are the names of your FT and PT faculty and staff members? Overall, what big changes have been made in the past 5 years in the degrees/certificates?)**

3. These questions would reflect the kind of "Jiminy Cricket" prompts that the coordinator would provide to faculty in a sit-down meeting. They would not be part of the official template, and would be deleted once the report-writing was complete. The questions could also help direct future changes to the template, to ensure the instructions themselves are as clear and direct as possible.

4. Kitty suggested that **changes might be made to the PR template** in consideration of the **new funding formula** from the Chancellor's Office. For example, the current template in Section 5.4 asks faculty to address the number of students earning degrees/certificates in the program; demographic data, tied to specific benchmarks in the funding formula, might also be helpful in this section, to provide a more in-depth picture regarding who is earning these degrees.

5. **The coordinator will present the template, with the added critical-thinking questions, at the next PR meeting**, so committee members can make amendments and additions. As these questions will inform the template, rather than replace approved text, they should not require Senate approval; however, the coordinator will discuss the proposed additions with the Senate. The committee will also add the revision of the template as a goal, and will consider more substantive changes for the Senate's consideration in late Spring 2019 or Fall 2019.

iii. **Terminating a yearly/bi-yearly update plan for all programs**: The committee's proposal to cease all plans for a yearly or bi-yearly program review update was met with no disagreement from the Senate. Any discussion of program-review updates should be placed on hold until an integrated planning process is in place.

iv. **Modifying Faculty Staffing Request Form** to integrate more directly with Program Review: Senate had other revisions in mind, following most recent round, and will incorporate input from the committee.

b. Reflections on **meeting with Coordinators and Senate President re**: master assessment **schedule** (including Program Review, abridged Program Review, PLO and SLO assessments, and Curriculum Review): After two meetings, the schedule is mostly fixed, with some wiggle-room regarding Curriculum Review's placement in cycle, pending feedback from the Curriculum coordinator. Once the Senate votes on the revised schedule, it will be disseminated to the committee and the college as a whole.

c. Reflections on **eLumen presentation:** The platform looks promising, especially for Program Review's needs; demographic and enrollment data component (with direct ties to Banner) looks especially useful. According to the eLuman presenters, 50 out 75 California colleges have switched from Curriqunet to eLumen (all but a few are community colleges). Ease of data transfer is questionable; if the college decides to switch to the new platform, it would be wise first to copy all the assessment information, and have student workers perform the needed data-entry work to get the old information into the new system. The eLumen representatives agreed to give a **presentation for the PR Committee in early Spring, at perhaps the Feb. 11 meeting**. The coordinator noted that other interested parties, such as Counsellors, might want to join us, or perhaps set up a separate demonstration. Nick noted that Counsellors would be interested in knowing, for example, to what extent eLumen works with SARS and DegreeWorks. **The coordinator will follow up with David to confirm the date and time for the presentation.**

d. Reflections on **meetings with Damany and Pei-Lin regarding data** for next PR cycle: Pei-Lin noted that the format of the data may differ from what Peter provided in the last cycle, for Applied Technology & Business self-study reports. Research and Planning may not have updated information for all the areas in the template, but will try to have a package of data ready for the coordinator's use by February 1.

e. **Mid-year goals:** The discussion of goals was postponed from the last meeting of the Fall 2018 semester, which was cancelled due to lack of quorum. The committee reviewed a draft of the mid-year goals, updating items to reflect what was discussed earlier in the meeting. The goals will be presented by the coordinator to the Senate.

5. Adjournment—1st Dmitriy, 2nd Chris