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| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Program Review Committee Minutes | | | | | |
| september 17, 2014 | | | 1:00-1:50 pm | | L 246 |
| Quorum = 5 members | | | | | |
| note taker | Angie Arietti | | | | |
| Attendees | Susan Yonker, Chair AS Vice President (Non-Voting) | | | Randy Beach, Resource IPROC Coordinator (Non-Voting) | |
| Andrew Rempt, AS President-Elect Ex-officio (Voting) | | |  | |
| Maya Bloch, School of Counseling and Personal Development (Voting) | | | Vacant-School of Arts & Communications (Voting) | |
| Walt Justice, School of Health, Exercise Science, Athletics & Applied Technology (Voting) | | | Vacant-School of Continuing Ed., Economic and Workforce Development (Voting) | |
| Lynn Pollock, School of Language & Literature (Voting) | | | Vacant-HEC Representative (Voting) | |
| Margie Stinson, School of Math, Science & Engineering (Voting) | | | Vacant-Part-Time Faculty (Voting) | |
| Thomas Murray, School of Social Sciences, Business & Humanities (Voting) | | |  | |
| Mark Meadows-Representative, Deans’ Council (Voting) | | |  | |
| Arnold Josafat-Instructional Support Services (Voting) | | |  | |
| GUEST/s | Patti Flores-Charter, Academic Senate President | | | Janet Mazzarella | |
| Joel Levine | | |  | |
| **Call to Order/Approval of Agenda** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| Discussion | | Approval of agenda; M/S/C. A question was asked to whether a committee member was allowed to approve the agenda and minutes via through email. It was suggested to take this question back to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for review of Robert’s Rules and Brown Act. | | | |
| **Public Comment** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| Discussion | | IPRC Announcement: Randy stated that the IPRC met last week and discussed revising the comprehensive program review for the next cycle because of the changed accreditation standards. Our comprehensive has been around and hasn’t been changed in quite some time. There is hope that APRC and other groups would be willing to discuss this change and even perhaps form a small group from each constituency to talk about it. | | | |
| **Approval of Minutes from September 3, 2014** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| Discussion | | Approval of minutes from 09-03-14; M/S/C. | | | |
| **Updates: Revised Meeting Schedule; Liberal Arts Placement** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| Discussion | | **Revised Meeting Schedule**: Susan sent out the revised meeting schedule with the agenda for this meeting.  **Liberal Arts Placement**: We as a committee need to decide where they are going on the 3-yr cycle. There are four different Liberal Arts Degrees: English & Communications, Arts & Humanities, Math & Science, and Social and Behavior Sciences.  A question was asked as to who owns the Liberal Arts majors? We currently do have interdisciplinary programs that do have owners. It was suggested that the Curriculum Committee needs to decide who the owners are and then the Academic Program Review would act accordingly. | | | |
| **Astronomy Comprehensive 2014-2015** | | | | | janet mazzarella | |
| DISCUSSION | | The APR Committee received a request to postpone Astronomy’s Comprehensive Review for one year. Janet Mazzarella spoke on behalf of the department. The issue is that the primary full-time instructors are out on leave. Grant Miller is scheduled to return next fall. Jeff Veal is out on sabbatical this year. Janet explained that most part-time faculty are brand new and shouldn’t be speaking on behalf of the needs of the department. We have a new building coming in 2-3 years and the department chairs have been told that it is very important to have a thorough quality submission because it talks about our program and it helps with our funding and staffing. Janet really wants her faculty to envision and support their vision for the future relating to the new building and their discipline. It was mentioned that Computer Science is in their 3rd year of snap shot, so they could switch Computer Science with Astronomy and next year it would be reversed.  There was a concern for equity amongst the cycles.  A motion was made to support Janet’s request to postpone the Astronomy Comprehensive Review for one year, was seconded and passed with a 7 in favor to 1 opposed vote. Motion passes; M/S/C. | | | | |
| **World Languages Comprehensive 2014-2015** | | | | | joel levine | |
| DISCUSSION | | Joel Levine spoke on behalf of World Languages. He is asking to delay/postpone the comprehensive program review until next year. He stated that there are extenuating circumstances that will be affecting the World Languages Comprehensive Review. Faculty from six different disciplines will be going out on some type of leave this year and will not have full-time faculty teaching them. Everything else will be manned by part-time faculty. The input of the faculty that will not be present to work on the comprehensive review will have a big impact on the department. This is a critical time as opposed to doing a snap shot.  There was a recommendation that in the future we have parameters set up and define what a “dire situation” is. We should also limit the number of switches. If you have to change it, then we should limit it to how many times it can be done.  A motion was made to postpone the World Languages Comprehensive Review for one year, was seconded and passed with a 7 in favor to 1 opposed vote. Motion passes; M/S/C.  A question was asked about when the World Languages and Astronomy snap shot will be due. | | | | |
| **Political Science Comprehensive 2013-2014** | | | | | Susan Yonker | |
| DISCUSSION | | The Political Science 2013-2014 Comprehensive Review did not get approved last year. They also did not turn in the revisions that were requested. It was done by a faculty member last year and was also asked to do some revisions. The revisions were due by December 5, 2013, but were not done. Phil Saenz has asked if he can do a legitimate snap shot for 2014-2015. It was stated that Political Science did pay a price because they were not able to get funding due to not completing the comprehensive.  There was a comment made that what is the value of the process of making that correction and what is the purpose of the comprehensive review. The comprehensive review is supposed to drive the snap shot. If it is not done, then how can they use the comprehensive to drive the snap shot and this is what accreditation is looking for. They want to see that you do complete the comprehensive review and that it drives the budgetary request. At FHP, they are talking about making sure that these are done. The question is how are we going to do this if people are required to make corrections? One idea was if they are done at the time of submitting the FHP, then it is accepted. If it is not done by the final correction date, the FHP request would then get pulled.  This topic will be added to the agenda for the next meeting as an action item. | | | | |
| **Comprehensive vs. Snapshot Equity** | | | | | susan Yonker | |
| DISCUSSION | | The meeting ended before this item was discussed. | | | | |
| **OTHER** | | | | | All | |
| DISCUSSION | | The meeting ended before this item was discussed. | | | | |
| **Adjournment** | | | | | Susan Yonker | |
| Discussion | | The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m. | | | | |
| The next meeting will be October 1, 2014 from 1:00-1:50 p.m. in L 246. | | | | | | |