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| Academic Program Review CommitteeMinutes |
| march 1, 2017 | 1:20 – 2:10 pm | L 246 |
| Quorum = 4 members |
| note taker | Angie Arietti |
| Attendees | Susan Yonker, Chair AS Vice President | Margie Stinson-School of Mathematics, Science & Engineering |
| ~~Patricia Flores-Charter-Past President or President-Elect~~ | Dionicio Monarrez-School of Wellness, Exercise Science & Athletics |
| Vacant-School of Arts, Communications & Social Science | James Spillers-Representative, Deans’ Council |
| ~~Emily Lynch Morissette-School of Business & Technology~~ | Vacant-HEC Representative |
| Erik Moberly-School of Counseling and Student Support Programs | Arnold Josafat-Instructional Support Services |
| Lynn Pollock-School of Language, Literature & Humanities | Vacant-Part-Time Faculty |
| GUEST/s |  |  |
| **Call to Order/Approval of Agenda**  | Susan Yonker |
| Action | The Meeting was called to order at 1:20 p.m. The agenda was approved as presented. |
| **Public Comment**  | Susan Yonker |
| discussion | None at this time. |
| **Approval of Minutes from 02/15/17** | Susan Yonker |
| action | The minutes were approved as presented. |
| **Chair’s Report** | Susan Yonker |
| info | We are still following up on Emily’s concern from our last meeting about Recording Arts and Technology getting software for their computers without going through the prioritization process at all. Linda Hensley, Emily and Susan discovered that according to Dan Borges, the software was a replacement. This makes no sense because replacement technology is just hardware officially. Therefore, software by definition cannot be considered replacement. The computers were on the replacement schedule and were replaced a couple of years ago. However, in order to be operable, they needed updated software. Susan, Linda, and Emily are going to meet with Dan and find out what they may have been able to do without the software. The problem is if you get the replacement hardware that is unusable without the software, then does it really need to be replaced? We have to find out exactly what happened. We are going to explain our position to Dan that if it goes outside the program review process, it creates a problem with the process as a whole. We plan to explain the process and if there is a problem with it, then he can let us know and give us ideas of how to fix it. It is very much in line with Linda’s idea for program review where we have a committee that prioritizes as packages so you do not end up with computers that do not work because they do not have necessary software. We will look at our process and get some input from Dan. We are still moving forward with having a demo of a new software called “Weave.” We will hopefully be looking at it sometime this month. We will let you know if it looks promising. At AOC, there was a discussion that IT might be willing to create a homegrown system for SLO’s. Margie stated that they are going to try to do a pilot and they will be starting with Biology. Biology has already turned over all of the stuff that Bob Stretch needs to be able to go back to IT and find out if their system would be doable. If it is doable, then Biology would put its SLO scores into the homegrown system this semester. We would probably have to also put it into eLumen, so either way it is there to see. Margie was very impressed with all of the effort that IT put in. They really understood the problems and Bob Stretch had presented five options with what the pros and cons would be. We have a very strong IT team.  |
| **Add Standing Committee Rubrics to Snapshot** | Susan Yonker |
| Action | We are probably going to be using Formstack for one more year for the snapshot because we are hoping to move to the homegrown or Weave system software within a year. The rubrics of each committee are on the IPRC website on page 27 of the IPRC handbook near the end. There was a suggestion to create a link in Formstack that would go directly to each of the rubrics that you need. This should be done by fall.  |
| **eLumen Survey: Conclusions?** | Susan Yonker |
| Action | We will not be using eLumen for the comprehensives. The SLO data did not come through. Susan passed out responses to the survey. Nine disciplines were involved. Three dropped out before they finished. We need to make the SLO timeline more obvious. The things that they did not like seem to be related to eLumen. What should Susan tell IPRC as far as splitting between one action step per form? We decided to keep it to one form per step. Should we have the SLO timeline be a part of the requirements for submitting the program review? Right now, there are not any consequences for not submitting an SLO timeline. There is no real way to link it. There was a suggestion to put it in as a question in the snapshot as part of the instructions. Perhaps put a note in the instructions in the snapshot to include the SLO timeline. No one really knows what an action step is. It makes it really hard to try to understand their justifications. It is also coming up in our new design. Your action step is meant to be your goal and the bundled items are associated with the task that you want to complete. An example of a goal is to increase your enrollment by 10%. The task would be creating a new Math Lab to make that happen. The resource should be the means. The end should be how it will improve student outcomes. Tasks are what you need to do to accomplish your goal. A project is a task. We can rewrite to directions to make it clearer. Susan handed out sample action step titles and description paper to have the committee look at and see what others were putting down as their action steps. They discovered that the action steps were mostly tasks instead of goals. The snapshot would benefit from a focus on goals. There was a suggestion to do a presentation to all of the chairs. Susan will talk to IPRC and ask that the directions be more informative so they can get a clear idea of what a task is and what a goal is. Also, show a couple of examples.  |
| **Add DE to Comprehensive APR?** | Susan Yonker |
| Action |  This was postponed. |
| **Adjournment** | Susan Yonker |
|  | The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.  |
| The next meeting will be March 15, 2017 from 1:20 – 2:10 p.m. in L 246. |