|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Program Review Committee Minutes | | | | | |
| october 04, 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 | |
| Emily Lynch Morissette-President-Elect | | | Dionicio Monarrez-School of Wellness, Exercise Science & Athletics | |
| Eun Park-School of Arts, Communications & Social Science | | | ~~James Spillers-Representative, Deans’ Council~~ | |
| Vacant-School of Business & Technology | | | Andrew Rempt-Instructional Support Services | |
| Erik Moberly-School of Counseling and Student Support Programs | | | Vacant-HEC Representative | |
| Lynn Pollock-School of Language, Literature & Humanities | | | Vacant-Part-Time Faculty | |
| GUEST/s |  | | |  | |
| **Call to Order/Approval of Agenda** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| Action | | The agenda was approved as presented. | | | |
| **Public Comment** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| discussion | | There was not public comment at this time. | | | |
| **Approval of Minutes from 09/20/17** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| action | | The minutes were approved as presented. | | | |
| **Chair’s Report** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| info | | There was some problems finding data that is needed for the data sets; pass/no pass information was not present. IT contacted Bob Stretch, Susan, and Everett. IT is willing to help and so is the Research Department. It was suggested to have a meeting with IT on the missing data. IT does not want to forward bad data. | | | |
| **Reader Teams and Process** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| discussion | | Susan passed out a handout of the APR Reader Teams 2017-2018 to help prepare for program review. We are short two members. We are missing School of Business & Technology representative and Patricia Flores-Charter was here as a Resource/Past-President. Susan stated that she did not yet have a partner to read the program reviews with. She did say that perhaps Community, Economic and Urban Development (CEUD) and International Logistics and Transportation (INTL-LT) may not have any comprehensive program reviews turned in. She asked if the teams that had these two programs wouldn’t mind taking one more program onto their sections. The program review comprehensive have to be read two weeks after the deadline to turn them in, which is November 1st. So, we need to return them back to the programs if work is needed by November 14th or 15th. This way, they will have time before our break, to send any revisions to us.  Normally we would meet on November 1st, but we will not this year. We are meeting on the November 8th, 15th, and the 29th if needed. On November 8th, we can have an initial discussion on what we have read. We can then resolve any questions that we may have at this meeting. There was a request to have a 2-hour meeting on the 8th. Susan would like to get everyone their Program Reviews to read by Friday, November 3rd and have everyone at least glance at them or finish reading them before our meeting on November 8th. There was a motion and second to have a 2-hour meeting on November 8th. This motion passed with one no vote. We will have Dionicio and Lynn start with their questions first. A lot of the discussion is between the two readers that are assigned to a specific program review. Last year, a lot of the conversations were done through email.  There was a motion to extend time for five minutes, second and passed unanimously.  Last time we did program review, the committee members emailed each other with their concerns and cc’d Susan at the same time. Susan was able to pull out the most contentious of concerns and the committee resolved them together. This seemed to be pretty efficient.  Susan explained what was going on with CEUD and ITLA-LT. She stated that Elisabeth Shapiro asked her if those two programs could be rolled into their Business Comprehensive. Susan told her no, because the Business Comprehensive wasn’t due until next year. Elisabeth said that she wasn’t aware of that and then she wouldn’t be able to do it at all. That was when it came clear that they were not going to be reviewed because there is no Full-time faculty driving either of these programs and they don’t have the funding to pay an adjunct to do it because funding was cut to do either of these. The question for this committee is whether we are okay with letting them roll this in with Business for next year? Susan will put it on the APRC agenda soon because unless someone turns in a comprehensive for either of these programs this year, these two programs will be receiving a one-year extension and the committee will have to weigh in. They also will not be eligible for FHP. They did have someone turn in a snapshot last year for International Logistics and Transportation. It is very important to note that there are programs or areas where it is an adjunct who actually has to do this and if we are not offering a stipend, then shame on us. It would have to be a college-wide thing. It would be a good idea to let the Governing Board know that we do need a stipend to complete these areas or it should be rolled in to an adjacent program.  There was a motion and second to extend time for 3 more minutes. The motion passed unanimously.  It does create a question that if they are too small to complete a program review, then should they even be a free standing program? What is the Academic Program Review Committees role in this? How many times has this came up? Have we had to revisit this question over and over again? Is this something that we need to establish guidelines for so it just becomes automatic? If the college is not going to establish a uniformed stipend across the board for adjunct faculty to complete the program review, then the likelihood of the program review getting complete is greatly diminished and shouldn’t they be will into the nearest applicable larger program so it doesn’t mean that they are disenfranchised from the process. It is not their fault that they don’t have the funds to guide them. Either way, the part-time faculty member is given more work to do. Susan is going to ask deans how many departments/programs are in the same situation. This way, we can settle this particular question. The reason that these two programs were separated is because Susan said the faculty told her that was how it was supposed to be. It is not our purview as a committee to decide whose role it is supposed to be. We can’t decide how to staff their area. Susan will send an email to all of the deans and ask for more information.  It was brought up that Marie Vicario does a lot of program reviews for adjunct faculty.  Susan asked this committee where we want to load the information. Should we put it on Blackboard or CANVAS? Susan brought up the point that we can’t add people on CANVAS, so it will be easier to load everything to Blackboard. | | | |
| **Action Steps: Tasks vs. Resource Requests** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| discussion | | Susan had a question about what you do if you have an action step that requires a few resources. Some of the things like collaborating some things with another department in your school is an important task or action step. The collaboration isn’t the action step. An action step is to improve the success of ESL students when they transfer into their English courses is your goal. Collaboration with the English department is part of that, because it can’t be an action step if you don’t know what you are hoping to get out of it. I want to collaborate, but why? It is clearly a task. The current snapshot really devalues those tasks that aren’t money based. There is just no place to put them. Every resource request goes straight to the prioritization committees and the tasks with no money attached go absolutely nowhere. If collaborating is an important part of the tasks that you are going to reach into achieving your step. Then it is important to have it recorded for people to easily look at and see that you are doing, this, this, and this. Right now, the only place is in the instructions and the description. Shouldn’t the people who are focused on the task collaborating, break it down into an action that can be resourced? For example, Conduct more workshops with blah, blah, blah. That would be something that you can ask for more resources for. It was brought up that it might be people asking for stuff just to ask for it. If someone has a task that would require resources, they should write it as an action. So, if the action step were to increase student learning and retention in the ESL students. That is your action step that doesn’t require any resources. Then when you are feeling out the Form Stack, you could take it all the way down to the part of requesting and still at the end, submit it. It was explained that you can’t also delineate from your tasks. You have to cram all of your tasks that don’t require any money into a 500 word box. We need to revise the form to focus less on the Christmas list and more on what we want to accomplish and how. | | | |
| **New PR Framework: Brainstorm!** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| discussion | | Susan asked this committee what we want the overall framework to look like. Susan is imagining it looking like a flowchart. We would have the steps that we want to see and what we would like to go into each step. IT will work with us to create something that makes sense. Susan would like to move the connection of strategic priorities into the comprehensive. We could have a chart that shows what we want in it and in what order. We may keep the word form. In the comprehensive for next time, we might add a step. For the snapshot, what would we like to have in it? If your overall goals for the next three years are in your comprehensive, and you don’t have to worry about doing it every single year, you could have your goals. What would you like to see in the snapshot? There was a suggestion to have all of the priorities and how far we have come in achieving them. It should have a direct link to what was in the comprehensive, so we don’t have to start over. We should have the goal and how far we are along in achieving that. We need to connect with strategic priorities. It never says to connect to your very own comprehensive. It is like the snapshot forgot the comprehensive evidence. If we have a connection to the comprehensive and the snapshot, then the connection to the strategic priorities will be there because it is in the comprehensive. We don’t talk about goals in the comprehensive anymore because it is in the snapshot. We analyze the data and let them know how our program is working and then we apply that to the snapshot. We can change that so that we have 3-years of goals in the comprehensives and have an annual check in for the snapshot. If something changes, we can always add a new goal before the next comprehensive is due. It should be a question of where are we along in the comprehensive. Where are we at as far as achieving our goals and achieving what we want? Has anything changed or needs to be modified since our last review? | | | |
| **Adjournment** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
|  | | The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m. | | | |
| The next meeting will be October 18, 2017 from 1:20 – 2:10 p.m. in L 246. | | | | | |