|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Program Review Committee Minutes | | | | | |
| september 20, 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 | | Andrew went to the first institute training for the Guided Pathways. It was pretty intense. One of the topics that continued to come up was the need for readjusting all of our processes to support guided pathways, including program review. We need to make sure that program review and learning outcomes are tied closely together, especially in the area of programs. This is going to be essential for the mapping that will be necessary for the first pillar, which is clarifying the path. Andrew does have a meeting with Susan and the SLO coordinators. We need to start talking about aligning our outcomes and start focusing on program outcomes as opposed to course outcomes and focusing on program review in alignment with those outcomes as well. There was also some discussion in using program reviews to state analyze your programs and start using that as your first step to mapping. One of the things that we are looking at to use for Opening Day is a giant introductions to make a case for Guided Pathways, which is very compelling. We need to discuss how your programs are going to fit into these particular pathways. | | | |
| **Approval of Minutes from 09/06/17** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| action | | The minutes were approved as presented. | | | |
| **Chair’s Report** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| info | | Susan sent out an email to all faculty and cc’d the administrators so they know what their faculty are doing. Attached to the email, was a workshop schedule for this year. Susan hasn’t had a chance to see how many people have signed up yet. Please spread the word to your constituents, you can sign up in Mylearningplan. | | | |
| **FHP Language in Comprehensive** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| discussion | | In our last meeting, we had talked about changing the FHP language in the comprehensive, in question two. We had wanted to make sure that the FHP data would answer the data. The next FHP meeting is next Tuesday.  There was a motion to change question #2 from: (Old on Website): Full-time and Part-time ratios meet college averages to: Over the last five years, what is your program’s average percentage of full-time, part-time and overload? This is going to require everyone who has already started working of their comprehensive. Susan was think of putting an addendum on the webpage. There was a question asked if the information that everyone received on Friday has the percentage of overload in it. We may be able to ask David Wales. There was a recommendation to separate #2 to two different questions.  There was a motion to extend for two minutes, second and passed.  There was a discussion on actually using overloads in the question.  There was a motion to extend for two minutes, second and passed.  There was a motion to approve a friendly amendment made to Margie’s amendment saying that we approve the change in language with the exception of removing the overload percentage box, with the understanding that folks will fill that in elsewhere to make their argument. Margie accepted the friendly amendment. The vote passed unanimously. | | | |
| **New Data Dashboards** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| discussion | | Susan had a meeting with the IT folks and Business Objects is on the website. Everyone has access to it now. Those who have MAC’s will be able to access it at work, but not at home due to security issues. We have the power to ask IT to shut down the old Data Dashboards at any time. Right now, we have access to both of them and it is up to the IPRC to tell them what to do. Some questions were raised: Is there an issue to having both dashboards open? Will everyone know that the new dashboard is ready to use and that they know have access to it? Susan clarified that everyone has access from their office and all Susan needs to do is send out an email to let people know. It is supposed to help send out instructions. It may be good not to have access to both, because the old dashboard does not have good data. The new data is going to be coming from MIS. It is the most accurate information that we have, which we have been sending to the State. Susan has showed us from the website how to get to iStrategy and IT has agreed to change the link to Business Objects on the website. Susan stated that the drawback to having both dashboards open is confusion an inaccurate data. The advantage is that those who do not get confused, will find the information interesting to compare and it also increases transparency of what is happening in IT. We could always compare our data this year with what we put down last year. If anyone has any questions about iStrategy, Susan can help them go to iStrategy.  There was a motion and second that we ask IT make the old link to iStrategy go away and replace it with the Business Objects link. The motion passed with 5 members voting yes and 1 member voting no. | | | |
| **Action Steps: Tasks vs. Resource Requests** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| discussion | | This was postponed. | | | |
| **2018 PR Task Force** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| discussion | | They are ready to pay programmers to work overtime in October to start making our very own form for program review once they receive the funding. They want us to tell them what we would like to include in the form. We get to help decide we want it to be. We will be rewriting the questions.  The snapshot has taken on a life of its own. The snapshot has become a monster because of the information that needs to go into it for the prioritization committees because of the limitations in the software that we have in order to spit out information in the excel spreadsheets. It is aware of the problem because they have to deal with that side. They are really motivated to make that simpler. If we can offload some of the strategic priority stuff and load it onto the comprehensive, it could make the process easier. The snapshots were originally made as a check-in to see how things are going. The comprehensive is where you would make goals that connect to the institutional priorities. You should have your own department’s strategic priorities. We would have to call it something else, but those connect to the institutional priorities. It really needs to be towards program outcomes. We need to move away from course outcomes to program outcomes. Program outcomes is something that achievable within three years, and those outlines need to align with the overall institutional goals. Now the Institutional goals are definitely going to be going under a revamp as well in light of Guided Pathways. So, it makes sense that that would be the alignment. How that works in terms of yearly prioritization, would then be that you have these program goals that you are trying to achieve in three years. In the progress of that 3-year plan, you are then saying that you need a certain item that is justified within the service of the original outcome. What if your plan changes within the three years? There needs to be a place where you can discontinue a goal or modify it in some way. We can decide and let IT know.  With our Program Review Task Force, we are going to brainstorm what needs to be done with maintenance and what is an innovation that is appropriate for program review. We are going to look at it as a big picture in that way. There was a suggestion to make a list of what is appropriate to put on the comprehensive. | | | |
| **Adjournment** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
|  | | The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m. | | | |
| The next meeting will be October 4, 2017 from 1:20 – 2:10 p.m. in L 246. | | | | | |