|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Program Review Committee Minutes | | | | | |
| february 15, 2017 | | | 1:20 – 2:10 pm | | L 246 |
| Quorum = 4 members | | | | | |
| note taker | Angie Arietti | | | | |
| Attendees | Susan Yonker, Chair AS Vice President | | | Dionicio Monarrez-School of Wellness, Exercise Science & Athletics | |
| ~~Patricia Flores-Charter-Past President or President-Elect~~ | | | James Spillers-Representative, Deans’ Council | |
| ~~Eun Park- School of Arts, Communications & Social Science~~ | | | Vacant-HEC Representative | |
| Emily Lynch Morissette-School of Business & Technology | | | Arnold Josafat-Instructional Support Services | |
| Erik Moberly- School of Counseling and Student Support Programs | | | Vacant-Part-Time Faculty | |
| ~~Lynn Pollock-School of Language, Literature & Humanities~~ | | | ~~Linda Hensley, Resource Office of Institutional Effectiveness~~ | |
| Margie Stinson-School of Mathematics, Science & Engineering | | |  | |
| 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 11/9/16 & 12/01/16** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| action | | The minutes were approved as presented. | | | |
| **Chair’s Report** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| info | | In IPRC, we are talking about what we are going to be doing next year. We are talking about several changes to our processes and what we are implementing next fall.  In fall, we are sticking with Formstack and not using eLumen for program review. We may pilot a system called “WEAVE Education”. The CSU’s use it and Chris Hayashi has experience using it at SDSU and said that it was very intuitive. Linda Gilstrap already had it on her radar to use it for accreditation management. We will have everyone use Formstack.  Do we want one form that has ten steps in it like 2015 or do we want to use a one step per form like last time? A committee member stated that she liked separating the action steps. It was easier to distribute the work. Another member agreed, but brought up that there was an issue because information was not in the description and it was hard to figure out what people were asking for. The hourly worker was doing a great job manipulating the data and making it more user friendly.  Andrew Rempt sent a query out on listserve to see what other colleges were using. ELumen seemed to be our best shot. Community colleges have not adopted WEAVE Education because may not be friendly to SLO’s. It does have an assessment module that we can customize.  Linda Hensley noticed that for prioritization, there is a decent amount of counterproductive separation between the committees when it comes time to prioritize. Linda was thinking about putting together a committee for prioritization that would include the co-chairs of each committee that is involved sit at the table. Prioritization could fall to this committee because everyone would be together to discuss any concerns that they may have.  Susan will provide our feedback to the IPRC Committee. The level 1, which is the VP’s and the Superintendent/President received an extension on their deadline for program review. February 1st was when it was due, but there was some problems with Formstack for that level. Linda gave them an extension until February 6th.  Outcomes Assessment Timeline: We need to discuss whether we want that to be a single document with the program review or if we want it to stay a separate document. What is happening now is that people are turning in their program reviews, they are being approved, but there are no consequences if you do not turn in your outcomes assessment timeline. We can change that it if we want, but only about 80% turned theirs in. This can affect accreditation. There was a question asked about SLO information. Susan explained that the union is currently negotiating compensation for inputting SLO data. Contractually, the simple fact is, we are not required to do anything except on our evaluation forms. We are supposed to check off a few boxes that state that we use SLO’s to inform our curriculum choices.  A committee member stated that each year she enters SLO information and it does not show up. It was explained that the data is not missing. Every time we make a major shift from one software to the next, this seems to happen repeatedly. ELumen needs to go back and rebuild it. We need to try to figure out how to bring back the data, where is it, and is the data correct? Many other colleges are having problems with eLumen as well. There is a meeting with the point people coming up next week. It was stated that we are looking to perhaps go to Canvas rather than use Webadvisor. We would enter our SLO’s at the same time that we enter our grades. Susan has been using Canvas this semester and the overall experience has been very smooth. It has a feature where you can do rubrics for our students to see, but it also connects directly to our SLO’s. If we move forward with our negotiations, then we could require people to use SLO data as one of their action steps. Bob Stretch has been helping with eLumen SLO problems. | | | |
| **Late Comprehensives** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| Action | | There is a simple question that is being asked of this committee. Do we read and give feedback to the three comprehensive reviews that came in late past the deadline? We would not be accepting them for any sort of resources. We would just be giving them some feedback. Someone suggested that by reading then and giving feedback, we might be giving program faculty false hope.  There is a motion to read Automotive Technology, Recording Arts and Technology, and Counseling & PD and give feedback. The motion was second and discussion began.  Susan explained why the comprehensives were received late. We do not have a policy as what happens if they miss the deadline. Do we take into account the special circumstances? We should probably make a policy.  The motion failed unanimously and was not approved. | | | |
| **eLumen Survey and the Future of Electronic APR** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| Action | | Three out of six people filled out the survey. There was a recommendation to eliminate eLumen. We will bring the eLumen survey back at our next meeting due to time constraints. Please take a look at the survey and the comments and bring it back for our next meeting on March 1st. | | | |
| **Committee Rubrics in Snapshot** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
| Action | | This was postponed. | | | |
| **Adjournment** | | | | | Susan Yonker |
|  | | The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m. | | | |
| The next meeting will be March 1, 2017 from 1:20 – 2:10 p.m. in L 246. | | | | | |