

APROC Meeting Notes, November 30, 2017

Attendees: Jennifer Steele, Rosa Lopez, Dennis Gilbert, JS Bird, Kate Sullivan, Tammy Salman, Tammie Stark, Christina Howard, Sharon Hagan

Updates: Implementation Plans

- Signed copies of Implementation Plans with comments have been submitted for the following programs:
 - Art History, Ellen Thompson
 - ABSE, Julie Pfaff
 - Dance, Bonnie Simoa
 - Music, Matt Svoboda
 - Lit/Film, Eileen Thompson
 - 2D Art, JS Bird
 - CIT Networking, Joseph Colton
 - CIT Programming, Mari Good
 - Chemistry, Brooke Taylor
- E-copies are stored on APROC drive and paper copies in ASA office
- 2D Art reported second meeting with AMT was positive and reflected a much clearer idea of the process

Scheduling

- Tammie Stark asked for members to share options for winter meetings
- Tammie Stark will look at options and set up a Doodle poll to determine specific days/times

PRC Self-Study Questions Submitted

- Questions that have been submitted were distributed
- Discussion about timelines for review and referral to AMT
- Discussion about role of APROC at this stage with respect to “vetting” questions
- Dennis moved that those who can provide feedback to the chair send it to APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu by Monday, Dec 4, 10 am. Seconded by JS. Affirmed by acclamation.

APROC Question for PRCs

The APROC question must still be agreed upon and refined. Committee members agreed to do this work via email as soon as practical.

Program Updates

- Writing – affirmed that part-time faculty will get payment. Questions anticipated by December 11
- 3D Art was encouraged to limit the scope of self-study questions
- Jen reported that it is not clear how to implement PR recommendations that could be funded this year. She is working with admin team to develop a process. \$75,000 was set aside this year for implementation

- Kate and others expressed concern about full-time faculty needs, timing of full-time faculty requests, and how these requests would affect program review implementation and general program viability (Graphic Design as an example – part-time faculty acting as coordinator)
- Christina asked if PRC leads could be queried about what recommendation is implementation-ready to assist with prioritization
- JS commented that 2D Art has actions that can be implemented immediately
- Dennis stated all teams should know that there is a \$75,000 one-time funding resource for this year
- Kate pointed out that the Graphic Design Program needs funding for additional human resources and should consider including plans for the long-term sustainability of the program; as coach, she will advise program lead on these matters

Academic Program Review Implementation Phase Details

- Dennis reviewed major headings in the document, connecting it to the APR Guiding Principles
- Document describes three PR implementation pathways: 1) no barriers, 2) local barriers, 3) global barriers (“local” refers to department/division specific barriers; “global” refers to institution-wide barriers)
- Salient features:
 - IST – PRC lead & VP Designee forms the team and collaboratively selects team members; suggested this be reflected in the database
 - PRC makes summative recommendations to move the work forward; this work is supported by APROC to help provide the level of detail needed for implementation planning
 - IST and PRC will *jointly* summarize options and barriers; this work is supported by APROC as needed. **This artifact serves as the first report provided to APROC.** Tammie Stark noted this may be the information that we are capturing in the template.
 - Document notes that a lack of resources will be a primary barrier for most IST recommendations. IST will provide an **initial summary of recommendations and barriers based on their path (i.e., none, local, global)**
 - Local barriers – decided locally (e.g., divisionally); if recommendations cannot be resolved locally, this is reported to APROC
 - Global barriers – recommendations where there is no local authority to implement recommendations (e.g. , faculty and staff requests)
 - IST and APROC creates and maintains ongoing summaries of implementation process, barriers, and outcomes as a means to further inform college planning and prioritization processes, which is provided to IEC or other appropriate bodies.
- Jen notes that there needs to be an explicit feedback element in the process, such that when recommendations are implemented through a variety of funding courses (e.g., tech fees, Perkins, etc.) then this is communicated to related funding source committees for tracking and avoiding duplication of efforts/funding
- Jen also recommended that APROC should provide regular reporting of program improvements, which will include how resources were allocated

- Rosa had concerns that PR is incentivizing processes that may not align with mission fulfillment
- JS noted that recommendations are connected to core themes and implementation in the APROC implementation template
- Rosa expressed concerns that the visual representation of budget, decision and planning processes implies that PR recommendations will be approved regardless of Core Theme alignment
- Committee members acknowledged how the role of Core Themes has evolved recently and should continue to evolve

Topics for Future Meetings / Committee Work (including items from previous meetings)

- Look at data from IRAP that connects to Core Themes
- Draw up summary documents of discussions and recommendations following review of complete PR Reports (e.g. barriers to IEC, lessons learned)
- Determine topics for January review with Executive Deans and VP ASA, including:
 - Creation of a process to invite, review and determine if new and distinct programs/disciplines should undertake a separate Academic Program Review process than currently listed (see: <https://www.lanec.edu/academicprogramreview/lane-programs-review>)
- Create 3 budget projection scenarios showing the potential financial impact of paying part-time faculty for program review work; create an APR budget showing all expenses
- “Must-haves” for Self-Study Report Executive Summaries
- Determine how to track and report on recommendations and barriers over time. “One method is to use DAPR, but it’s crucial that we create space for conversations and processing,” meeting notes, 10.19.17. (In process: Implementation Plan template will be updated to include list of barriers.)
- “Deans’ and Directors’ role is critical, they may need more information about what their role is, existing communication efforts have seemed helpful, we need to continue reaching out to them. Consider hosting events for them specifically,” meeting notes, 10.19.17.