

## **APROC Meeting**

April 29, 2016

*In Attendance: Anne McGrail, Susan Reddoor, Jennifer Steele, JS Bird, Jean Lloyd, Kelly Collins, Christina Howard, Molloy Wilson, Craig Taylor, Mari Good, Joseph Colton, Rosa Lopez, Sharon Hagen, Kate Sullivan, Lee Imonen, Dennis Gilbert*

Purpose of the meeting: check in on the status of various review processes and teams with a goal of completing reviews by the end of the academic year

### **Progress Reports:**

#### Kelly Collins- MOA

- Have been reviewing competencies
- Which is the right trigger course for students coming into the program?
- Dawn DeWolf mentioned changes to the curriculum based on an external review but these haven't yet been shared with the faculty
- Medical Scribe program set up as a continuing education program. No registrations. Employers are sending employees to intensive two-week training programs; this may be causing the decline in demand.
- Basic Radiology Certificate – OMG has requested that the college consider offering this program
- Issue: Faculty program coordinator position is in limbo
- External review has not been scheduled
- >>APROC will let the AMT know that the program would like an update on the curricular changes and coordinator position

#### Mari Good – CIT Programming

- Department continues to be short staffed; now in the process of hiring two new faculty members. Additionally the dean is retiring
- Mari asked for O/L or CD funds as she couldn't take release. >>Jen and Anne will follow up on this.
- Started with a list of four questions: increasing enrollment and involvement of high school students, non-transitional students, and "bottleneck" courses, employment. Narrowed down to examining the first year sequence and employment.
- First year sequence: individual course completion rates are about 60%, which are significantly lower than completion rates in other CIT courses and other courses at the college. This has been a long-standing issue. Need to analyze root causes/factors. In order to answer these questions, we need to look at individual student characteristics. IRAP doesn't have this data.
- Currently stuck, but has clearly identified the need for faculty access to specific data to assess programs
- Need to design a process, database and application for tracking our students. The career center has a system that has been used for certain groups of students; perhaps this can be used for CIT.
- Will have a coop student in the fall help develop a tracking system for student employment
- Hope to complete in the summer, assuming data is available

### Joseph Colton – CIT Networking

- Similar issues as Mari regarding shortage of faculty in the department
- Questions regarding better understanding students: who is entering the program and where do they go when they exist. Has discarded a question regarding faculty resources b/c they don't have enough faculty resources to do this analysis.
- AMT question around CLOs appears to be more of a yes/no than a research question. They may incorporate CLOs into the implementation plan.
- Other AMT question is related to the advisory committee. The advisory committee doesn't seem to understand the program at Lane.
- >>Need an institutional structure to better support advisory committees and define roles
- Mari and Joseph don't want to know how many or what percent; they want to know who and why
- No timeline set for external review.

### Susan Reddoor – ALS

- Focus on the writing sequence. We reduced the number of required writing courses in the sequence and instituted a co-requisite where students take a developmental level and college level course during the same term.
- Questions around success data after the redesign compared to the prior design, and how students do in subsequent coursework
- Issue: limited faculty resources in the department
- Spent quite a bit of time during fall term working with coaches to develop questions. Winter term a new department chair came on board.
- Have been reviewing initial program review data package, attended statewide developmental education conferences and Achieving the Dream
- New dean is a "data person" and helped to make the data questions more sophisticated; these questions were just submitted to IRAP.
- Will schedule external review after they have had time to review and analyze the data
- >>Susan will share the data request with other teams as they may be common elements for academic review
- Susan has found that the review process requires a long-term relationship with IRAP and lots of time for back and forth and analysis
- IRAP would like to be involved in the development of questions (both from review teams and AMTs)
- Susan will be attending the upcoming ATD data summit

### Jean Bishop - ECE

- Started in 2014; bumpy process
- The faculty member originally assigned to the process handed it off to Jean this year.
- Straightforward questions: increasing enrollment and success rates and ensuring lab practicum aligns with course outcomes.
- Tension with students not seeing the modeling they wish to see.
- Have developed recommendations around lab improvements, advising/prerequisites, targeted marketing and program design (e.g. online courses) for individuals already working in the field. Centers are seeking higher ratings which require higher-trained staff, and closer collaboration with workforce centers.
- Already seeing results in the diversity of their student body and enrollment levels.
- Consider asking faculty from Southern Oregon Community College to do the external review

### Christina Howard - PTA

- Just completed external accreditation for the program; this provides an advantage in program review
- Things that emerged as she was completing the external accreditation self-study have become the basis for program review: are we reaching a diverse audience? does our admissions process limit diversity?
- Christina has the needed data for PTA because she collects it herself and is required to report it to the accrediting body. The data Christina has is markedly different from the data that IRAP presents.
- >>Need to access the source and validity of data.
- Christina will connect her findings to specific resource requests such as curriculum development.
- AMT question regarding CLOs is outcome-based not improvement-based
- Christina has completed a draft of her review and will share it with the committee

### **General Comments**

- Consider a way to showcase and highlight the program review work (perhaps an open house once or twice a year), broadly exchange information, and appreciate the depth and complexity of the college
- It will be useful to write the reviews in a way that helps readers understand the program (tells the story of the program) in addition to addressing specific questions and recommendations
- Program Review will support the college's vision for planning-based resource allocation
- >>Review teams: Please work to round out the year with a narrative self-study that discusses what you've discovered and initial findings and next steps.