

Academic Program Review Committee

Meeting Notes

Tuesday October 1, 2013

1:00-2:00p.m. – Admin 127

Committee Members Present: Bob Klier, Carolyn Pineda, Judy Kasabian (Wanda Morris absent but provided written recommendations)

Faculty/Program Representatives Present: Hiram Hironaka, Robert Beaudoin, Daniel Shrader, Stephanie Rodriguez

Committee Recommendations – 2013 Automotive Technology Program Review

i. General Comments

- Revise document with a general audience in mind; that is, any faculty, staff member, administrator, or member of the public should be able to comprehend the document and be educated about the program.
- Include costs or cost estimates for any recommendations.
- Ensure that recommendations build off thorough analysis and identification of any needs.
- Consider how and where to include additional information regarding new building and how the facilities, equipment, and setup fit with teaching, vision, staffing needs, etc. of the program.
- Consider how to strengthen presentation of hybrid technologies and how this fits with curricular recommendations.

1. Overview of the Program

- When making statement about upcoming LBCC trades program closure and already evidenced increased enrollment demands at ECC, clarify type of data you refer to with “evidenced by data” phrasing. Make clearer the bigger picture of how other program closures will clearly impact program at ECC (1a).
- If not already apparent, include jobs typically associated with program certificates. (This could also be done, if appropriate, when discussing hybrid technology courses and “Phase 1” of planned curricular changes.) (1b)
- Remove duplicate 1c entry for SLOs (1c #2).
- Provide clear status update for prior Program Review recommendations (e.g. “Complete”, “No Action Taken”, “Ongoing”) (1d).

2. Analysis of Research Data

- Consider whether success standard will continue to be appropriate for potential influx of students with increased and different section offerings. The success minimum/“floor” might, if appropriate, drop from 64.9% to 63% or a few percentage points below and then the program can set an appropriate target above that minimum. Rates that fall below the minimum/“floor” are the ones that shoul

prompt concern, not necessarily those below a target. Variables will always influence and should be noted as a caveat (2.a.3).

- Use “Data may have been influenced by...” language instead of “A factor not revealed by the data is...” (2.a.4).
- Address where program falls within state success, retention, etc. standards. The Chancellor’s Office DataMart is an appropriate resource for this comparison information.

3. Curriculum

- Address hybrid technology content more thoroughly. How many courses? Timeline? Sequence? Certificates? Are there models from other schools? Make clear what the first phase of this curriculum plan is and where future phases might lead (3b).
- Emphasize potential student demand for the hybrid courses. This also relates to your comments regarding warranty expiration for hybrid vehicles and how the time is right for this program expansion.
- Use data provided by Institutional research and Planning (IRP) to more fully address degrees, certificates, licenses, etc. (3.e.3).
- Request and include ASE certification data as additional information about job/employment preparation and success.

4. Assessment and Student and Program Learning Outcomes (SLOs & PLOs)

- Include PLO assessment results (4d).
- Item 4e should address program status on the ACCJC SLO rubric. Use provided rubric to determine and discuss program placement on this rubric (4e).
- Include any program discussion regarding SLO assessment results and use of those results to continue existing and/or take new actions (4f).

5. Facilities and Equipment

- Strengthen discussion of new facilities and your program’s input on the planning and building process, especially in relation to developing student learning opportunities (within ASF restrictions, of course). Did program get items included that will help program stay current, assist faculty, keep up with new technologies and curricular proposals, etc.? Again, keep a general audience in mind who may not possess knowledge of building process and the opportunities (along with any limitations) it provided to program. Also include any items that need continued attention and justifications for those needs.

6. Technology and Software

- Comment during our review session regarding SmartRoom technology was interesting and surprising. Similar to facilities recommendation, consider a fuller discussion of technology involved in new facility and how it meets program and student needs.

7. Staffing

- Strengthen case for staffing recommendations. It is apparent program will need replacement faculty, but ensure the need is clearly stated and references earlier material regarding student success, curriculum delivery, needed facilities oversight, etc.
- Articulate need for lab assistants more clearly

8. Future Direction and Vision

9. Prioritized Recommendations

- Include costs and associated Strategic Initiatives alongside recommendations. Use table provided in Program Review Template.

10. CTE Review (if applicable)

- The committee will more fully address CTE Review questions at a later point this semester.

Next Tuesday APRC meeting: Tuesday October 8, 2013, 1:00-2:00p.m. – Theatre