

# Academic Program Review Committee

## Meeting Notes

Thursday October 10, 2013

1:00-2:00p.m. – Admin 127

Committee Members Present: Bob Klier, Janet Young, Chris Wells (Additional committee members did not attend but provided written comments)

Faculty/Program Representatives Present: Juli Soden, Kristi Daniels-DiGregorio

## Committee Recommendations – 2013 Human Development Program Review

### i. General Comments

- Include material relating to full-time faculty recommendation in relevant areas of the document (i.e. curriculum, student success, etc.).
- Consider recent adult re-entry population findings and AB 86 issues, where relevant and useful.

### 1. Overview of the Program

- Here and perhaps in Section 2, make clear reasons why program was affected especially hard by cutbacks (i.e. EOPS cutbacks influencing Human Development offerings, etc.)
- Discuss distinction from Academic Strategies and why your program is “Human Development”.
- Include information about who your students are and their various groups (i.e. dedicated sections for EOPS students versus other groups) and how students get to you (i.e. program, student/teacher referrals).
- Consider Including discussion of Student Success Task Force and influence on Human Development earlier in document.
- Adjust status of full-time faculty in section 1.d

### 2. Analysis of Research Data

- Consider use of more direct measures such as pre/post testing and consider working with IRP to develop any additional needed survey instruments. This could be used as a recommendation for this and/or section 4 material.
- Include additional explanation regarding student success rates and influence of program thinking/philosophy regarding grades in Human Development courses rather than Pass/No Pass option (2.a.3).
- Address 5-week classes.
- Address Human Development 8’s 75% retention rate in 2012 (page 18).
- Include any additional recommendations at end of section 2.

### 3. Curriculum

- Update section 3.b based on upcoming meetings. (Does Human Development 12 fulfill Area E?)
- Clarify nature/basis of “research based” statements in 3.e.

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

- Consider whether Human Development should be ranked at the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level on the ACCJC SLO Rubric (4.e).

#### **5. Facilities and Equipment**

#### **6. Technology and Software**

- Consider increasing to 50 seat count of requested lab space so space can be shared with other programs.

#### **7. Staffing**

- What you are arguing for is apt, but note that 75/25% rule is a college-wide average and not program-specific.
- Re-prioritize faculty-hire.
- Consider expansion of argument/evidence relating to need for full-time position here and elsewhere in document.

#### **8. Future Direction and Vision**

#### **9. Prioritized Recommendations**

#### **10. CTE Review (if applicable)**

Revised human Development Program Review document will be submitted to the APRC by Friday November 1, 2013.