

**Lane Community College**  
**Working Charter Draft: Academic Program Review Oversight Committee**

**Contact:** Anne McGrail X3317 mcgraila@lanecc.edu

**Term of Charter:** 2018 - 2020

**2018-19 Members and current institutional roles:**

Dennis Gilbert (Physics)

Sharon Hagan (Dental Hygiene)

Christina Howard (Learning Council Chair, Physical Therapist Assistant Faculty)

Anne McGrail (English, APROC Chair)

Tammy Salman (Coordinator of Student Learning Assessment and Curriculum Development)

Jennifer Steele (Ex-Officio, Liaison to Administration, Director for Planning & Strategy)

Kate Sullivan (Assessment Team Chair, English Faculty)

Mai Mathers (Administrative Coordinator, non-voting)

Faculty, Open position

Classified Advisor, Open position

**Purpose Statement:** APROC exists to support and maintain a faculty-led academic program review process at Lane that is rigorous and discipline-specific. It aims to promote key campus objectives within a decentralized organizational culture. To this end, APROC provides college-wide oversight, stewardship and facilitation of Academic Program Review (APR) per the founding principles and processes incorporated into this charter. (See Guiding Principles at: <https://www.lanecc.edu/academicprogramreview/about-academic-program-review-lane>).

**Membership**

Formally appointed by the Faculty Council. Faculty appointees provide perspectives from a variety of academic disciplines, divisions, and the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Professional and Technical Careers, and councils and groups with faculty representation focusing on specific concerns such as counseling, diversity and inclusion, strategic learning planning, facilities, long-range financial planning, assessment, professional development, and scholarly inquiry about teaching and learning. In addition, the Faculty Council will appoint three classified staff colleagues involved with career/workforce outlook planning, instructional technology, and academic advising, who will provide perspectives based on their expertise and represent by their presence APROC's commitment to welcoming robust participation in conversations and providing feedback at the division and discipline levels by all staff categories during the self-study phase of APR.

**Qualifications for Membership:**

- Dedicated, forward thinking, problem solvers.
- Skilled in active listening and peer mentoring
- Committed to attending and/or engaging in work groups, meetings, and presentations

**Terms of and Selection Process for Membership:**

**Faculty Chair:** three-to five-year commitment with possible renewal. Following initial appointment of the Chair at the founding of APROC, the Faculty Council appoints the APROC Chair.

**Regular members** will serve staggered 2-year terms defined jointly by the Faculty Council and APROC, and members can be reappointed by the Faculty Council; two-year commitment. Call for new members will be made as needed by Faculty Council.

**Governance Policies:** Decision making: Roberts Rules or some variation, will apply to conducting meetings. In making decisions, as feasible, effort will be made to reach consensus solutions.

**Responsibilities:**

- **Meet regularly** in the service of supporting and improving APR at Lane
- **Recruit** and support programs for Academic Program Review from Phase 1 (Self-Study) to Phase 2 (External Review) to Phase 3 (Implementation) to Phase 4 (Mid-Cycle Check-in)
- **Conduct** orientations for new PRCs annually
- **Review and respond to** inquiry questions from PRCs and AMTs for appropriateness and feasibility
- **Liase between PRCs and AMTs:** receive and vet reports from PRCs and External reviewers and ensure their appropriate movement through the college planning and resource allocation process [mechanisms for this ensurance?]
- **Promote** the important role that Lane’s faculty-led inquiry model of academic program review plays for continued improvement of the student learning environment and the integration of planning, assessment and resource allocation
- **Respond** to program self-studies as scholarly documents
- **Advocate** for programs and intercede on their behalf when obstacles to participation in APR become apparent.
- **Provide data and communications** to support institutional effectiveness

**Documentation and Distribution**

- **Ownership of Program Review Self Study documents—where does this information go (Handbook? Necessary to provide language in charter?)**

## Yearly Goals 2016-17

GOAL	SUCCESS MEASURE
Move 2015-16 PRC from self-study phase to external review and Implementation Phase of APR.	<b>Success measure:</b> Submission of 8/8 Self-Studies by 2015-16 PRCs by ____June 30, 2017____
Recruit programs interested in participating in Academic Program Review in 2017, 2018, 2019 academic years:	<b>Success measure:</b> __60%____ of programs commit to participate by end of first five-year cycle. (Criterion=____)
Improve quality, fidelity and timeliness of data collection, analysis and turnaround from IRAP in support of meaningful APR analysis.	<b>Success measure:</b> PRCs are able to request and acquire valid data and analysis (e.g., enrollment, retention, success, articulation and transfer etc.) to complete APR in a timely manner (i.e., within the academic year)
Continue to develop the infrastructure to facilitate and support APR.	<p><b>Success measure: Achievement of “Development” Level of Implementation</b> in ACCJC Rubric for evaluating program review, e.g.,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular communications with ASA and Faculty Council</li> <li>Program review is <i>embedded</i> in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness</li> <li>Dialogue about the results of program review is <i>evident within the program and division</i> as part of discussion of program effectiveness.<sup>1</sup></li> <li>Appropriate <i>resources are allocated</i> to conducting program review of meaningful quality.</li> <li><i>Development of a framework</i> for linking results of program review to planning for improvement</li> <li><i>Development of a framework</i> to align results of program review to resource allocation</li> </ol> <p><b>Stretch Goal: Achievement of “Proficiency”:</b> e.g.,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes are in place and implemented regularly</li> <li>Results of APRs are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making</li> <li>APR framework is established and implemented</li> <li>Dialogue about the results of all APRs is evident throughout the institution as part of discussions of institutional effectiveness</li> <li>Results of APR are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide concrete examples</li> <li>The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and</li> </ol>

a. <sup>1</sup> [Clarify responsibilities about decision-making on moving forward with plans—who MAKES and IMPLEMENTS the plans?]

	improving achievement and student learning outcomes
<p>Provide training, communication and support for PRCs.</p> <p>a. Website with handbook, disciplinary models, templates and timelines is active.</p> <p>b. Fall orientation for new programs stepping on to Year 1 and communicate with deans/AMTs is well attended</p> <p>c. Adequate support and coaching for PRCs moving into Implementation Phase</p> <p>d. Adequate support and coaching for PRCs entering mid-cycle check-in (Year 3 of Participation)</p> <p>e. Experienced PRC participants recruited to act as resources for new and interested PRCs</p>	<p><b>Success measures:</b></p> <p>a. Participating programs report a high degree of satisfaction with orientations, materials and support for their project management at each stage.</p> <p>b. PRCs complete self-studies in a timely fashion; obstacles are removed when necessary.</p> <p><b>Other:</b> Website traffic?<sup>1</sup></p>
<p>Establish equitable ways of assigning workload and compensation for work on and in APR.</p>	<p><b>Success measures:</b> Established stipend for external reviewers; develop acceptable, bargained workloads; use a clear and appropriate FTE formula.</p>

**Implications for other groups:**  
 Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Assessment Team, Budget Committee, \_\_\_\_ Faculty Council\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup>Connect to measurable milestones on implementation plans across programs? What does this look like?