

## **PROGRAM REVIEW MEETING MINUTES**

September 27, 2013

### **Members Present:**

Lillard, Sheri, Co-Chair	King, Rose	Moneymaker, Melinda
Millican, Ed, Co-Char	Lamore, Joel	Pires, Romana
Alsip, Andee	Lillard, Sheri	Smith, David B.
Chatterjee, Achala	Meyer, Stacy	Smith, James E.
Che, Yon	Millican, Ed	Cross, Laura (Note-taker)

### **Discussion/revision of efficacy forms in preparation for spring 2014 Efficacy Review**

The Efficacy Review Teams will be established by November 8, 2013; perhaps by Co-Chairs Sheri Lillard and Ed Millican who may also give out the topics. Sheri will make an immediate request to Research Development for demographic data.

The first page of the form is the Educational Master Plan (EMP) followed by customized demographics data with a table that includes both department and campus data. James Smith detailed the process for demographics; past discrepancies are not expected and the process of importing data into the form is not difficult. Instructions on the form are vague with the use of the word “address”. Committee members suggested ways to clarify the process; for programs that do not meet the criteria, they must address/review the plan they develop to correct deficiencies.

Of concern is how programs will address their problematic Outcomes in both Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Student Area Outcomes (SAOs). Currently, Celia Huston is working with mapping and suggested meeting with the co-chairs. To date, few programs have assessed their SLOs, a problem which has not yet been addressed institutionally but which must be. Programs must detail their process for evaluating SLOs/SAOs and will be cited for not doing so. James suggested linking the SLOs/SAOs to the Core Competencies. Every program has one or two Outcomes which can be mapped to the core competencies and their sub-divisions. We now require assessment of all course SLOs every semester, and 96% of course SLOs have been assessed; of the few courses linked to their core competencies, only 6% of the core competencies were assessed – a situation that has been widely recognized across the campus yet not addressed – and the Committee would like to know why the number is so low. Additionally, course SLOs need to be linked with the institutional SLOs. James and Celia are mapping the Outcomes linked to the core competencies, and we need to start with a model of some sort to begin review. Message to campus: here is a deadline, draw lines from your course SLOs/SAOs to the core competencies by this date. That is the mapping/connection. Not every program has done that, or is clear it is supposed to be done. Data collection is an issue and the collection process may need to be redone, but that’s not what we do - we use the data provided. Celia will be invited to the meeting on November 8 at which we will finalize the efficacy forms before disbursing to the programs. Committee co-chairs will meet with Celia during October to clarify some of these issues.

### **Evaluation of and process for bringing questions to College Council**

Some of the list items were not brought up at College Council due to time constraints, so it was the first time the President heard them. Therefore, submit reports to the President in writing before College Council with a list of questions so they may be addressed in College Council. Reference was made to questions from last time (in bold on agenda) and the committee decided to incorporate them into the report. A supposed abolished position was filled as a replacement position, which created conflict. Also, many positions still appear in the budget and personnel requests go forward, but the positions are not filled; therefore, the committee wants definitive answers on which positions have been abolished as opposed to those that still have a budget behind them and are merely not being filled at this time. We had two Psychology faculty position disappears and Human Resources seems to be making arbitrary

decisions; wording needs to be stronger in addressing HR and practices. Perhaps a task force should be formed to request a list of all vacated positions since 2008, the reason the position is vacant, and the status (filled, abolished, funded). For abolished positions, we want the reason abolished and by whom. How do we deal with needs assessment ranking? Perhaps our voting is arbitrary and not the best way.

\*Future agenda item: How do we approach the voting for needs assessment?

Co-chairs should meet with the President to deliver and review the Program Review Needs Assessment Report at least a week before the College Council meeting. Conflated points: 1.) report for this year, and 2.) questions about former issues. Former issues need to be addressed now. The list of questions on today's agenda will be submitted to the President immediately in advance of the next College Council meeting. It was suggested that the co-chairs meet personally with the President and present a list of the committee's issues and make a request that they be acted upon either independently or with College Council.

The committee reviewed some abolished positions that include 6 dean positions – down from 11 to 5. The increased levels of work are unsustainable. One example of the cut creating extra work for many includes the cut of the Work Experience Studies manager. When FTEs were cut, the position was not back-filled after vacated, so the work (previously done by a dean and associated support staff) was spread among the divisions. Records of abolished positions are needed and must include the position titles of management, faculty and staff, and the scope of work. Of special concern is why grant positions not being filled.

Regarding this committee's membership, it should include 8 classified, 17 faculty, 7 managers and 2 students for a total of 34, yet we currently have only 17 members; actual membership needs to be brought closer to intended membership. The Academic Senate appoints faculty and managers, and we're currently short 6 classified members and 2 students; Sheri will bring our committee's need for members to the Academic Senate.

### **Discussion of 2-year "mini-review" process for vocational programs.**

We need to develop our own form as our process is different than that of a 4-year program and the EMP. Achala will send Sheri a link to the top codes for CTE programs currently in Program Review and identify the program names and budget numbers. Annually, Corrina Baber sends the revised Taxonomy of Programs to the faculty chairs. All vocational programs are required to go through this 2-year review. ALL programs with an asterisk need to go through 2-year review. We'll figure out which programs on the list apply to us and then decide what form and mini-review process to use by November. Forms will be sent at the same time as other program review forms.

The 2-year mini-review process is required by Title 5, so we will include it in our scope of work. The process needs to be reviewed to make sure it meets a documented labor market demand. We will include questions about the labor market on the form and get the form signed off by each program advisory committee. Summary phrase: we want the EMP as the first part of it along with labor market data and comments from the advisory board on one form. It is important to demonstrate gainful employment. (How are we tracking the success of programs with gainful employment?) We will be required to have this data in 2 years and gather it from the CAL Occupational information system. While labor data is easily obtained, tracking student employment is not, and we don't have accurate data on student employment – only a good estimate. Additionally, transfer is success as well. The RCC form (Career Education Program Two-Year Review, or Norco Form) combines program needs with efficacy; costs in 2-year programs increase while their budgets may not, so we need that item included in our form, and we will send our proposed form to vocational personnel for feedback. The narrative form was preferred over the Norco box form. CEP 2-year review form appears to be just a top summary form to which narrative is attached, which the committee preferred and approved for use, keeping it to two pages.