

Program Review Committee Meeting Notes

April 2, 2013

Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Billy Barnes, Kristin Rabe, Mike Carley, Kim Nickell, Manny Mourtzanos, Liz Rozell,

Guest: Dr. Bonnie Suderman

Welcome of new committee member from the DO: Mike Carley – Institutional Research & Reporting

Update on APR – Defining program & expanding the form – probably not prepared to address it right now. Non-instructional units – how do we gauge assessment? Assessment of technology needed also. Many feel that the SWOT analysis portion of the APR does not close the loop in showing how decisions are made. Need a few more open ended questions to address strengths and weaknesses.

Core Metrics: need to be defined – Carley will provide data through the Institutional Research and Planning office. Why are we being compared to the college as a whole – programs compared to themselves over time. Comparing to the college average is sometimes not helpful in determining success.

Self-report licensure/certification pass rates. How do you determine transfer rates – eventually with the demise of CPEC-CSU/UC data. Exclude transfer rates from the report. Can have self-reported pass rates. Persistence rate not done at program level. Inclusion of goal setting element. Report on the degree of goal accomplishment.

Work with college council and academic senate to get support.

Kristin/Kim/Liz – form change for the APR – report on April 15. Get with Kate Pluta and share.

Bonnie – Integration of Assessment – Assessment in curricunet. How the assessments change and impact budgetary concerns. What to put the two assessment questions right before budget and planning – technology – accomplishments and program level outcomes. When will you be assessing this next? Bonnie just wants to be sure we are adding an assessment piece to the future APR process and will provide the information.

Curricunet to spit out a report – Bonnie will look into it. Curricunet PRC module? Why are we not using it??

Recommendation #1: Demonstrate that we are already meeting requirements also to bolster mission and become more of a workplan. APR Improvements. What does the data show you to justify your request? Resource gap, personnel, technology, cannot achieve without. Surveys are too perceptual – over survey people and lead to survey fatigue. Perception issues – what is the most important thing to know?

Issues of transparency and communication: Increase transparency via a statement of acknowledgement – of APR's by upper leadership. How are the APR's recv'd and moving through the process to make crucial decisions. Elements of discussion making process is the living document that speaks to this process..

Focus Groups – need more of these than surveys

Improve our data collection process. Tool to assess the degree to which decisions are effective to decision makers. Use data for discussions could be a focus group which is a group of 4 or more.

Develop a method: On principal this idea is valid but with the other two colleges and DO personnel – survey or focus group had the best response.

Each program/service needs to do a program review and be an ongoing process. District-wide process that each needs to follow identical to the other. Who is responding to DO recommendations made in the last accreditation report?? Carley could not answer – Manny will research further for more clarity.

Kim, Liz and Kristin will take a stab at the form – I have looked at it – we've had some dialog about it – but nothing substantial yet. We also talked about having the 2nd draft of the document done for accreditation.

The next thing I have noted is that we are going to revisit the colleges and look at changes we can make to the APR process. You were going to seek clarity on the district-wide need to respond to the district-wide recommendation.