



Program Review Committee

Minutes

April 5, 2016

EW 207 and Videoconference with Bishop and Mammoth

12:30-2:00pm

Present: Christine Abbott, Suzie Ama, Scott Cameron, Steve Rogers, Lisa Fuller, Kim Kelley

Absent: Karee Hamilton, Corey Marvin, Sylvia Sotomayor, David Villicana

Start Time: 12:30 pm

Adjourn: 1:30 pm



Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
1. Call to order		
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From March 22, 2016	S. Ama	Approved
3. Approval of Agenda	S. Ama	Approved
4. Financial Aid/Scholarships Program Review – 2nd Review	S. Ama	Approval for a second review, with no changes.
5. Business Programs Program Review – 2nd Review	S. Ama	Approval for a second review, with no changes.
6. Vocational Nursing Program Review – 2nd Review	S. Ama	Approval for a second review, with the suggestion from Christine that the statement about what was wrong with the PLOs precede the proposed PLOs. Annette was delayed accessing the phone conference, and Suzie agreed to make this change herself and send Annette the revised copy to submit to Academic Senate.
8. 2016-2017 Goals	S. Ama	The Program Review Annual Report is due at the end of April, and the committee discussed goals for the upcoming year. There was strong agreement that has not been enough collaboration in the writing of Program Reviews. Department members are not being provided the opportunity to give input. In an email, Corey requested that the educational administrator and counseling also have early input. Advisory committees should also review the document

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>before submitted. The committee discussed the feasibility of a signature page to ensure that interested parties have seen the document and approve of it, however it was also felt that this may be cumbersome for use at other campuses. It was also suggested that minutes be attached in the appendix to document meetings during which the program review is discussed. This doesn't assume that there would necessarily be collaboration on the writing itself, but rather feedback on the content. Proposers should also copy every member of the department, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the Vice President of Student Services on that email. This expectation will be communicated during training every fall. Proposers will be strongly encouraged to schedule a presentation with the counseling department in the fall semester and work with the educational administrator throughout the writing process. Corey (via email) also asked that the CTE Dean be included as a member of the committee.</p> <p>A concern that was raised by Scott is the need for clear information about how to get started with a Program Review —especially for those who would like to get started before the Fall semester. The Program Review website will be revised to accommodate this. We also learned that there is an old insideCC group with old Program Review documents, including old templates. We aren't using this group, so Suzie will ask to have the group removed. Scott suggested that exemplar in similar program reviews be provided to chairs during program review training in the fall, to serve as examples.</p> <p>There was also discussion about how the Program Review workload has become somewhat lopsided, due to when new programs have been activated. This year was quite heavy, although partly due to the complete of past-due Program Reviews. Next year (2016-2017) will be a little lighter, but 2017-2018 will be very heavy with 9 different programs. In 2018-2019, there are only 2 scheduled. The committee agreed to defer a few that are due in 2018 to 2019, but criteria for identifying which ones would be moved has not yet been developed. However, it was mentioned that we should try to avoid doubling an individual faculty member's workload in the same year if he or she is responsible for multiple Program Reviews. This will be a goal for next year.</p> <p>The committee's goals for the coming year include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revise the Program Review website to convey how to get started, and communicate to proposers where they can find this information. 2. Provide exemplar and similar Program Reviews to proposers during training. 3. Communicate the expectation of widespread dialogue and collaboration during the writing of the Program Review.

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Communicate that minutes of meetings during which the Program Review was discussed are attached in the appendix. 5. Communicate that program review submissions should copy the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Vice President of Student Services, and all members of the department and should certify that these people in the CTE advisory committee, if applicable, were consulted for feedback. 6. The insideCC group will be removed. 7. The CTE Dean will be added to the Program Review committee. 8. The annual Program Review schedule will be adjusted to balance committee and faculty workload.
9. Future Meeting Dates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	S. Ama	
11. Adjourned		1:30pm

Facilitator: Suzie Ama

Recorder: Suzie Ama

  <p>MINUTES</p>	<p align="center">CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION COUNCIL</p> <p align="right">October 20, 2017 9:00 am – 12:00 pm IWV LRC 709 and via CCCConfer</p>
---	--

Committee Members in Attendance:

Ben Beshwate (CIC Chair), Vivian Baker (SLO Chair), Sarah King (Articulation Officer), Sharlene Paxton, Matt Wanta, Cliff Davis, Tom Heck, Guck Ooi, Melissa Gross, Annette Hodgins, and Jaime Broussard

Additionally Present:

Chad Houck (Dean of Letters & Science), Steve Rogers, Tyson Huffman and John Stenger-Smith

Approval of Minutes

Minutes Dated: 10/06/2017

Action: Approved. Motion by Sarah King, second by Cliff Davis
Ayes: Vivian Baker, Ben Beshwate, Gary Enns, Missy Gross, Tom Heck, Annette Hodgins, Guck Ooi, Matt Wanta, Sharlene Paxton.

MATH C121 Elementary Probability and Statistics

Presenter: Steve Rogers
Description: Course Revision
Review: Second
Discussion: Course is being updated to align program applicability with current programs, confirming the addition of a rigor statement as well as providing specific examples within the SLOs.

Last assessed Fall 2014 - Made evident the need to reduce the number of and broaden the scope of the outcomes.

Action: Approved. Motion by Guck, seconded by Vivian. Ayes: Everyone else.

MATH C121H Elementary Probability and Statistics-Honors

Presenter: Steve Rogers
Description: Course Revision
Review: Second
Discussion: Course is being updated to align program applicability with current programs, confirming the addition of a rigor statement, modifying verbiage and out of

class assignments within the SLOs. Section 22: changed from “assess” and “analyze” from SLO 4 & 5

- Section 27.D and E: use nomenclature of “honors” (i.e., “Honors Paper”) to identify the honors-specific assignments

Last assessed Fall 2014 - Made evident the need to reduce the number of and broaden the scope of the outcomes.

Action: Approved. Motion by Guck Ooi, seconded by Cliff Davis. Ayes: Everyone else.

MATH C130 Finite Mathematics

Presenter: Steve Rogers

Description: Course Revision

Review: Second

Discussion: Course is being updated to align program applicability with current programs, confirming the addition of a rigor statement, and modifying verbiage of SLOs.

- Section 22: all SLO’s revised, restrict usage of “demonstrate competency” unless the students are actually doing something. Suggested “Performing matrix” instead.
- Section 26: provide an example problem

Last assessed Fall 2015 - All outcomes met the target when this class was last assessed. The assessment did not inform the revision. The revision was based on aligning with the C-ID descriptor and merging similar SLOs into a single, more general outcome statement.

Action: Approved. Motion by Sarah King, seconded by Cliff Davis. Ayes: Everyone else.

MATH C151 Analytical Geometry and Calculus I

Presenter: Steve Rogers

Description: Course Revision

Review: Second

Discussion: Course is being updated to align program applicability with current programs, outline completely revamped with the addition of sub-levels, and unit value reduced from 5 to 4. Section 28: changed the textbook to the 14th edition.

Last assessed Fall 2015 - Topics near the end of the semester needed to be put into the subsequent course. Areas and volumes of integration moved to MATH C152. Doing this allowed the unit load of the course to be reduced.

Action: Approved. Motion by Vivian Baker, seconded by Guck Ooi. Ayes: Everyone else.

MATH C152 Analytical Geometry and Calculus II

Presenter: Steve Rogers

Description: Course Revision

Review: Second

Discussion: Course is being updated to align program applicability with current programs, confirming the addition of a rigor statement, sub-levels to Section 24 using information from the old COR so the outline goes at least two levels deep, and reduce the unit value from 5 to 4.

Last assessed Spring 2015 - Although all outcomes met the target in the last assessment, vector-related topics such as dot and cross products were moved to the subsequent Calculus course (MATH C251) to align with the C-ID descriptor.

Action: Approved. Motion by Vivian Baker, seconded by Melissa Gross. Ayes: Everyone else.

MATH C251 Analytical Geometry and Calculus III

Presenter: Steve Rogers

Description: Course Revision

Review: Second

Discussion: Course is being updated to align program applicability with current programs, confirming the addition of a rigor statement, topic outline was left alone, provided a problem example, and reduce the unit value from 5 to 4.

Last assessed Fall 2015 - Assessment helped inform the decision to remove instruction in First Order Differential Equations in this course.

Action: Approved. Motion by Cliff Davis, seconded by Annette Hodgins. Ayes: Everyone else.

MATH C255 Ordinary Differential Equations

Presenter: Steve Rogers

Description: Course Revision

Review: Second

Discussion: Course is being updated to align program applicability with current programs, outline modified to include sub-levels using information from the old COR so the outline goes at least two levels deep. SLO's and textbook updated (talked to Jorge), changing to Edwards & Penney (2014) should be coming out with

another edition in Jan. 2018. C255 should go with CID, provides recommendations but not required.

- Section 20: add Mathematics AS-T under Restricted Elective
- Provide a DE Addendum rigor statement

Last assessed Spring 2015 - Assessment informed the fact that one of the old SLOs was not being taught nor assessed. It was removed in the revision.

Action: Approved. Motion by Guck Ooi, seconded by Cliff Davis. Ayes: Everyone else.

MATH C257 Linear Algebra

Presenter: Steve Rogers

Description: Course Revision

Review: Second

Discussion: Course is being updated to align program applicability with current programs, confirming the addition of a rigor statement, and outline modified to include sub-levels using information from the old COR so the outline goes at least two levels deep.

- Section 22 (SLO's): change to "apply operations" instead of "use/perform operations".
- Out of class assignments – need to specify with an example. Be sure to include this when sending Ben the final draft.
- Section 28: a new edition of the textbook is available

Last assessed Fall 2014 - All outcomes met the target percentages in the last assessment. The revision was based primarily on the goal of broadening the scope of the SLOs and aligning with the C-ID descriptor.

Action: Approved. Motion by Cliff Davis, seconded by Vivian Baker. Ayes: Everyone else.

MATH C101 Survey of Mathematical Concepts

Presenter: Steve Rogers

Description: Deletion

Review: Second

Action: Approved. Motion by Matt Wanta, seconded by Vivian Baker. Ayes: Everyone else.

CSCI C140 A+ Essential Skills for Computers

Presenter: Matthew Hightower

Description: Deletion



Review: Second
Action: Approved. Motion by Matt Wanta, seconded by Vivian Baker. Ayes: Everyone else.

CSCI C141 A+ Standard Skills for IT^ Tech

Presenter: Matthew Hightower
Description: Deletion
Review: Second
Action: Approved. Motion by Matt Wanta, seconded by Vivian Baker. Ayes: Everyone else.

CSCI C171 Intro to Internet/WWW

Presenter: Matthew Hightower
Description: Deletion
Review: First
Action: Approved. Motion by Vivian Baker, seconded by Julie Cornett. Ayes: Everyone else.

CSCI C241 Intro to Telecommunications

Presenter: Matthew Hightower
Description: Deletion
Review: Second
Action: Approved. Motion by Vivian Baker, seconded by Julie Cornett. Ayes: Everyone else.

ASL C100 Deaf History

Presenter: Clifford Davis
Description: Deletion
Review: Second
Action: Approved. Motion by Sharlene Paxton, seconded by Vivian Baker. Ayes: Everyone else.

ENGL C042 Preparation for Introductory Composition

Presenter: Clifford Davis
Description: Deletion
Review: Second
Action: Approved. Motion by Sharlene Paxton, seconded by Vivian Baker. Ayes: Everyone else.

ENGL C070A ENGL C070 Corequisite Writing Lab

Presenter: Clifford Davis

Description: Addition

Review: First

Discussion: Matt – This is a co-req writing lab for students to place below 70. ‘Just in time’ remediation and the idea is for instructors to connect with the students to identify specific weaknesses and assist them through which makes hosting the lec/lab with the same instructor vital.

Tyson – AB705 requires schools to increase the access to college classes available sooner. Training at Porterville was showing that this was extremely beneficial as long as the instructors participating are best suited for this and can make the connection with the students. Students with this course are succeeding closer to 16/17% rate. Would like for this to be pass/no pass.

- Cliff – Adjust to 1 unit lab with 54 hours. Take out the out of class assignments. Include as a pre-req for all social sciences. Creation of a 3rd course ENGL 70, ENGL 70A, ENGL 10-49A? Leave all of them open to everyone and allow counseling to get people into the appropriate sections.
- Jaime – Find a course number that we can use for this class. (Response: 47)

Action: Approved. Motion by Matt Crow, seconded by Vivian Baker. Ayes: Everyone else.

CHEM C101 Introduction to Chemistry

Presenter: John Stenger-Smith

Description: Revision

Review: First

Discussion: Textbook updated, and usage of higher level verbs per Vivian. Guck taking notes and will send to John for changes to be made.

- Remove duplication of Liberal Arts degree.
- General Education degree needs to be removed.
- Method of delivery OK but need to add a rigor statement (use the honors examples).
- When was the last time these courses were assessed? Vivian sent an email requesting that detail in time for the next read.

Action: Approved. Motion by Guck Ooi, seconded by Tom Heck. Ayes: Everyone else.

CHEM C111 General Inorganic Chemistry I

Presenter: John Stenger-Smith
Description: Revision
Review: First
Discussion: Textbook updated, added examples of out of class assignments. SLO wording/grammar changes. Guck taking notes and will send to John for changes to be made.

- Addition of an actual problem to the out of class assignments.
- Need to specify the emphasis for the General Sciences degrees.

Action: Approved. Motion by Cliff Davis, seconded by Missy Gross. Ayes: Everyone else.

CHEM C113 General Inorganic Chemistry II

Presenter: John Stenger-Smith
Description: Revision
Review: First
Discussion: Textbook updated, added examples of out of class assignments. Guck taking notes and will send to John for changes to be made.

- Addition of an actual problem to the out of class assignments.
- SLO 7 – needs a space for the verbiage.
- Need to specify the emphasis for the General Sciences degrees.

Action: Approved. Motion by Guck Ooi, seconded by Cliff Davis. Ayes: Everyone else.

CHEM C113H General Inorganic Chemistry II: Honors

Presenter: John Stenger-Smith
Description: Revision
Review: First
Discussion: Part of Mode B goal - Starting an undergrad research lab, and added ENGL 70 pre-req language. Guck taking notes and will send to John for changes to be made.

- Included input from Swiridoff in relation to honors verbiage.
- Add Christine as a co-author.

Action: Approved. Motion by Cliff Davis, seconded by Missy Gross. Ayes: Everyone else.

CHEM C221 Organic Chemistry I

Presenter: John Stenger-Smith
Description: Revision



Review: First
Discussion: Textbook updated and verbiage on SLOs updated. Guck taking notes and will send to John for changes to be made.

- Update start term to say Fall 2018.
- General Education degree needs to be removed.
- Need to specify the emphasis for the General Sciences degrees.

Action: Approved. Motion by Cliff Davis, seconded by Vivian Baker. Ayes: Everyone else.

CHEM C223 Organic Chemistry II

Presenter: John Stenger-Smith

Description: Revision

Review: First

Discussion: Textbook updated, addition of out of class assignments, and verbiage on SLOs updated. Guck taking notes and will send to John for changes to be made.

- Update start term to say Fall 2018. It's when the change takes effect in the catalog not when it will be offered again.
- Fix 'sesssion' in Methods of Evaluation.
- Need to specify the emphasis for the General Sciences degrees.

Action: Approved. Motion by Vivian Baker, seconded by Julie Cornett. Ayes: Everyone else.

CHEM C223H Organic Chemistry II: Honors

Presenter: John Stenger-Smith

Description: Revision

Review: First

Discussion: SLOs updated to mirror 223 with some exceptions, textbook updated, and method of evaluation. Pre-requisites verified. Guck taking notes and will send to John for changes to be made.

- SLOs 5 & 7 – only need one of these.
- Update start term to say Fall 2018.
- General Education degree needs to be removed.
- Add Christine as a co-author.
- Need to specify the emphasis for the General Sciences degrees.

Action: Approved. Motion by Cliff Davis, seconded by Missy Gross. Ayes: Everyone else.

Discussion



Presenter: Vivian Baker and Sarah King

Description: eLumen Update

Discussion: Waiting on District to make corrections to division/department structure in Banner. Waiting on workflow. For programs, Bill is working on pulling these out of CurricUNET.

Action Items

- Ben - Add Chad Houck to CIC Sharepoint page.
- Jaime – Find a course number for ENGL C070A
- Guck – Be sure to review the grading method for all CORs.

Next Meeting: Friday, November 3, 2017, in LRC Room 631 & via CCCConfer

Adjournment: Time: 11:20 pm

Note taker: Jaime Broussard



LRC Department Meeting Minutes

January 17, 2018

Attendees: Julie Cornett, Sharlene Paxton, Tyson Huffman

- I. We met to begin brainstorming on establishing some LRC department Policies. We used the sample provided by the CHDV department. The chair will be working on a draft to send out to the other two full time faculty based on the discussion.
- II. Major sections that were identified/agreed upon (in terms of inclusion into the future Policies):
 - a. Department membership: All full time and part time faculty in both LAC and Library department(s)
 - b. Meetings: twice each semester
 - c. Purpose of meetings: to discuss planning, implementation and evaluation of the following areas:
 - i. Curriculum trends and best practices as well as textbook adoption
 - ii. Faculty assignment, staffing, student contact
 - iii. Professional development
 - iv. Enrollment management and scheduling
 - v. Student retention and success
 - vi. SLO, PLO, AUO assessment
 - vii. AUP and Program Review
 - viii. Site specific needs
 - ix. Oversight and evaluation of classified staff
- III. We discussed and compared respective load calculations as well as staffing, touching upon the recent push to provide weekend hours

Action Item: Julie will work on a draft of the Policies and submit to Tyson and Sharlene for review.



Program Review Committee

Minutes

February 23, 2018

EW 207, Video, CCCConfer

10:30 am - 12:00 pm

Present: Suzie Ama, Lisa Fuller, Michael Erskine, Michael Kane, Heather Ostash, Sylvia Sotomayor
 On phone: Steve Rogers, Karee Hamilton Peter Fulks,

Absent: Scott Cameron, Ryan Khamkongsay, Kim Kelly

Start Time:

Adjourn:

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
1. Call to order		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10:30 AM
2. Approval of Agenda	S. Ama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved
3. Basic Skills Program Review – 1st Review	T. Huffman	<p><i>Action</i></p> <p>Approved for a First Review</p> <p><i>Feedback</i></p> <p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good first review. • Throughout the document, ensure that course numbers are spelled correctly. There should be a space before the C. • I feel like there should be some mention somewhere in the review that that there is no knowledge by department members of how to implement the co-requisite model in an online delivery mode. <p>Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reframe to account for the conclusions made later, per template – use final conclusions to inform. <p>Part 1 Relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a little more specificity about demand for Basic Skills at the sites. • State more clearly that we (as a college, irrespective of the State) are moving to an accelerated coreq model.

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 – State that Basic Skills does not have a catalog program description, but the catalog does define remedial courses work as follows: Remedial coursework refers to pre-collegiate basic skills courses defined as courses in reading, writing, computation, learning skills, and English as a Second Language, which are designated as non-degree credit courses. No student shall receive more than thirty (30) semester units of credit for remedial coursework within the Kern Community College district, except for the following: 1) students currently enrolled in one or more courses of English as a Second Language, 2) students identified by the college as having a qualifying disability • 1.2 – Explain that the program does not have PLOs, per se, but the exit skills (SLOs) from the final course are equivalent. List those. • 1.3 – Typo: “Other sites will follow suite” Should be “suit” • 1.3 – Clarify that the sites discontinued Math CO20 before IWV did. (Bishop/Mammoth discontinued before IWV.) • 1.4 – Math will implement the co-requisite course for the first time in Spring 2019, not Fall 2018. • 1.4, Pg. 5 – Typo: For students who are assessed as not ready for transfer level course work, the Basic Skills program is required. <p>Part 2 Appropriateness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2 – Provide more complete description here of the assessment/placement process and Multiple Measures- examples of measures influencing placement- connection to statewide initiative. Give some examples. • 2.3 – Would be relevant to mention that courses are not required prior to students taking college-level courses for the most part- while students may need the basic skills development, there is nothing preventing a student from taking CTE and transfer level courses- other than very limited prerequisites. • 2.5 - Describe patterns of enrollment, broken down by site. Provide a brief history of not offering some levels at all of the sites. • 2.5 – Are students ever waitlisted in these courses? Has there been an issue with declining FTE and reduced course offerings making it more difficult to enroll? • 2.6 – Address total costs more thoroughly. Should include texts and materials since other programs report out on this. And provide some analysis about costs to students. Are there opportunities to decrease costs? • Page 6, The highlighted part of Sec 2 belongs in Sec 4. <p>Part 3 Currency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If multiple or all classes use a particular technology, describe. (Canvas plugins, Kahn Academic, YouTube) Is there anything specifically used in basic skills that there isn't anywhere else? • 3.1 – Provide explanation of the chart in section 1. What do the number of sections refer to: all Math sections, only Basic Skills sections, total sections over six semesters, average section per semester? • 3.1 – What about Director role? Support positions, like Sherri's? Any positions partially funded by Basic Skills funding? Basic Skills Committee? Describe these roles and functions. • 3.2 – Discuss the connection as a categorical program, integrated planning, state and Guided Pathways connections? Co-requisite one of the elements of Guided Pathways. • 3.4 – Elaborate on efforts to increase number of students taking English and math in first term (Guided Pathways Measure)? Elaborate on connection matriculation process/assessment outreach?

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>Part 4 Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part 4 - Pa. 20 Typo - Another aspect of basic skills that can be viewed as a strength are the departments' decision to remove courses that are multiple levels below transfer. Is instead of are <p>Part 5 Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5.1 – Discuss connection to Guided Pathways and Integrated Planning.
<p>4. Athletics – 1st Review</p>	<p>J. Mchenry</p>	<p><i>Action</i></p> <p>Approved for a First Review</p> <p><i>Feedback</i></p> <p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Great first review. ● Suggestion to apply wherever relevant: Give examples of strategies to make things better. How will you know if the program is more efficient? What is the measurement? If you say you're going to do something, say how you're going to do it. <p>Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reiterate future plans (from part 5) at the end. <p>Part 1 Relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No changes <p>Part 2 Appropriateness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 2.2 – First describe student needs, including eligibility requirements, facilities support, and academic support, and address prevalent lack of housing and food security. Then discuss how these needs are determined. Then discuss how these are being met (tutoring, study hall, and other student support services). Discuss challenges to meeting those needs (regulatory constraints). Discuss ways that needs can be met that do not violate regulatory constraints (e.g. they can benefit from campus-wide programs, like the Hunger-Free Campus program, and others). This section should be several paragraphs to fully address these topics. ● 2.3 – The current content here is a qualitative analysis of several function in the program, but the functions themselves are not first described. It would be clearer to first summarize the department function (e.g. recruit athletes, train athletes, support athletes academically, and host and participate in competitive events.) Describe how those processes should ideally function, then the evaluation of how well the processes are functioning can follow. Possibly include an example of the type of processes being aligned. ● 2.4 – Provide more specific information about what these relationships look like. There needs to be a discussion of the connection with faculty and the academic programs. Describe connection with instructional side. Describe connection to student workers. ● 2.6 - Really good job of showing Title IX compliance but going forward <u>how</u> will you be able to demonstrate that student athletes are satisfied with their experience as a student athlete at Cerro Coso?

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.6 – More analysis is needed in this section. There is strong interest in some sports that are not being offered. What is the criteria to determine whether a new competitive sport will be offered? Why do the costs of a sport vary so widely from year to year? And why do some sports get more \$\$\$ than others? <p>Part 3 Currency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.3 – Athletics and Kinesiology discussion about facilities should align. Between these program reviews, the information is almost contradictory. The adequacy and needs of track, tennis course, weight room flooring, and training room space should be described comparably between the Athletics and Kinesiology program reviews. Any misalignment in these descriptions will cast doubt on needs and may impact funding. Meet with Kim to coordinate these sections between documents. • 3.5 - Expand the first paragraph to address marketing. Who does the social media? Is there a budget? Etc. How does recruitment happen? How do you plan to expand the marketing efforts to support recruiting? <p>Part 4 Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AUO section looks good. ○ The Part 4 section that pertains to SLOs needs to be restored, including tables. List all intercollegiate sports classes, and report out on SLO assessment. Discuss gaps and summarize how gaps will be addressed. <p>Part 5 Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit strategies to see if AUO and SLO assessment results prompt revisions or additions. • 5.1 How do you measure effectiveness? What metrics will you use going forward to determine whether or not efficiency is improving in athletics. What methods will athletics use to do a better job of recruiting • Goal 2 mentions closing an achievement gap. What achievement gap? The bullet points talk about underrepresented groups, but the only groups discussed in PR are men and women. This should be clarified.
<p>5. Kinesiology Program Review – 2nd Review</p>	<p>K. Kelly</p>	<p><i>Action</i></p> <p>No action, due to need to align 3.3 with Athletics. See feedback.</p> <p><i>Feedback</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover page it is dated January 31, 2017. Change to 2018. • Class prerequisites on page 7 are missing the “C” before the class number, and course discipline abbreviations should always be capitalized. Also, MATH C121 does not only have a prerequisite of MATH C053—a student can alternatively complete MATH C055: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BIOL C251, BIOL C255 – ENGL C070 ○ CHEM C111 – MATH C055 ○ CHEM C221 – CHEM C111 ○ MATH C121 – MATH C055 ○ PSYC C101 – ENGL C070 ○ MATH C121 – MATH C053 or MATH C055 • 3.3 – Athletics and Kinesiology discussion about facilities should align. Between these

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>program reviews, the information sounds somewhat contradictory. The adequacy and needs of track, tennis course, weight room flooring, and training room space should be described comparably between the Athletics and Kinesiology program reviews. Any misalignment in these descriptions will cast doubt on needs and may impact funding. Kim was asked to meet with John to coordinate the content of these sections between documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part 5 – Remove blank page (page 34) • The committee usually approves 2nd readings if there are only minor pending changes related to typos and formatting. But since the content in 3.3 needs to be revised to align with Athletics, the committee wants to see the KINS Program Review again. This is an excellent Program Review. But the committee wants to verify that the two Program Reviews are presenting a unified front in the analysis of facilities—for both programs’ benefit. It is very fortunate that these PRs were written in the same semester to allow such coordination.
6. Administration of Justice Program Review – 2nd Review	S. Ama	Action – Approved for 2 nd Review and is ready for Academic Senate presentation March 15.
7. Paralegal Program Review – 2nd Review	S. Ama	Action – Approved for 2 nd Review, pending corrections to course numbers. Those corrections have been made and is ready for Academic Senate presentation March 15.
8. Welding Program Review – 2nd Review	S. Ama	Action – Approved for 2 nd Review, pending minor corrections to formatting and minor additions to content. Those corrections have been made and is ready for Academic Senate presentation March 15.
9. Adjournment	S. Ama	Adjourned 12:00 pm

Facilitator: Suzie Ama

Recorder: Suzie Ama