



Program Review Committee Minutes

October 21, 2014

12:30 - 2:00 PM

MB 350A video w/KRVPL5, MAM228, BIS 197

Present: Suzie Ama, Christine Abbott, Lisa Fuller, Karee Hamilton, Joe Slovacek, Kim Kelly, Sylvia Sotomayor, David Villacana

Absent: Corey Marvin, Laura Vasquez,

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. Call to order	S. Ama	12:30 PM		X
2. Approval of Agenda	S. Ama	Approved with no changes		X
3. Counseling Program Review – 2 nd Review	S. Ama	Requested changes were made, and it was approved.		X
4. Liberal Arts Math and Science	J. Stenger-Smith	<p>This was approved for a first review with the following requested changes:</p> <p>Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statements made need clarification. Example: “Physical resources are a challenge at all campus locations, particularly non-IWV sites.” • Transfer Degrees (ADT’s) are only beneficial for CSU transfer students. So UC/private university transfer students will still pursue Liberal Arts. • Some grammar errors. • Please define all abbreviations (even ones like IWV) at first use. Do not assume that the reader is familiar with the inner workings of the college. • Executive Summary inadequately describes program or department’s key 	X	

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>strengths, areas needing improvement, and actions to be taken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Space between paragraphs and page numbers <p>Part 1 – Relevance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less positive emphasis on ADTs. • Analysis: is repetitive in catalog description. Should there be a comma after verbally in PLO A? arts and humanities degree needs to be capitalized? • Page 4 – Math and Science degree courses must be completed with a grade of 2.0 or better is irrelevant because this is true for all majors. • Page 5 – Conditions of enrollment indicates the courses in Physics and Chemistry have math prereqs; math courses also have math prereqs. • Page 6 – Microbiology is now called BIOL C262, not sure if it should be referred to as new name in this document. • Why are there references to and quotes from the Arts and Humanities Analysis and program review? • All required sections of this part completely and accurately reflect content in corresponding college documents, with minor differences in content (perhaps referencing an older version). This felt more like a presentation of data rather than a discussion or analysis. <p>Parts 2 – Appropriateness / Part 3 - Currency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the determination of students needs section, 6th paragraph, streamlined should read streamlined. Same paragraph, At both the Bishop and Mammoth campus these course, should campus and course be plural? Campus manger should read manager. In current cost of the program to students, ahs should read has. • Facilities and physical resources section, above the conclusion missing the r in never. Missing marketing section. • Currency, Section 3. Facilities & Physical Resources. At ESCC, the fume hoods have been put in working order and are be certified. This may allow for expanded offerings in Chemistry. Add the word “to” between “are” and “be.” 		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4, majors and completers. Success and retention should go under achievement section (part 4, section 1). • Page 9 – refers to AC-T degrees; may be a typo for ADT degrees? • Page 11 – Typo: the Science Department ahs (should be has) • Page 14 – missing word: “At ESCC, fume hoods have been put in working order and are <u>to</u> be certified.” • Bottom of p. 9 – mentions adjunct faculty training and professional development – did faculty (adjunct or otherwise) from this program participate in the professional development opportunities? • Bottom of p. 9 – AC-T degrees? What are these? • Top of p. 10 – specific area in appendix? Not clear on quoted text. • p. 11 – strictly forbids charging a materials fee and then explains how the materials fee is determined? • p. 14 – bolded some issues, but only included 1 issue (sinks are too shallow) – need to be consistent in issue vs. issues. • Why are conclusions reiterating Arts and Humanities with direct quotes? • p. 15 – why discussing the art building installation of smart classrooms? It seems that the technology statement needs to be specific for Math and Science. • p. 15 – Marketing section is incomplete • The discussion about appropriateness and currency is brief and omits important considerations for analysis. • Recommend not to reference the Arts & Humanities PR. Not everyone who reads this PR will have read the previous one. So, if you are going to copy and paste, please then re-write to remove references to the previous document and to make the sections relevant to this document. • Part 3 section 5 is incomplete <p>Part 4 – Achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should sections 4, 5, 7, and 8 have the required information instead of refer to another section of the program review? • Long term schedule of math courses paragraph needs to be filled in. • Page 15: Section 1 refers to needing date from VPAA. Will this be included in 		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>the revised document?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 16: Section 3 summary refers to GE courses only. Will student performance for math and science be included as well? There is reference to “Full student performance data can be found in the date spreadsheets (appendix);” I do not see the appendix referencing this material. • Page 16-17: section 4, 5, 7, and 8 refer to: “See the relevant section for improving DE completion.” I do not see this information. • p. 16 – need data for 1 – is this needed to complete the program review? • p. 16 – why included other departments (SPAN, FREN, ART)? • p. 13 #3 concluding paragraph – is there a plan to achieve sustainable continuous quality improvement? It will be a challenge, how will it be addressed in Math and Science? - why last statement is Liberal Arts areas in general? • p. 17 # 6 Student Learning Outcomes, not Objectives – virtually assured of achieving the PLOs – achieving ? • p. 17 #8 – AC-T degree? • SLOs or AUOs are more accurately described as goals or objectives and lack orientation around the final outcome of student learning or experience of service recipients. • If gaps were identified, there is a significant lack of analysis about why the gaps exist and/or no plan to improve outcomes. • My only minor concern has to do with its PLOs: They seem to focus on Science versus Math and Science (but that might be a matter of language). <p>Part V – Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p. 18 I’m confused by the Math and Science program strengths coming from the Arts and Humanities Section – section of what? How are these relevant to the Math and Science program strengths? • p. 19 #3 – some of these seem to be college strategies, not program strategies. • pp. 19-20 no 6 year goals? Or are program strategies different? • Goals reasonably relate to the problems identified; they are satisfactorily stated based on the analysis and evidence cited; they present what needs to be done but may lack precise action plans. Strengths and weaknesses are 		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>not cited or not based on evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of analysis of how student learning outcomes can be improved and how outcomes can be more effectively measured. • Three- and six-year program goals cannot reasonably be traced back to SLO/AUP Assessment data. <p>Overall Impression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program review does still not balance math and science. In some sections, science is represented and not math, in some parts math and not science; • There is still a lot of “boilerplate” language for the GE program review and Liberal Arts: Arts and Humanities program reviews that has not been tailored to math and science; standard or general language is fine but it feels like it should be followed up with at least a sentence or two about math and about science specifically; • The SLO achievement part does not seem attempted and must be completed • A couple of other sections require major revision: majors and completers, student demand, marketing • The relative lack of science courses available on online is not addressed at all • Some stuff in technology should really be in professional development • The document should be brought up to date, some of it seems written in spring 2014, some in fall 2014 • Additional specific items will be brought to the attention of the proposer • Seemed well done overall- one # missing by second action plan to link to college strategic objective . • Much improved over first draft. • There are some minor grammar/spelling/punctuation mistakes. • Inconsistent formatting and page numbering. document feels like an exercise in completion rather than a work plan for improvement of student learning. • parts are disunified or incoherent; • There is not a clear story of what has transpired in the program since the last program review. 		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other than that--just a couple of very minor grammatical things (plus, I'd like to see the same font used for the entire document). 		
5. Adjournment	S. Ama	1:50 PM		

Meeting Chair: S. Ama

Recorder: S. Ama

Open/ Closed

DRAFT