



**Program Review Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**February 7, 2017**  
**EW 207, Video, CCCConfer**  
**12:30pm-2:00am**

**Present:** Christine Abbott, Suzie Ama, Scott Cameron, Peter Fulks, Michael Kane, Kimberlee Kelly, Steve Rogers, Sylvia Sotomayor

**Absent:** Lisa Fuller, Karee Hamilton

**Start Time:** 2/7/17, 12:30 PM

**Adjourn:** 2/7/17, 1:30 PM

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
<b>1. Call to order</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2/7/17, 12:30 PM</li> </ul>
<b>2. Approval of Agenda</b>	S. Ama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved</li> </ul>
<b>3. General Sciences Program Review – 2<sup>nd</sup> Review</b>	J. Stenger-Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John will use the copy that Sylvia provided with formatting issues fixed. He will correct (or confirm correction of) the following spelling/grammar errors:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Page 10 – “Units” is inappropriate capitalized. Enrollment is misspelled</li> <li>○ Page 15 – Capitalization “The issue with shallow Laboratory sinks app”</li> <li>○ Page 16 – Spelling “especially laborartory classes”</li> <li>○ Page 18 – Spelling “online shows a statistically significant lower” and “out-of-discipline unenforcable prerequisites”</li> <li>○ Page 20 – Spelling “since the current temporarty lab facilities”</li> <li>○ Page 22 – “This will provide student in the outlying areas more on-site options for completing the degree.” and “We hope to improve things vial collegial discussions.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Program Review Committee clarified that we are here to help make Program Reviews more compelling and persuasive—never to minimize concerns or to be an obstacle. Given that the document is read by constituents who do not have any knowledge of current problems, don’t make assumptions about what the reader knows. Make your case with quantitative and qualitative data.</li> <li>• 1.4 – Short statement added to clarify that the sequencing of courses.</li> <li>• 2.3</li> </ul>

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There are two “2.3” sections. “Majors and Completers” should be numbered 4. Omit number for Analysis.</li> <li>▪ The section on mission still should be moved to section 2.1.</li> <li>▪ This section still needs discussion about the program’s relationship to similar programs at the college – especially the Liberal Arts – Mathematics and Sciences program. How do the missions and requirements of each differ?</li> <li>▪ John will make the last column in the two tables consistent (i.e. either Total or Average)</li> <li>• 3.3 – John will describe the lack of process for budgeting for equipment replacement and will describe a plan that identifies items in their equipment inventory, expected lifetime, and expected replacement cost. The Physical Education Department has been doing this successfully for 3 years. Kim Kelly agreed to share their spreadsheet with the Science department for ideas.</li> <li>• Cite drops in enrollment, due to construction, but also clarify that numbers do not tell the whole story. Explain how instruction has suffered qualitatively. Examples, such as students not being able to hear instructors due to acoustical problems in the swing facility should be included. Describe how faculty have been required to perform work outside of their contractual duties. List examples. Make a compelling case with quantitative and qualitative data. This will be much more forceful than emotional language.</li> <li>• 4.3 - In the Recent Results cells, please express the results as a percentage (the specific, actual result) so we can easily see if the target was met.</li> <li>• 5.2 – John will clarify that the institutional researcher is needed for the analysis of student success (not SLO activities) and for tracking transfer of graduates. (Michael Kane commented that some of this data is not even accessible to researchers, however)</li> <li>• 5.2 – The content about Curricunet and eLumen can be retained.</li> <li>• 5.4 – The statement, “If the analysis performed by the science department determines that these improvements were not made, the program will be deleted in 2022,” will be revised to say that the program will be <i>recommended</i> for deletion if the stated improvements are not made.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Student Activities Program Review – 2<sup>nd</sup> Review</b>	S. Ama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved for 2<sup>nd</sup> Review</li> </ul>
<b>5. Approval of 2/7/17 minutes</b>	S. Ama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved</li> </ul>
<b>6. Adjournment</b>		

Facilitator: Suzie Ama

Recorder: Suzie Ama