



Program Review Committee
Minutes
February 2, 2018
EW 207, Video, CCCConfer
10:30 am - 12:00 pm

Present: Suzie Ama, Michael Erskine, Kim Kelly, Heather Ostash, Sylvia Sotomayor
 On phone: Steve Rogers, Karee Hamilton

Absent: Scott Cameron, Peter Fulks, Lisa Fuller, Michael Kane, Ryan Khamkongsay

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. Maintenance & Operations Program Review – 1st Review	J. Daly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee members felt that it was a good first review draft, but several important functions of the department were not described. Strengths that are identified should not be subjective, but based on data. Heather is going to work with John in the development of the revision. • Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add cover page. ○ Section 1.1 – Develop mission further. Suggest to first identify College mission and then relate the department mission to it. Address the section prompts. ○ 1.2 – Without too much detail, explain key periods of the department’s evolution. Include key developments at the sites. ○ 2.3 – List <u>all</u> of the department’s key functions (a bullet list is great). Don’t forget to include maintenance of college auto fleet, xeriscape, remodeling project, event setup, maintenance of solar field, etc. Explain the difference between OSHA vs DSA. What functions are outsourced? Provide some analysis about how these functions are operating. Anything that is mentioned in the Exec Summary or the Planning part, must be thoroughly discussed here.

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2.5 – Identify service recipients as they relate to the various functions of the department. The service recipients may not be the same for all functions. How are service recipients’ needs determined? ○ 2.4 – Discuss employment of student workers. ○ 2.6 – Add percentages to present a single value. Analyze the findings. ○ 2.7 - List the costs of providing the department services. What are the sources of revenue for the department? Are outsourced functions cost-effective? Analyze. ○ 3.1 – Discuss staffing vacancies/replacements. ○ 3.3 – Discuss building replacement and vehicle replacement plans. ○ 4.1 – For all AUOs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Simply state the target in the Target cell (e.g. 75%). ▪ The Assessment Method cells should contain a description of how the AUO was measured (e.g. The AUO was assessed with the Spring 2015 Student Experience survey and a Staff satisfaction survey.) If you know the number of people who participated, this is the best place to indicate that. If you are using multiple measures/surveys, explain how the separate results will be aggregated into a single result. ▪ In the Assessment Date cells, only indicate the semester and year when the data was collected (e.g. Spring 2015). ▪ In Recent Results, indicate the results (e.g. 82% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied.) ○ 4.1 – Why hasn’t AUO 2 been assessed? School Dude has been in use for a while now. ○ Part 5 – There are currently goals that mention an issue for the first time in Part 5. Make sure the subjects of all goals have been fully described and analyzed earlier in the document. ● Spelling/Grammar/Style <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2.4 change “we will” to “we” ○ Spell out abbreviations
<p>4. Paralegal Program Review – 1st Review</p>	<p>D. Ward</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Committee felt that this was a strong first review and that it thoroughly and appropriately uses the data to formulate goals for continued improvement. ● Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide more information about why there was a decline in FTES but increase in FTEF. Explain that adjuncts were added for prison classes. ○ Section 2.4 - Student success and retention is discussed both in this section and in Part 4. This section only pertains to majors and completors, so recommend that duplicated

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>content be deleted from 2.4 and unduplicated content be moved to Part 4, as necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2.5 - Provide more analysis on why enrollments have been declining. ○ 2.5 - More discussion about enrollment at sites or working with other communities. Program online so available throughout our service area? Students taking at the sites? Tehachapi? Would be useful data by zip code. ○ 2.5 - More information about where students are located. ○ 2.5 - More discussion about serving incarcerated students. Is a certificate going to be offered? Any enrollment info? Future plans? Seems like a potential focus area with program declining online. ○ 2.8 - Provide data to support claim that ABA cannot be pursued because an on-ground program is not possible. ○ 2.8 – Explain plans for adding advisory members. ○ 3.1 It is stated that the 2015 hire was the first time the program had a full time hire. Actually, this isn't true. We had a full time faculty member many years ago who started the program. ○ 3.5 - How do posters and brochures market an online program? What marketing efforts are being used to reach potential students outside our service area? ○ Part 4 - It was suggested that the targets for some SLOs are too high and should all be lowered to 75%. Yet, some SLO outcomes are slightly above 75% and instructional improvements were still identified. Therefore, the target is not too high. The target should be the threshold of student achievement, above which no instructional or institutional improvements can be identified. This may differ for different classes. The targets cannot be changed for past assessments, but the discussion about future changes to targets should account for this high threshold. ○ 4.1 - Could use the Launchboard data for employment 2 and 4 quarters after exit in the employment data section. Ask M. Kane about this. ○ 4.4.c – If there are specific trends or conclusions to be drawn about SLOs that directly inform PLOs, discuss that. ○ Part 5 - Long-term planning does not discuss planning or response if enrollment continues to decline. Expand upon this. ○ 5.1 – Meaning unclear: “The current strength of the program would be within the faculty and addition of full-time faculty to the program to help with consistency within

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>the course offerings.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spelling/Grammar/Style <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For all instances of course numbers, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add space after PARA or BSAD (e.g. PARA C101) ▪ BSAD131 should be BSAD C131 (space and C is needed). ○ Spell out acronyms, including EMSI ○ 2.4 (page 14) “Although success rates are trending down.” is not a complete sentence. ○ 2.4 (page 15) “fair” should be “fare” ○ 3.1 “Current Staffing needs appear to the adequate.” should be “Current staffing appears to be adequate.” ○ 3.1 - suggest referring to students in the prison as “incarcerated students” and not “inmates.” ○ 4.1 Refer to Parts and Sections consistently. ○ Page 41-43 BSAD 131 needs to read BSAD C131 ○ Spell out LDA.
<p>5. Administration of Justice Review – 1st Review</p>	<p>J. Bowen</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee agreed that this is a strong First Review draft. • Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In Executive Summary, change reference of department to program. PRs evaluate programs, rather than departments. ○ Throughout the document, use headings to differentiate discussion of AS-T and POST in all relevant sections. ○ ○ Section 1.3 – Revise Spring 2017 to Spring 2018 ○ 2.1 - Mission needs to discuss “transfer” and modeling after TMC. ○ 2.4, 2.5 – Also present data in charts. ○ 3.5 – Consider discussing Career Day and the I’m Going to College – 5th grade event. ○ 4.1 – 5-year trending student achievement data is needed here (success, retention, equity, and Perkins data. Present in charts with narrative explanation and analysis to follow. ○ 4.1 – Enrollment data doesn’t belong here—should be discussed in 2.5. ○ 4.1 – Completer data doesn’t belong here—should be discussed in 2.4.

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 4.1, 4.2 – Also present data in charts. ○ 4.3 – In Assessment Method cells, also identify the courses that were used to assess PLO. Also complete the Assessment Date and Recent Results cell, which are empty. Make clear that the PLOs pertain to the AS-T. ○ 4.4 – Mastery of all SLOs may suggest that the targets are too low. The target should challenge instructional and institutional practices. Normally, if there is room for improvement, and an outcome is met, the target is too low. On the other hand, regulations may require that students meet every outcome. Discuss this. ○ 4.4.b – It is mentioned briefly that all SLOs will be revised in the next cycle. This topic needs a dedicated paragraph to explain the rationale for doing so. ● Spelling/Grammar/Style <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Spell out acronyms ○ Section 2.8, list advisory members in bullet list. ○ “Victor Valley College” rather than “Victorville Valley College” ○ 3.3 – Recommend starting new paragraph at “Due to the lead exposure...” and “Since the last...” ○ 5.1 – First sentence “demonstrative” should “demonstrated” ○ Sylvia has provided a marked up copy to correct other spelling and grammar errors.
8. Adjournment	S. Ama	Adjourned 12:00 pm

Facilitator: Suzie Ama

Recorder: Suzie Ama