



Program Review Committee
Minutes
February 9, 2018
EW 207, Video, CCCConfer
9:00 am - 12:00 pm

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

Absent: Scott Cameron, Peter Fulks, Ryan Khamkongsay

Start Time:

Adjourn:

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
1. Call to order		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9:00 AM
2. Approval of Agenda	S. Ama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved
3. Welding Program Review – 1st Review	D. Villicana	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change page layout to portrait. Add program name to the header of the document. Use consistent font and size for paragraphs, tables, and lists. Close up gaps between paragraphs and sections. Ensure that strengths or weaknesses that are discussed in Planning are fully developed in the body of the document. Page 20 – Marketing – recommend discussion your participation in outreach events such as “I’m Going to College,” “Career Day,” and other campus events. Page 26 – Typo “employment” Sylvia provided a marked up hard copy with spelling/grammar/style corrections. <p>Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify student population (proportions)

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>Part 1 Relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 – Add some analysis to this section. • 1.1 -Pass/No Pass grading not allowed for any major courses • 1.2 – Add analysis to this section. Make connections between PLOs and relevance to workplace. • 1.2 - The PLOs are listed but there is no discussion of their relevance to what students can do upon completion. • 1.4 – Provide more explanation about why the program takes 3 semesters. <p>Part 2 Appropriateness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1and 2.2 - Make a clear statement about the proportion of students taking classes. • 2.4 - Drop in declared majors along with drop in enrollment- any analysis or commentary on this? • CNC plasma cutter referred to as potentially having a substantial impact on enrollment and completers- need to provide some explanation of this? What does this add to the program? Why will it make a difference to student enrollment and completion? • If drop in enrollment between C101 and C102 because substantially increased difficulty level, is there a way to distribute this between the two classes for a smoother transition? Application of additional supports if this course if acting as a gatekeeper to the rest of the program? What supports are available to students to minimize drops in persistence between courses? Mention that hobbyists tend to drop at this point. • 2.5 - Regarding the reference to scheduling in evening around student employment, how is this determined? Is their data on the number of students employed and needing evening classes? How does this relate to students only taking classes for personal reasons- is this only in the lower level classes? • 2.9 - Program costs on PR inconsistent with the website information which is updated every year. Reference what is on the web site, but provide additional information, if available. Info can be found at: https://www.cerrococo.edu/programs/welding-technology-degree <p>Part 3 Currency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaborate on why lower class sizes are needed. The classes are limited by the number of work stations available. This means productivity will be lower, and some of the comparisons with

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>college numbers aren't really indicative of the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1 With decline in productivity and enrollment, what is the need for increased adjuncts? Discuss depth of pool and flexibility • 3.2 Elaborate on how trade shows connect to professional development? Is it vendors? Is it an opportunity to learn new technologies? Currency, they get to try stuff out. Statement that it meets industry standards. • 3.5 Are there target student populations for the program? Pipelines or particular outreach? Are there ROP programs to partner with or recruit from in our communities? Opportunities for pathways? Incorporate Skill Attainment in marketing? <p>Part 4 Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 Examples of non-welder positions great! Are there any numbers that can be tied to this? Makes sense, would help to support with some numbers for context. • 4.3 – Last sentence change to “...should not be changed.” • 4.3.b – Typo: “We believe that the current learning outcomes are satisfactory and should [not?] require major change in the near future” ○ 4.4 – DRFT C108 and MCTL C107 show being assessed in FA17, but no indicated whether met or not. <p>Part 5 Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For marketing goal include the PIO part of that responsible team.
<p>4. Library Program Review – 1st Review</p>	<p>J. Cornett</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Comments about Spelling and Grammar: Please define abbreviations before use. Please be consistent in what is capitalized. Refer to campuses as Ridgecrest/Indian Wells Valley (IWV) and then IWV. For ESCC, refer to Eastern Sierra, Eastern Sierra College Center (ESCC), Bishop, and/or Mammoth Lakes. For KRV, Lake Isabella or Kern River Valley (KRV). Also, Cerro Coso or Cerro Coso Community College, not Cerro Coso College, please. Please be consistent in academic year formats, using either 2016-2017 or 2016-17. Please be consistent with course name formats. They should match the schedule of classes & catalog so “COUN C101” rather than COUNS 101. Sylvia provided a marked up copy for you with other minor spelling and

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>grammar issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 9, 12, 37, 40 references to counseling classes as “COUNS” however should be “COUN” • Page 13 and 24 – suggest not using “inmate students” but rather “incarcerated students” • This is a great first review! Nice work <p>Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typo: One of the department’s prioritized goal plural. <p>Part 1 Relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 – Provide text of college mission immediately preceding discussion of relationship to college mission and strategic goals. • 1.3 – “however, there is a reserve text collection housed in a locking cabinet and the Librarians are working with an adjunct and the Site Director to begin developing Library services and programming there.” Clarify that adjunct is adjunct instructor. • 1.3 - Should decreasing number of sections college-wide be taken into consideration when justifying the downward trend in Library C100 enrollments? Mention that enrollments college-wide are declining. • 1.2 – “Professional literature makes a strong case..” sentence is repeated. <p>Part 2 Appropriateness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2 pg 12 – Paragraph that is centered should be left-aligned. • 2.5 - Statement about joint-use library in Mammoth- how was insufficiency determined? Can an example or two of gaps be provided? • 2.6 – (Optional suggestion) Although the pie charts are beautifully done, Pareto charts would be even more effective in sequencing the expenditures from high to low. <p>Part 3 Currency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1 - Is there any comparative data for California Community College for librarian staffing to support the recommendations about staffing? I understand the recommendations as ideals we would all support, but it seems appropriate to consider it in the context of the fact that it is unfunded and in the context of overall resource allocation. As an example, counseling also has

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>these staffing recommendation for decades and repeatedly affirmed (most recently in 2016) that the student to counselor ratio should be 1:370. For our headcount, that would mean 16 FTE of counselors. We currently have 10.5 FTE of counselors (full-time and adjunct) teaching or reassigned 1.4 FTE within load. We would have to hire 5.5 FTE of counselors to meet this recommendation. What are the ideal numbers? Even Counseling staff falls below ideal. Comparisons with other schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1 - Analysis and recommendation would be strengthened with comparative and clearer data to support the recommendations on staffing for sufficiency. • 3.5 - (Optional suggestion) Library/Info competency/support services are also “marketed” in orientation and Navigate- could add content to more explicitly promote LIBR C100. It is there, but would be more clearly described and promoted as a recommended learning support class. <p>Part 4 Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Note from SLO Committee: Consider working IR in the future on a standardized random survey. ○ 4.2 – Use table for PLOs (same table as used for AUOs) ○ 4.3 – If possible add information in the narrative such as how many offerings, locations, etc. were included in each assessment. ○ 4.3 - Related to KRV campus and identified gap. Was pedagogy evaluated (both representative of course offering, and also if it could be adjusted to better connect with the identified population)? If only a few students were in the course, could that have been a factor (for how the course was taught, in considering results, etc)? What attempts were made, or could be made in the future to make the curriculum more inclusive (representative of the group served)? If a faculty training on how to work with different populations, including targeted teaching strategies might help, identify it (this can help with resource allocation)? <p>Part 5 Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5.3 - Page 36 – reference to how LIBR C100 is not offered on ground at ESCC or prison; it is also not offered on ground at the Tehachapi site. • 5.5 – The document makes the case that better facilities and increased staffing at the sites is needed. Recommend adding a goal that pertains to these. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
<p>5. Kinesiology Program Review – 1st Review</p>	<p>K. Kelly</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the Instructions Page. • Remove section prompts. • Spelling and Grammar: Use abbreviations sparingly, and define abbreviations before use. Refer to the program consistently as Kinesiology or Kinesiology AA-T and to the department as Kinesiology or Kinesiology and Health Science. Refer to campuses as Ridgecrest/Indian Wells Valley (I WV) and then IWV. For ESCC, refer to Eastern Sierra, Eastern Sierra College Center (ESCC), Bishop, and/or Mammoth Lakes. Please be consistent in academic year formats, using either 2016-2017 or 2016-17. Spell out semester + year combinations. Please be consistent with course name formats. They should match the schedule of classes & catalog so “BIOL C101” rather than BIO 101. Sylvia provided a marked up copy with corrections for other minor spelling and grammar issues. <p>Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recommendations <p>Part 1 Relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 – Some analysis is needed. What stakeholders participated in the development of the program description? • 1.2 – Some analysis is needed. For example, briefly refer to PLO assessments and discuss how that process has confirmed the appropriateness of the PLOs • 1.3 – Restore matrix table. Delete the screen capture and create table in Word. • 1.3 – Restore the Program Pathway heading. Sylvia will provide a better image to use for the pathway document. • 1.4 - Revise the formatting of the class-prerequisite list. A table with Course and Prerequisite headings would make the relationships clearer. • 1.4 – Renumber section heading “Conditions of Enrollment” to 1.5. Add MATH C053 to prerequisites for MATH C121. <p>Part 2 Appropriateness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either 2.1 or 2.3 – A number of the courses required for the degree also apply as general education. This supports GE as part of the mission, assists students in timely completion (lower units). Up to 13 units of the major courses also count as meeting GE requirements for the CSU

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p data-bbox="953 237 1287 261">Cert and IGETC. Point that out.</p> <ul data-bbox="909 297 1955 886" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="909 297 1955 459">• 2.3 - Add a statement about transfer model curriculum and major prep determined by CSU alignment. Something like: As an AS-T, the major courses are determined by the Transfer Model Curriculum, which simultaneously awards students an associate degree and prepares them for special benefits/guarantees upon transfer to CSU. This alignment informs the appropriateness and currency of the program. <li data-bbox="909 492 1808 516">• 2.4 – Explain how athletics may serve as a pipeline for the Kinesiology program. <li data-bbox="909 548 1877 573">• 2.5 (HO) - Are there plans to revise PHED C101 to count for CSU Cert Area E? Discuss. <li data-bbox="909 605 1940 703">• 2.5 (HO) - I have a list from ASSIST of all of the CSUs offering Kinesiology programs that our Major would prep for if you want to add that as an attachment or you could just list the number of CSUs. Either way, good demand data. <li data-bbox="909 735 1961 800">• 2.5 – Please remove “, IR could not marry majors to sites, just addresses” or expand upon the issue. <li data-bbox="909 833 1955 886">• 2.6 – Clarify what OERs are and how they lower costs to the students, since this document is for the general public. <p data-bbox="858 919 1031 943">Part 3 Currency</p> <ul data-bbox="909 979 1955 1141" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="909 979 1955 1076">• Explain how athletics may serve as a pipeline for the Kinesiology program- tied in in terms of faculty (3.1), full-time enrollments (2.5) at the college, but also part of the pipeline for the major specifically (2.4). <li data-bbox="909 1109 1461 1133">• 3.5 - “Preview Day” is now called “Career Day.” <p data-bbox="858 1182 1073 1206">Part 4 Achievement</p> <ul data-bbox="909 1247 1955 1495" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="909 1247 1749 1271">• 4.1 - Suggested to show off the high success and retention rates in graphs <li data-bbox="909 1304 1955 1433">• 4.1 - Describe impact of the transferability of the program on success, retention, and completion. In other words, pretty much every CSU has a KINS degree, and this may be the connection—the transfer connection. Student may understand this, positively affecting their participation. <li data-bbox="909 1466 1955 1495">• 4.3 – Use the table provided in the template. This table was developed by the SLO committee

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>and ensure that the information is presented consistently across all program reviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.4.a – The gaps section is missing. Just indicate N/A if no gaps. Renumber summary to b. ○ 4.4.b – Explain more about why some SLOs didn't get assessed. You could indicate that the implementation of eLumen will provide prompts to assess or reassess when needed and will ensure a systematic cycle of assessment. Other program reviews have mentioned eLumen in reference to this gap. <p>Part 5 Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.3, 5.4 – Rather than CIC rep being responsible for goals, identify Faculty Chair and department as responsible parties. • 5.4 - The 18-19 Kinesiology AUP indicated survey data and an initiative to explore and/or develop the offering of new PE classes based on student interest. This does not seem to be reflected in the PR, since so many PE classes apply in the major, seems to a connection between AUP goals and PR goals. Discuss transition from focusing on movement to seminar classes.
<p>6. Child Development Review – 1st Review</p>	<p>L. Fuller</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Comments about Spelling and Grammar: Use acronyms sparingly unless used extensively. If acronyms are required, spell out at first use. Be consistent in academic year formats, using either 2016-2017 or 2016-17. Sylvia provided marked up copy, identifying spelling and grammar issues. <p>Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Executive Summary <p>Part 1 Relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3. PLOs referred to by letter rather than by number as in the previous section. Please be consistent, one way or the other. • 1.4. Re pre-reqs: Take repeated sentences for each course and add them to the paragraph explaining the need for pre-reqs for CHDV C203. • 1.4 – Discuss intentionality of citing content reviews.

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<p>Part 2 Appropriateness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1 - Cite college mission for comparison. • 2.2 - Since the program is statewide it might be nice to show the statewide EMSI data as well. • 2.2 - Since this is a transfer program, is there data on articulation? At http://www.calstate.edu/transfer/adt-search/search.shtml you can get a list of all CSUs with similar program and alignment to our AS-T. Speaks to demand. • 2.3 - A number of courses also meet GE- C104, C105, C106, C121 - could also alternatively be addressed in alignment with mission Point out courses that also meet local GE. • 2.4 – Provide analysis of majors versus completers. • 2.5 - Comparison of first day enrollment versus census enrollment shows attrition. Data is provided but not addressed or analysis provided. Optional: How does attrition rate compare to the college average (same modes of delivery) like in comparison to college average provided in Students/sections)? <p>Part 3 Currency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1 – Typo: “Only is (if) some of the smaller communities like Lake Isabella, Lone Pine, and Big Pine are there issues with students finding employment.” • 3.1 – If possible, widen the table to fit column labels on one line. • 3.3 - Explain rotation of courses at KRV • 3.1 (p 28) – What is meant by “local program,” given that this is an online program? • 3.1 - Is faculty load analysis based on current situation or on the eventual replacement of the semi-retired faculty member? Clarify. • <p>Part 4 Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 - Success and retention numbers for Distance Ed. consistent or better than college average- could be included in the analysis and provide more of a context for numbers. Statement about how the program meets or exceeds college average.

Topic	Facilitator	Summary/Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1 – Regarding statement made about lack of online student preparedness, what are strategies to improve being considered? OEI tools? • 4.1 – Perkins data should be presented and analyzed here, as well. • 4.1 – The “Exchange” is mentioned, but the Online Education Initiative is not discussed here or any place else in the document. This section or 2.5 may be the best place for that. • 4.2 – The Earnings table should be moved to section 2.6. Section 4.2 is asking about the employment/placement of our actual students. Do you have employment data on your graduates? ○ 4.5 – Is PLO 5 being assessed in Year 4, too? ○ CHDV 105 and 106—narrative mentions that the courses were update for CAP alignment and that they have completely different (new) SLOs and that SLO tools still being developed...yet, according to the matrix, some of the SLOs were met. A bit confused: were all the SLOs assessed? Or only certain ones? Were the ones that were not met due to the fact they weren’t assessed? Or due to the fact that mastery was not achieved? ○ Discussion of the courses that double as GE courses should be addressed. <p>Part 5 Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recommendations
8. Adjournment	S. Ama	Adjourned 11:00 pm

Facilitator: Suzie Ama

Recorder: Suzie Ama