



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 C020 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