In attendance at the meeting were:
Mark Fronke, Chair
Angela Beck
Angela Conley
Christina Fernandez
Todd Gaffaney
Nick Kremer
Cynthia Lavariere
Rachel Mason
Lola Rizkallah
Linda Rose
Farid Wissa
David Young

Absent:
Lorraine Gersitz (Excused)
Shantal Voorwinden (Excused)

Guests:
Debra Moore
Rich Cameron
Ed Heckerman
Connie Mayfield

1. Photography Presentation – Mark Fronke welcomed Ed Heckerman to the meeting. Christina Fernandez and Connie Mayfield joined in the presentation. The committee had a thorough discussion on the goals of the department. Mark Fronke and the committee emphasized their desire for clarity of the goals document (Appendix D) since future reference will be obtained therein and the Planning document (Appendix A) will not include details. Debra Moore, Faculty Senate President emphasized the availability of numerous examples for the departments to review to avoid
miscommunication and misdirected expectations. Mark Fronke confirmed that the approved Programs will be posted online for future reference; in addition he will post examples. Since each department and program review is unique he does not want to refer to a particular program as being a model. **Motion:** The motion to approve the Photography program review pending changes was moved by Farid Wissa and seconded by Nick Kremer. **Action:** The committee unanimously approved the conditional approval of the department’s program review. Connie Mayfield thanked the committee for allowing her to be vocal and express her opinions on the Program Review documents. The committee noted the requested changes to update the document for approval.

2. **Review/Approve Minutes** Item tabled for the next meeting time due to constraints.

3. **Discussion on Goal Establishment Form** Tabled for the next meeting.

4. **Comments on CIS** – Mark Fronke encouraged the committee members to stay on top of forwarding their comments in a timely manner since there has been a decline with the committee comment responses on programs under review. Based on this fact there is the perception which was confirmed with him by Debra Moore that he is personally making all the comments on the reports independently. Since Mark is only working with the tools he is presented, his comments are the only ones available when follow-up is due to the departments for feedback to their drafts. The committee had a discussion on making changes regarding reading the drafts and finals for possible allocation among the committee members.

5. **Programs Under Review Due Dates 2010-11** – Mark Fronke gave the committee an update on his progress with the following departments: programs for next year and have contacted the following: Business Administration, Chemistry, and Teacher Trac. Mark is currently waiting for a reply from the remaining departments: Administration of Justice, Speech and Language Pathology, and Real Estate departments, Auto Collision and Auto Repair.

6. **Nominations for IPR Chair** – Mark Fronke’s term as Program Review Chair ends for the 2009-10 school year. Mark Fronke informed the committee that he is willing to continue as the chair, or even as a committee member if the committee is favorable of another chair. Linda Rose nominated Mark Fronke as the Instructional Program Review Chair. The nomination was seconded by Lola Rizkallah. The committee unanimously approved Mark Fronke to continue as chair to the Instructional Program Review Committee for the 2010-11 and 2011-2012 school years. The committee unanimously voted for Mark Fronke as the chair of Program Review. The term is for two years.

7. **Items from the Floor** – Nick Kremer made the recommendation that the committee hold an additional meeting on Tuesday, 5-11-10. The committee unanimously agreed that an additional meeting would be held on that date. **Action:** There will be an additional Program Review Meeting held on Tuesday, 5-11-10, at 3:00 in SS 141.
8. **Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

**Next meeting**  
Tuesday, May 4  
3:00-4:30  
SS 141

**Photography Presentation Summary**

Mark Fronke requested that the presenter spend time on sharing the department goals. Ed Heckerman discussed the department goals as follows: Ed indicated they feel they have done a good job on the report distributed to the committee.

Facility space and Surplus issues were thoroughly discussed: The department’s first goal is to make the classroom and lab environment physically more conducive to student learning by acquiring storage space on or off campus for valuable dark room that is currently filling up the classroom studio space. Ed Heckerman informed the committee of the grant the department received three years prior to transform their facilities in which they received only 25% of the amount of the grant. The result of the grant funds allowed them to turn the film development area into digital resource center. The enlargers (E-lab) were moved to the film development area. This caused surplus enlargers. The classroom doubles as studio space. A large amount of equipment is taking up the majority of available space. The department doesn’t want to surplus the equipment due to safety hazards as well as additional reasons, and due to the expense of storing the enlargers, the department consulted and felt it would be foolish to surplus these items. It was suggested that there are some creative options on campus where these can possible be stored, as well as the option of a new facility in the future. Connie Mayfield validated this suggestion and informed the committee that this information has been on the district capital outlay priority list plan for the past two years. In addition she noted that Dr. Lacy is approving of their plan, although there are currently no resources available. Connie Mayfield informed the committee that this discussion was made at the Facilities Planning Committee meeting and the Burnight Center which houses the photography department is and is included in the next two Bonds, either this November or next, photography will follow in line.

Additional goals are to provide courses for people who want to make money in photography, and transfer. The department discussed in detail courses they are pursuing that tie in with their mission statement with their critical analysis. The department would need to redefine the certificates to accommodate these courses. The department submitted surveys to the students in which it was indicated they are interested in more commercial photography courses. The challenge is the difficulty of finding someone in the industry with the proper degree to teach at the community college level. Once FTE’s are of importance the other issue will be where additional courses will be housed.
The department stressed issues they have been having with the vocabulary and methods not being consistent throughout the department which poses a problem. An example of this is when a student advances into a higher class within the department and the terminology used is completely different for the same item. Clarification was given to ensure that common methods are used. Ed Heckerman mentioned that this could be re-written in the curriculum.

Nick Kremer recommended to the department to emphasize the safety issues in their argument with the lab manager which was not strongly indicated in writing as is in their verbal presentation. Ed Heckerman and Christina Fernandez emphasized this case and how costs have been passed on to the students as lab fees. Connie Mayfield indicated that adult hourly student workers have been hired as fill in’s due to the absence of a lab manager. Approval was made by Marilyn Brock to continue the adult hourly workers due to safety issues. Ed Heckerman confirmed the committee that he and Christina Fernandez are both working part of an additional assignment due to the lack of faculty in the department in addition to the one hour of release time that he is receiving as Department Chair. The department indicated that there are lab manager issues which is the management of the safety chemicals and equipment. The department is comprised of only two staff members which they indicated is inadequate. The division Dean, Connie Mayfield emphasized this issue.

Discussion was made on presenting a competitive website for the department to attract students that are searching for photography colleges. Christina Fernandez informed the committee of the restrictions that apply as well as web author access that must be obtained which entails a longer process and many of the students lack the attention span for this process. The department has been unsuccessful with a student rep thus far. The department does not have a web author, it was clarified that the web author for Fine Arts/Theatre Arts does not include the photography department. The advantage to this is for marketing purposes.

Mark Fronke emphasized to the presenters not to make goals that cannot be supported with substantial evidence. Assertions that are put in the document either need to be deleted or evidence should be supplied. One example of this is the suggestion that the department goal would be that writing a job description for a lab manager would be an obtainable goal since the department has no control over hiring, and not the statement that the goal is to hire a lab manager. This difference leaves the obtainable goal achievable with the department where the statement issued by the department does not. The department indicated that the administration is aware of their hiring concerns.

Christina Fernandez expressed her frustration with the statements concerning proof of evidence to assertions indicating that she feels that the information pertaining to the impact on the issues related to students is logical. Connie Mayfield inserted her input stating that the department’s outlook on the situation differs from the committee’s; they have an artistic bias and the communication gap. The committee confirmed that they did address the comments and input that was given to them as feedback previously. Mark
Fronke followed-up with the department that if they do not wish to take the additional comments into the documentation, that he is fine with that.

David Young communicated that a breakdown in the Program Review process has occurred and that it has been frustrating to some of the departments and that attention should be given to that.

Linda Rose emphasized the importance of the documentation being clear due to accreditation purposes. She noted that Program Review is one of the main areas that the Accreditation Committee will focus on in the future. The departments have the ability to avoid future red flags in this area.

Mark Fronke, Linda Rose and Rachel Mason gave suggestions as to evidence to the department that the information is justified. Rachel Mason recommended that the department give clarification in the report

Mark Fronke verified concerns that the documentation the departments have spent hours preparing will be posted on the website once approved for the view of administration. He emphasized his job in requiring adequate documentation to assertions for purposes of clarity in the future.

Mark Fronke also confirmed that all past documentation and archives have been maintained. Miriam Tolson agreed and indicated that the documents are now in files in the Faculty Senate Office.