CERRITOS COLLEGE

TO: Members of the Program Review Advisory Committee

FROM: Miriam Tolson, Program Assistant II

DATE: February 17, 2010

SUBJECT: Minutes of IPR meeting –February 16, 2009

In attendance at the meeting:
Mark Fronke
Angela Beck
Christina Fernandez
Todd Gaffaney
Lorraine Gersitz
Cynthia Lavariere
Rachel Mason
Lola Rizkallah
Farid Wissa
David Young

Absent:
Angela Conley
Nick Kremer
Linda Rose
Shantal Voorwinden

Guest (s):
Janet McLarty-Schroeder
Jim Henriques
Thad Szabo
Robert Buschauer
Carlos Mera

Call to order – The meeting was called to order at 3:07 P.M.

1. Physics/Astronomy Presentation – Mark Fronke welcomed the presenters, Janet McLarty-Schroeder, Department Chair Janet McLarty Schroeder and colleagues as indicated under the roster guest list. The presentation is summarized as follows in the report summary following the minutes.

A motion was made by Mark Fronke to approve the Physics/Astronomy Program Review. It was moved by Lola Rizkallah and seconded by Todd Gaffaney.
**Action:** The committee unanimously approved the department’s program review. The department will submit the addendum form which includes the goals and accomplishments which will be reviewed in approximately three years. The feedback form will be submitted to the department chair by Miriam Tolson. Mark Fronke indicated to the Presenters that their comments will be read and taken to heart and that all the colleagues present with the Chair are welcomed to participate.

2. **Review/Approve Minutes from February 2, 2010 Motion:** Action: It was moved by David Young and seconded by Farid Wissa to approve the minutes of 2-2-10.

   **Discussion:** David Young noted the minutes should reflect that on the Discussion on Evaluating GE Courses should clarify that the discussion was about the contribution of G.E. courses to students to obtain either degrees or certificates and they we as a college are currently not currently doing a good job of processing this. **Action:** The committee unanimously approved the minutes of as amended.

3. **Program Review Standards** – David Young presented information to the committee regarding his involvement with other task force groups on campus, and reviewing the notion of prerequisites and SLO’s, and the frustration present due to the reluctance of the campus to inform students of their skills to be successful in the classes. In reviewing the Program Review Self-Study the Program Review Workbook 2008 – on page 8-9 regarding Program Review standards under “Description of the Program” item number ii and item number 3 which states, “The appropriateness of the prerequisites, co-requisites, and advisories in terms of course content and program student learning outcomes and goals.” David indicated that this standard is also indicating the absence of prerequisites, and that it is implicit that with the absence of prerequisites there is a need to justify the reason they are not present, based on the students’ reading and math levels. David Young’s recommendation is that the Program Review committee request that Programs under review, justify the prerequisites and co-requisites (or lack thereof) for their courses. Page 8 item 2 c. which reads “Course grading and retention patterns. Explain any patterns in grading or retention in terms of the student demographics and program goals.” David is requesting an expanded definition of the concept “demographics”, which in terms of the Program Review process, identify the characteristics of population of education and skill sets and not in terms of demographics based on age, gender etc. David Young emphasized the point of students taking up seats in classes that should have been pre-warned of and denying access to students that could succeed. The mechanisms are available if it is made clear to students what skill level is required. Christina Fernandez inquired as to what instrument the Program Review process could utilize and making the instrument for this accessible to the campus. Examples were given by Mark Fronke based on Accounting 100 which does not have a prerequisite; however it does require basic math which is understood, but no proof is required. David Young stressed the fact of putting advisories on the course prerequisite list and coming from the institution which he believes overall would deter students that would not succeed as a warning which he believes is an illusion to a student that is not up to that standard. The committee had a lengthy conversation on this topic. David Young emphasized that a climate of transparency is good as well as the emphasis on the student’s self-esteem when the student passes or fails. It was noted that the college’s desire for higher enrollment has resulted in limited
prerequisites. This is harmful to students who are not prepared as well as students denied entrance due to the class being full. Christina Fernandez emphasized that the problem is institutional; however David Young emphasized that this needs to be initiated through the Program Review process with this being an institutional committee. Mark Fronke noted to the committee to think about whether the committee would need to revise the Program Review Workbook and if this process will be done annually or longer. The committee emphasized the need for the presence of Chris Myers as part of the involvement in this conversation. It was discussed that the trends would be discussed at some point at the end of the semester based on the information on the Feedback Input forms received from the departments Under Review.

4. **Comments on Reading and BCOT/BCOM Draft** – Mark Fronke sent comments to the Reading department who will be presenting on 2-16-10. There was discussion on the BCOT/BCOM department items that needed to be purged in their report. Mark indicated that he was appreciative of receiving the comments that he did from the committee. Rachel Mason will follow-up, although she saw parts of it the beginning of the year she had not seen anything recently. The following department presentations are scheduled as follows: **BCOT/BCOM 3-2-10, Reading 3-16-10, Foreign Language 4-6-10, Photography 4-20-10, and CIS on 5-4-10.**

5. **Liaisons for 2010-11 school year.** Mark Fronke distributed a list of the 2010-11 Programs that are Under Review. The committee members present volunteered for the departments that were not associated with their teaching divisions as directed by Mark Fronke. The committee members that were not present were assigned departments. It was recommended that the student representative share as a liaison with a committee member. An updated chart will be issued to the committee by Mark Fronke via email.

6. **Items from the Floor** – Mark Fronke informed the committee that Lorraine Edson-Perone would no longer be on the committee and the replacement is Angela Conley. Mark Fronke requested a committee member to represent the Program Review Committee at the Student Success Committee meeting on the following Wednesday. The meetings are held the 2nd and 4th Wednesday’s of the month at 3:00 P.M. It was decided that Mark Fronke would attend if a committee member was unable to represent the Program Review department. Mark Fronke requested that the committee submit him feedback confirming they read the reports even if they do not have comments to send. Mark Fronke requested for Miriam Tolson to set up the meeting schedule dates for Program Review Committee meetings for the first and third Tuesdays, during the 2011-2012 school year. In addition the assignment due dates for the Programs Under Review will be placed on the next agenda for discussion.

7. **Adjournment** - The meeting adjourned at 4:20 P.M.

---

Next Program Review Meeting  
Tuesday, March 2, 2010  
3:00-4:30 P.M.  
SS 141
Physics/Astronomy Presentation Summary

The Presenters Janet McLarty-Schroeder, Department chair Physics/Astronomy and associates from the SEM division were present. A summary of the presentation is as follows:

Janet McLarty-Schroeder discussed the program and their goals, and it was indicated that the Physics/Astronomy program is a small and fairly healthy program. The Astronomy Program has grown in the past 10 years, and the Physics Program has grown within the past several years.

The department lobbies for full-time instructors
Astronomy instructors are not usually native to California, so it is very difficult to find full-time instructors. Adjunct faculty is very rare to find for this program due to the knowledge about Astronomy. Most of the Astronomy instructors locate in Hawaii, Arizona, normally outside of California. The current chair relocated to California from Arizona.

Student recruiting – It was noted that the students are usually transfer students so programs pertaining to community/industry is not common.

Department Goals
- The department desires to maintain the course offerings and equipment that they currently have. Physics continues to be equipment heavy.
- The department decided it is better to cancel Astronomy classes rather than to staff the courses with those who are not proficient in the Astronomy field. Even with advanced degrees negative consequences have resulted in this teaching area with inadequate teaching information.
- Priority lists are submitted yearly

Mark Fronke inquired regarding the area of outside funding since the response on the required form was very vague. Janet McLarty-Schroeder indicated that the vague information is due to the fact that it any outside funding would usually apply to equipment. Lola Rizkallah asked the presenter whether advisory boards had been explored for supportive reasons in the industry. Janet McLarty-Schroeder indicated there were formerly ties to the aerospace industry many years prior, however at this time the majority of Physics/Astronomy students are transfer students to universities; therefore there is less of a tie to industry.

Some of the ways that funding is utilized includes
- Conferences for mostly Hispanic institutions
- Grants were discussed for the planetarium or observatory
  - Other college planetariums can be rented
- Grants for equipment
- Building upgrades to accommodate the telescope is extremely expensive and has not been completed; however equipment unit in the value of $10,000 is
underutilized due to the building being non supportive – not in compliance for installation.
  ● Specific area for housing this is required
  ● Doorway access is a concern due to the size of the equipment
● Funding concern for equipment already owned but cannot be installed due to the building not being supportive

**Long Term Goals**

- Mark Fronke suggested that ongoing goals would include the equipment needs including installation to facilitate the underutilized equipment. Mark Fronke recommended that the department request that the equipment be installed within a six (6) year timeframe
  ● This timeframe does not seem feasible to the department chair
Janet clarified that it takes approximately 10 years to obtain one set of telescopes.
- The current equipment item took the department 40 years to obtain.
- It was noted that the college does not support Planetarium at Cerritos College although equipment is available on campus.

**Recommendation:** Mark Fronke and the committee unanimously recommended that the department have a long term goal for a plan to get this moving. It was also recommended that the goal be measurable. There was great concern for the equipment being underutilized based on the logistics of moving the equipment to a suitable location for use.

Recommendation: The committee recommended the concern regarding the building structure for the telescope attachment be placed in the ten year goals. David Young recommended detailing having the plan for mounting of the equipment. The 14 inch Telescope installation to be integrated into the engineering plans.

Farid Wissa opened a discussion regarding removal of course from the Physics/Astronomy Department through the Curriculum Committee. Janet McLarty-Schroeder confirmed that the department agreed to have these courses removed and that Ken Matsuura checked the Articulation status and confirmed that these course removals were accurate.

The department will submit Appendix “D” as an addendum to address the questions asked by the committee.

This addendum will be updated in three years for the committee to review regarding the department goals.