TO: Members of the Program Review Advisory Committee
FROM: Miriam Tolson, Program Assistant II
DATE: October 21, 2009
SUBJECT: Minutes of IPR meeting – October 20, 2009

In attendance at the meeting:

Mark Fronke
Angela Beck
Lorraine Edson-Perone
Todd Gaffaney
Lorraine Gersitz
Rachel Mason
Lola Rizkallah
Linda Rose
Farid Wissa
David Young

Absent:
Nick Kremer
Cynthia Lavariere

Guests:
Chris Myers

Call to order – The meeting was called to order at 3:05 P.M.

1. Review/Approve Minutes from September 1, 2009 and October 6, 2009 – Motion:
It was moved by Farid Wissa and seconded by Lorraine Gersitz to approve the minutes of 9-1-09. Action: Motion was unanimously approved. The committee unanimously approved the September 1, 2009 minutes. Discussion: It was pointed out that the minutes should reflect the correction of the ARCC acronym as well as the sentence pertaining to the Master Plan. Motion: It was moved by David Young and seconded by Lola Rizkallah to approve the 10-6-09 minutes. Action: Motion was
unanimously approved by the committee as corrected during the discussion; the posted minutes will reflect the changes. The committee unanimously approved the minutes of 10-6-09.

2. **Update Status of all Programs Under Review** - Mark Fronke called for the routine update from all of the committee members for the programs under review as follows:

- **Business Communications**, Photography, Culinary Arts, Philosophy, Reading, Foreign Language, Health Occupations, CIS, Physics/Astronomy, Plastics Composites, and Dental Hygiene/Dental Assisting:
  
  1) **Business Communications** department processed by liaisons Angela Beck and Lorraine Edson-Perone. Lorraine reported that she and Angela Beck have scheduled a meeting with Mageya Sharp for the following week to review the status and inquire whether the department has any questions. Mark Fronke came in contact with Barbara Soden as well, and she agreed the department is in good shape. Rachel Mason commented that their writing is complete and they were editing and rearranging the draft. And that she emphasized to the department to follow the format prescribed and to make adjustments in any areas that they may have deviated from the original format. This process will avoid leaving out information. The committee had a thorough discussion on the subject of reading comprehension with the academic subjects pertaining to proficiency levels and student success and failures affected by this.

  2) **Photography** – Liaison Farid Wissa – indicated the department is moving forward.

  3) **Culinary Arts** – Lola Rizkallah reported that the first deadline for the first draft is due December 22 and not October 20. Mark Fronke confirmed the date Lola had for October must have been an internal deadline for the department. Lola indicated that she sent a friendly reminder to the department on the October date. Mark Fronke confirmed that Cynthia Lavariere (although not a regular committee meeting attendee) is co-liaison with Lola Rizkallah for the Culinary Arts Program.

  4) **Philosophy** – Lorraine Gersitz reported to the committee on the meeting she and Mark Fronke held the prior week with the department. She indicated they had completed quite a lot and are in the process of editing. It was noted by Lorraine that the department indicated they had no recollection of going through the Program Review process six years ago. Mark Fronke confirmed that they did not go through the process. The committee had a lengthy discussion regarding the reading requirements and the disadvantage students have when their reading hinders their comprehension of other subjects. Lorraine Gersitz mentioned various reading techniques i.e. captioning on the board for students to participate to increase their reading skills. David Young discussed a metric system with up line courses based on skills set.

  5) **Reading** – Rachel Mason indicated the Reading department was on track with their creative timelines. She is also planning to meet with the department next week, and to determine if there is anything the department may need during their process. She also reported on the meeting she held with Chris Myers. The committee had a thorough and lengthy discussion regarding Reading requirements and the link to other areas of learning. Linda Rose shared information she received from a recent conference regarding input she received as an outsider. Mark Fronke and the committee emphasized the need for entrance tests for courses that do not require a reading prerequisite. Lorraine Gersitz noted to the committee the fact that a student may have excelled in another college and would have validation of being qualified for the level they are enrolled in although a
prerequisite is not required. Rachel Mason mentioned the big dilemma students’ are having with moving into the advanced classes and realize unless they understand certain concepts of learning they cannot advance. David Young emphasized the importance of students being successful, advancing to a higher level where a prerequisite is not required, and the low percentile of a student being successful. 6) **Foreign Language** – Todd Gaffaney and Mark Fronke will attempt to contact former liaison Jeff Rigby. Todd would like to see if Jeff has made any progress with the department. Mark Fronke was doubtful as to any process being made since Jeff was not on the committee from the beginning of this semester, but will definitely do a follow-up as he stated at the last meeting. 7) **CIS** – Nick Kremer was absent from the meeting; therefore an update on this department was not provided. 8) **Fine Arts** – There is currently no liaison for this department – 9) **Physics and Astronomy** – Mark did receive some information that he will share with the committee. Mark Fronke will cover this department and will give the committee an update at the next Program Review meeting 10) **Plastics/Composites** – Mark Fronke indicated that the final report from Terry Price will be due December 17. The committee will send the comments on the Plastics department to Miriam Tolson by Tuesday, 10-27-09. Mark Fronke will compile the comments and have them available for the committee to review and or respond at the next Program Review meeting. It was noted that the Plastics/Composites department report did not contain a lot of the substance that the committee needs for the process. 11) **Dental Hygiene/Dental Assisting** – David Young reported that these departments finished with flying colors. There were some issues and some recommendations in the process.

3. **Plastics/Composites self-study draft** – Mark Fronke indicated the committee should focus on what is presented in the draft report, and allow him to focus on what is missing. Mark Fronke and Linda Rose mentioned as feedback to the reviewer that it should be documented that the original draft was not in the format required. The committee emphasized that the first draft from this department is a model of what not to do. The committee discussed addressing the importance of the departments under review to provide their draft as requested on the documents required by the Program Review process. Since this is the first year of the report, the committee noted there will be questions as to what was submitted and where the verification of what has been stated is documented. This will validate what is submitted. It was also noted by Linda Rose that this model will assist in enhancements and improvements for future reports. It was noted by the committee that there are definitely additional processes beyond this point. The expectation is that the final draft will have the enhancements and recommendations included. Rachel Mason indicated that this type of system is used by the California Community College Commission with the accreditation reports, which allows a later timeframe after the deadline to make adjustments and corrections. Linda Rose indicated that if necessary the department could add addendums. Mark Fronke recommended to the committee to take time to read through the draft using the Appendix “C” form and/or comments directly onto the original draft and submitting them to Miriam Tolson, Program Assistant. The Appendix “C” form will be submitted to the committee via email in PDF and MS Word format. The comments are to be submitted to Miriam by Tuesday, 10-27-09 Once the comments have been compiled, Mark will present them to the committee for
further comments at the Program Review meeting on 11-3-09. Once the process is finalized, Mark Fronke will prepare a response to Terry Price that the committee can review prior to submittal. David Young emphasized and the committee agreed that once the committee makes their recommendations from the report, there will be other phases of the project including an appeal and clarification process.

4. **Update on Student Success Plan – Bryan Reece** – Mark Fronke shared with the committee that he had a brief exchange with Bryan Reece after the last Program Review Meeting. Mark indicated that he was unclear as to the Program Review Committee’s part in supporting Bryan Reece in his quest, what does the Student Success Plan mean and what is the Program Review Committee assigned to do. Lola Rizkallah updated the committee on the presentation that Bryan Reece presented the prior day, and that he would further present to the Board of Trustees meeting along with measurable goals measured by the ARCC report. The committee discussed the handout and the Power Point presentation document. Rachel Mason updated the committee that the primary goals have become the major goals of the plan. Linda Rose indicated that the way Program Review has revamped itself means that Program Review is holding programs accountable for what they say, and reporting to Faculty Senate and Coordinating Committee. The analysis and reporting of the committee towards reporting in the Program Review Process is going to be different now since previously this was not affecting student success. Commentary, analysis of reports and honest feedback is a way to play a role in student success. Mark Fronke concluded the discussion and indicated that he would meet with Bryan Reece. He commended the committee that they are operating on a higher level than they have in the past and he will inform Bryan of the rich conversations that the Program Review Committee is having regarding Student Success and formally document them if necessary along with complying with Bryan’s agenda and championing the Research and Planning department to get more involved in assessing our status and the reason that things are not working Student Success wise and perhaps rethink process so things can be changed. Rachel Mason updated the committee on the Student Success Plan on Learning Environment topics, it was discussed about integrating the goals with Program Review Process with the programs under review and how they are doing within the Learning Environment. Lind Rose noted that certain student groups are not being addressed in these categories for instance non-credit students. The committee discussed how these student groups would be addressed. Mark Fronke will confront Bryan Reece regarding the vocational and non-credit student groups along with Nick Kremer, regarding intentions to include them in the process. In addition Mark will notify the Faculty Senate to inform them of these conversations.

5. **Articulation Agreements** – Mark Fronke submitted a list to Ken Matsuura of all the Programs Under Review to confirm if any of them have articulation agreements, the response from Ken was that none of them did. Mark addressed the committee with the question regarding listing a question on the self-study reports or through the Program Review process inquiring if the department currently has any articulation agreements, and more importantly if they are currently offering the courses at least once a year so the students can satisfy the requirements. The committee realized that there is an indication of this on the document under the program description; however it is very vague. The committee discussed the importance of having this item clearly
defined. Ken indicated that he does not currently have a mechanism to track this. Ken indicated that he would keep ahead of the committee pertaining to this issue. The committee discussed putting demands on the Administration in continuing courses that were previously established and not changing this due to administration changes.

6. **Items from the Floor** – Linda Rose and the committee discussed different aspects of the Program Review process. Lorraine Gersitz inquired regarding the timeframe expectation of going through the document. Linda Rose shared information with the committee from a conference she attended and relayed information from outside funding sources indicating that funds will no longer be offered due to students being placed in classes they are not prepared for, the sources are aware that we have technical and vocational offerings but there are drops and incompletes - Students unable to move forward to advanced classes based on the career choices they decided to follow, but due to their reading deficiencies they are unable to proceed. David Young discussed with the committee regarding assisting students and the lack of follow-up as to whether the college met their goals. The committee had a thorough discussion regarding the student certificate and job prospect educational opportunities.

7. **Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M

Next Program Review Meeting
Tuesday, November 3, 2009
3:00-4:30 P.M.
SS 141