CERRITOS COLLEGE

TO: Members of the Program Review Advisory Committee
FROM: Miriam Tolson, Program Assistant II
DATE: November 4, 2009
SUBJECT: Minutes of IPR meeting – November 3, 2009

In attendance at the meeting:

Mark Fronke
Angela Beck
Todd Gaffaney
Lorraine Gersitz
Nick Kremer
Cynthia Lavariere
Linda Rose
Farid Wissa
David Young

Absent:
Lorraine Edson-Perone
Rachel Mason
Lola Rizkallah (Excused)

Guests:
Chris Myers (Absent)
Jenine Nolan
Adelle Krayer
Donna Wendell

Call to order – The meeting was called to order at 3:10 P.M.

1. Review/Approve Minutes from October 20, 2009 – Motion: It was moved by Linda Rose and seconded by Lorraine Gersitz to approve the minutes of 10-20-09 as amended. Action: Motion was unanimously approved. The committee unanimously approved the 10-20-09 minutes save one abstention by Nick Kremer who was absent
at the last meeting. Discussion: It was noted that the minutes should been corrected to indicate that the Philosophy department did not go through the Program Review process six years prior. 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 10-20-09. Mark Fronke announced to the committee that with Miriam Tolson there are very well documented minutes.

2. Accreditation/IPR report from Dental Hygiene and Medical Assisting - Mark welcomed the representatives from Health Occupations, Jenine Nolan, the Instructional Dean of Health Occupations, Donna Wendell, Faculty and Adelle Krayer, Faculty (Director of Dental Hygiene Program). Mark asked the department to review their goals and how they came about. Adelle Krayer proceeded to give the IPR group an update on the goals of the Dental Hygiene department. The team discussed their first goal is to create an additional clinical rotation to comply with the new accreditation standards. She explained the clinical rotation and submitted a handout to the committee with their goals, actions to be taken, and the timeframe. The set-up simulates the actual working environment. The equipment in the department is state of the art, and Cerritos College is the only community college that has this equipment. Nick Kremer inquired if the units cause reactions – the answer is no. Used for a number of courses and would like to finish the project and find additional units. Adelle Krayer indicated that she will look for grant funds or additional and available funding options if necessary. The long term goal of the department is to build another lab for Dental Assisting and Dental Hygiene to utilize. The current Dental Assisting/hygiene lab has ample space and will allow an additional six more units in their building. Donna Wendell then proceeded to give the report on Dental Assisting indicating their biggest goal is to obtain ample supplies. The Program requires a lot of expendable supplies. Currently ion the process of seeking monies possible sources to increase 2010 industry changed large increase in 8-10 duties – 30, 40,000 of new things. Jenine – duties have to expand curriculum due to state of California requirements. – Jenine Nolan indicated materials fees with no value – they don’t last on a one time basis due to consistency status and mixture of the supplies. they are working on seeking other sources of income and funding. A discussion regarding recruitment efforts based on student success. Jenine Nolan indicated there are many interested in getting into the program so their recruitment efforts won’t be as extreme due to open/access and accrediting issues. Mark Fronke inquired if their goals were in priority order – Jenine Nolan indicated they were taken from last year’s unit plans. David Young indicated due to demands of the accrediting – they don’t want to recruit those not effective. All predictors of success someone with a higher GPA or someone not working may be more likely to be successful. Mark Fronke indicated that the IPR program needs to take action regarding approving the Dental Hygiene program. Lorraine Gersitz made a motion and it was seconded by David Young. They have plans to redo the entire dental lab, but large plans. David young made the point about institutional support and if this is available. Motion: to approve Dental Hygiene by David Young, Seconded by Farid Wissa – the committee unanimously approved the motion:  Mark Fronke entertained a motion to approve Dental Assisting, the motion was made by Next a motion was made by David Young
and seconded by Lorraine Gersitz. Mark Fronke will prepare the paperwork for the signature of the Dental Hygiene/

3. **Plastics/Composites self-study draft** – Mark Fronke indicated he would be meeting with Terry Price later that day and that Linda Rose was invited to attend with him. Mark indicated he would inform Terry Price that what the committee is looking for is analysis. Mark instructed the committee to look at the comments that he tried to incorporated in the document to be certain their concerns were properly addressed. 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. Linda Rose indicated she took the whole IPR document with her when meeting with Terry Price. She also confirmed that he had loads of documentation. 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. The team brought their self-study reports. Discussion: Recommendations addressed two sessions ago…inquired (Nick) mentioned

4. **Comments Regarding Self-Study Report for Plastics** – The committee comments handout was discussed. It was noted that Terry Price did not follow Sect 1,2,3 or 5 – the change didn’t submit proper forms, there were typos. Important analysis how does are not being addressed in these categories for instance non-credit students. The committee discussed how these student groups would be addressed. Mark Fronke indicated to the committee that he would contact Terry Price - The committee was concerned that there was no involvement with the Dean of the division; therefore some of the process was not monitored or reviewed. Mark Fronke did inform the
committee that the submittal form requires the Dean’s signature. There is concern since the presentation date is quickly approaching and the final report is due in two weeks from today. It was noted that there are options that can be taken by the presenter, i.e. an extension, however it was noted that what was currently given is not adequate. The decision would be entirely up to Terry Price, Linda Rose and Mark Fronke scheduled a meeting in ME- at 5:00 on the current day the committee met. Lola Rizkallah said to Terry Price if you’re going to give a list of documentation then you need to give a narrative so the narrative would describe what the data is referring to. Mark Fronke said we should not be editing the notes. Mark Fronke will get final self study in two weeks before final. Say need evidence. Linda Rose said it is easier to think about for the future possibly to have workshops as to how to write this. Lorraine Gersitz next year will be easier when have it up on the website. Angela Beck samples – It was noted that Rachel Mason made the report better due to her involvement. There has been no leadership in the Bossiness Division for 15 years. It was commended that Rachel Mason is very good in directing the department. Due to lack of involvement on Steve Berklite’s part has been involved in past problem

5. **Update on Non-Credit Classes** – Mark Fronke began the discussion noting an apology to Nick Kremer regarding this special category of classes. Mark noted that he was supposed to talk to Bill Farker and make - Mark Fronke noted to the committee again that there is no liaison for Fine Arts – therefore Mark will represent that department. The committee discussed the vacancies on the program Review Committee for the Fine Arts and HPEA departments. Lorraine Gersitz noted that the announcement had been made in Faculty Senate for the vacancies for the past two weeks, and Miriam Tolson confirmed that the announcement had been made since the beginning of the semester. It was also noted that there is a vacancy for a student representation. Miriam Tolson noted that she would do a follow-up with Oscar Franco, ASCC regarding this vacancy. Mark discussed his meeting with Lorraine and Anna Torres-Bower on Thursday

6. **Items from the Floor** – Mark Fronke shared with the committee regarding his meeting with the Coordinating Committee…The discussion stemmed around the fact of non-instructional program review. Efforts to integrate business services and non-credit administration. It was noted that someone will one day realize the need to do this. Mark Fronke said maybe they don’t understand what once a semester alignment. Mark Fronke said he would bring the subject back to the table at the Coordinating Committee Meeting if he doesn’t hear anything from them regarding it at the next meeting. Lorraine Gersitz discussed classes not being taught – have to address it in – Lola Rizkallah mentioned about course content – Firad Wissa due to cut backs on classes and how this affects it. Lola asked if this could be mentioned in the unit plans and if this can be addressed. Mark Fronke said he would report back to Faculty Senate part of the Program Review process to address inactive courses, but part of the department is to do something about it. Angela Beck reported on her department – met with Mahae in Bus. Coom. Concerned about the evidence. Should they bring the whole cart of documents? David Young mentioned that one of our roles as a committee plays are the area managers adequately trained, skills to support the departments. Is there a skill set to support process – meaningful – one of the roles of the committee plays – some managers more skilled than others. Mark Fronke
reiterated that the Dena needs to be part of the process. He also commended and thanked the committee for all of their hard work.

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

**Next Program Review Meeting**
**Tuesday, November 17, 2009**
**3:00-4:30 P.M.**
**SS 141**