

**NORCO COLLEGE**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW MEETING MINUTES**  
December 3, 2015  
IT 218

Dr.'s Gray and Fleming co-chaired this meeting.

**Members:**

Dr. Alexis Gray.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Khalil Andacheh.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Gail Zwart.....Business, Engineering & Information Technologies  
Dr. Laura Adams.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Greg Aycock.....Dean, Institutional Effectiveness  
Beverly Wimer.....Math and Science  
Kris Anderson.....Communications  
Dr. Kevin Fleming.....Dean of Instruction, Career and Technical Education  
Dr. Sarah Burnett.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Koji Uesugi.....Dean of Student Services  
Dr. Monica Green.....Vice President of Student Services  
Quinton Bemiller.....Arts, Humanities, & World Languages  
Dr. Carol Farrar.....Dean of Instruction  
Dr. Tim Russell.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Thelma Montiel.....ASNC

**Members Absent:**

Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer.....Vice President of Academic Affairs  
Beth Gomez.....Vice President, Business Services

**Committee Support Administrator:**

Nicole C. Ramirez.....Office of the Dean of Instruction

- A. Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m.**
- B. Agenda Approved – December 3, 2015** (MSC: G. Zwart/L. Adams) Committee Approved.
- C. Approval of Minutes – November 12, 2015** (MSC: G. Zwart/K. Uesugi) Committee Approved.
- D. Discussion Items:**
  - i. Co-Chairs to facilitate gaps in scored rubrics:** Dr. Fleming spoke to the committee regarding when rubrics come back and there is a significant ranges differences in the scoring from two different reviewers. A practice in the Norco Assessment committee is that the co-chairs will review both of the rubrics and have a conversation with the two reviewers to see where the differences are to then get the scores more inline. So the co-chairs act as a mediator/facilitator with both reviewers when there is a 1.50 point (or greater) scoring difference. The issue is angering authors when there is a large scoring discrepancy. Option 1 is a regrading of the report, and Option 2 is to mediate with the reviewers. Option 2 provides the opportunity for the reviewers to learn the process to be a better reviewer. Dr. Green asked ‘where do the score’s go?’ and Dr. Gray responded that she receives all of the scores, combines them, sends the scores to Nicole and then Nicole sends the rubrics back to the author of the paper themselves to review the feedback.

Nicole also compiles the scores. The committee agreed by consensus for the Program Review Committee Co-Chairs to mediate/facilitate the conversation between two reviewers in the future if such a discrepancy occurs.

- ii. **Unit “groupings” for Annual Instructional PRs.:** How the units group into APRs and CPRs is currently up to the discipline. They are not consistent. We need to decide as a committee on whether it is our charge to decide for the discipline what each individual unit is, and which groupings should collaborate or separate APRs and CPRs. Dr. Farrar’s concern is that each discipline in a section (ex. Biology, microbiology, etc.) is not doing their assessment or is not recognizing their place or balance in the unit. As long as that discipline does what they are supposed to do in their unit, then it’s acceptable. Committee members suggested a faculty signature line for each discipline with multiple units for accountability. Another issue is no consistency and missing years in reporting sections because they combined reports that year (Ex. Commercial music and Music). We need to have the academic senate make that decision on what disciplines/units can be combined. This is a major document that drives resource allocation and we need to develop principles to guide the division of program review. \*\* Add this to the February 25, 2016 agenda as a continuing item of discussion. Dr. Fleming asked the committee members to please think about the pros and cons of merging or separating the program reviews at Norco College.

**E. Information Item:**

- i. **Report from District Program Review Committee:** Dr. Gray gave an update on the status for the district program review committee. Moreno Valley College (MVC) has put forth nine CPRs to be reviewed and it seems that they made a decision that the district votes on ones we all have as a shared discipline, and they submit single-college discipline CPRs as an information item, but then MVC asked for a vote. So Dr. Gray said they will be voting on whether we accept it or not accept it. The issue is if we don’t accept it, we can only make recommendations to the author. Another question the district asked was ‘what do we do with the resource requests in regards to comprehensive vs the annual?’ We all agree that they go in the annuals, and if they asked for the items that are not selected, do they automatically go back on the list for the four years and Dr. Gray was unsure how to respond. Should the Annual Program review requests automatically roll into the comprehensive reports if they are not selected? Dr. Gray stated that they did not plan to recycle the long term goals not achieved back into the CPR or annual reports. **For the Program Review template, Question #3, we should add a STEM statement and bold it for it to stand out. Also in the resource requests section, we should ask the authors to reference anything that is comprehensive.** Suggestions were made to data mine the scores and tie them to whether their requests were received and determine the percentage of rate of return. This was rejected because of the labor intensive work and not be efficient. Goals 1, 2, 3, 4 should be linked to the CPR and Dr. Gray agrees.
- ii. **Administrative PR’s – Scoring update:** Dr. Gray spoke about the scoring update and we are 100% collected! Nicole provided an updated report with the scores.
- iii. **Posting of modified CPR cycle:** Dr. Gray talked about posting the comprehensive list of when each discipline is due and it is now posted on the district webpage. They re-arranged their expectations on our program review cycled based on the dates Dr. Gray gave them. We are still going to put the actual list for faculty on our own web-page. So the due date ‘clocks’ have been reset going forward so we are all on the same cycle. Riverside City College is planning on turning in a

comprehensive program review report on every discipline in March 2016, even if they did one in 2015.

**iv. Annual IPR went to Academic Senate on 11/30/15. They didn't have a quorum and so the CPR template will go back on the 7<sup>th</sup> of December, 2015.** We have to also submit the comprehensive program review reports that day as well. So our review timeline is shortening.

**v. Annual Report on Strategic Goals sent to Academic Senate:** Dr. Gray and Dr. Fleming worked together on the report and Dr. Fleming presented the report to the committee. The feedback was very positive.

**F. Norco Program Review Action Items:**

**i. Document revision ratification:** Dr. Gray listed out the changes accepted.

**a) Comprehensive Program Review Template:** (MSC: S. Burnett/G. Zwart) Committee Approved. It was advised by Dr. Dieckmeyer that we need a table that is devoted to just programs rather than only one question. We need to develop relevant questions that pertain only to programs that come up with a number of completers, industry connections, etc. Dr. Gray will give this document to Dr. Fleming and he will make a table with those lists of requirements and give it back to Dr. Gray the next day so she can submit it. The committee approves. Dr. Gray went over the template and all the changes made.

**b) Comprehensive Program Review Rubric:** Because of time constraints left in the meeting, Dr. Gray would like to have this rubric completed before the next reporting cycle and asked the committee member to please email her any issues or suggestions with the rubric so she can make a target list of what needs to be done.

**c) Administrative PR Rubric:** Because of time constraints left in the meeting, Dr. Gray would like to have this rubric completed before the next reporting cycle and asked the committee member to please email her any issues or suggestions with the rubric so she can make a target list of what needs to be done.

**G. Comprehensive Program Review Submissions: Economics** The District Program Review committee loved the report and especially the assessment portion. It was a well written report and Peter Boelman deserves praise on a job well done. The annuals should relate to the comprehensive reports. The goal in the CPR should be reflected in the annuals if they have been achieved or not.

**H. Good of the Order:**

1. Dr. Aycock talked about the changes to the new reports. They are going from data listed on three charts to data now listed on twenty-five charts because it was asked to be more specific as well as to be disaggregated by gender and ethnicity. Dr. Aycock would like to offer a training session in the spring 2016. Dr. Gray suggested that Ruth Leal come and film you at your computer on how to navigate and use the spreadsheets. Create a two minute user friendly video soundbite for each section that an end-user might encounter and post it on you-tube. If you have any trouble for this, here is a quick tutorial.
2. David Torres at district asked if we still need him to compile data for us, and suggested to Dr. Aycock that he is available for assistance.
3. Question on when the annuals will be posted: Dr. Gray stated that when the academic senate approves it, then Nicole will send it to Jefferson to upload to our webpage.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m. Next regular Program Review Committee Meeting: February 25, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. until 3:30 p.m.**