

**NORCO COLLEGE**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW MEETING MINUTES**  
February 25, 2016  
IT 218

**Members:**

Dr. Kevin Fleming.....Dean of Instruction, Career and Technical Education  
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. Koji Uesugi.....Dean of Student Services  
Dr. Sarah Burnett.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Quinton Bemiller.....Arts, Humanities, & World Languages  
Dr. Carol Farrar.....Dean of Instruction  
Dr. Tim Russell.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Dominique Hitchcock.....Arts, Humanities & World Languages  
Miriam Torres.....ASNC  
Thelma Montiel.....ASNC

**Members Absent:**

Dr. Alexis Gray.....Social & Behavioral Sciences \* Attending District business\*  
Dr. Khalil Andacheh.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer.....Vice President of Academic Affairs  
Beth Gomez.....Vice President, Business Services  
Dr. Monica Green.....Vice President of Student Services

**Committee Support Administrator:**

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

- A. Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m.** Committee welcomed new member Dr. Dominique Hitchcock. We are excited to have her on our team.
- B. Agenda Approved – February 25, 2016** (MSC: G. Zwart/L. Adams) Committee Approved.
- C. Approval of Minutes – December 3, 2015** (MSC: G. Zwart/T. Russell) Abstained: D. Hitchcock. Committee Approved.
- D. Discussion Items:**
- i. **“Groupings” of unit reviews:** This topic is to be continued for additional discussion at the next meeting agenda. The committee should discuss and recommend the proper merging, separations of the disciplines/unit reviews. This was discussed in the December 2015 as well.
    - **Define all the variables we need to consider (workload, data interpretation, instructional and administrative, etc.).** The chair asked the department representatives to take notes from today’s meeting to bring back to their departments for feedback. Please forward your feedback to Dr. Fleming and Dr. Gray. Below are the variables discussed:
      1. Budgetary impact
      2. How do we merge or group, or separate out the disciplines.

3. Workload issue: The number of fulltime faculty available in comparison to the workload commitments.
  4. No standardized routine.
  5. Data Interpretation
  6. Instructional and Administrative program reviews.
    - a) Should the Deans of Instruction do separate Administrative program reviews or do one combined?
- Discussion among the committee on the budgetary impact to a particular discipline when combined to another discipline (Staffing, equipment, technology, supplies, etc.). What are the pro's and con's for that? Is there a benefit to be merged into one document or into a separate one? Another issue is the number of fulltime faculty to the workload issue. Some departments are larger than others and some only have one FT faculty. Currently there isn't any standardized routine in doing the Program Review process within the disciplines (small or large). It is important to make sure that every faculty member has an understanding on what is in the program review. The suggestion was made that every faculty member in an academic department should sign off on their program review to ensure communication and dialog (sign off sheet or signature lines on the cover page). This option of having a signature page for those who participated in that unit can also work for the administrative program reviews. We currently ask for one contact person, but many assume they are the responsible party for the entire document.
  - **Draft some Guiding principles for groupings:** To account for future changes of programs and department structure, it was recommended to draft some guiding principles for the merging and separation of the unit/program reviews. These guiding principles would be in addition to a recommended list of units/departments that we would forward to the Academic Senate. When putting disciplines together (such as French, Spanish, etc.), the goals for each disciplines are different. As readers, we may lose the area of emphasis, purpose and goals of that assessment if we combine the disciplines together. The more focused the document, the most substantial it could be. Dr. Hitchcock is concerned about the quality of the content if it is combined. As readers, how are we to score it?
  - **Make recommendations to Academic Senate to approve the guiding principles.** We are trying to make this report more of a planning document. On the next agenda, add the grouping of unit reviews as a standard item for our committee to continue to work on.
- ii. **Revise the Academic Senate statement of purpose for the Program Review Committee.** We need to review our 'Statement of Purpose'. The following suggestions were presented:
- **Our purpose on why we do it is not listed.**
  - We need to establish guidelines and content requirements for the program review.
  - We evaluate/review/score unit program reviews on an annual and comprehensive basis. (Why?)
  - To facilitate self-evaluation and planning to support quality of programs.
  - How are we going to measure the success from the items received?
  - If we stopped doing it, we wouldn't get stuff...but that shouldn't be all it is about.

The committee chair asked the department representatives to ask their department the following question: "What would you like the purpose of Program Review to be? What should program review be to be helpful and what would you like the purpose of it to be?"

The committee edited the statement of purpose as follows:

Purpose of the committee: We establish guidelines, tools, and content requirements for the Program Review process at Norco College (for admin and instructional). We evaluate/review/score the unit/program reviews on an annual and comprehensive basis to help each unit to grow and mature; improving the quality of the unit itself.

We facilitate this intentional self-evaluation and planning in order to support quality of programs, to improve student success and equity, the quality of teaching and learning (via assessment section), to support the mission of the college, to connect resource allocation to strategic planning,

Topic to be continued for additional discussion at the next meeting agenda.

**E. Information Item:**

- i. **Review of APR due dates:** Listed on the annual: **April 20<sup>th</sup>**.
- ii. **Show new data for Instructional APRs (Aycock):** We have now doubled the links we have for data. (two to four) in order to present program of study and program award data. The disaggregation of all the data also created substantially more charts and data tables. A question was asked if there will be training since this is a lot of new complex data. As a college, we have to raise our success rates. We need a workshop on how faculty can improve the success rates for a particular focus. Department meetings should be the main medium to remind the faculty on how to improve success rates and also create a presentation/instructional user friendly video. It was suggested that this data should be presented at the committee of the whole. Faculty should not only list the data, but explain why and offer analysis on how to remedy it (it negative) or sustain/improve it (if positive). Dr. Fleming suggested to use conditional formatting in the spreadsheets to aid for easier interpretation. Dr. Aycock will look into it.
- iii. **Review draft APR reviewers.** Please review and provide suggestions to Dr. Fleming and Dr. Gray. Nicole will update the list and the topic is to be continued for additional discussion at the next meeting agenda.

**F. Comprehensive Program Review Submissions: NONE**

**G. Good of the Order: NONE**

**Meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m. Next regular Program Review Committee Meeting: March 24, 2016**

## Report from the Program Review Committee

### Statement of Purpose:

The purpose of this committee will be to review and accept the Norco College Comprehensive Instructional Program Reviews and the Annual Instructional Reviews and forward them to the District for posting to the web. The information from these Program Reviews will then be forwarded to and integrated into the College's Strategic Planning Processes.

Is the committee satisfied with its statement of purpose?

No. We also need to integrate that we are also now a college-wide Program Review Committee which includes Administrative PRs.

If not, what plans does the committee have of improving its statement of purpose?

The committee will revisit this statement in the spring to reflect our current scope, and to revisit which PRs are in fact forwarded/integrated as stated.

How does the committee align with Norco College's Mission? Norco College serves our students, our community, and its workforce by providing educational opportunities, celebrating diversity, and promoting collaboration. We encourage an inclusive, innovative approach to learning and the creative application of emerging technologies. We provide foundational skills and pathways to transfer, career and technical education, certificates and degrees.

The Program Review committee changed our membership to include students, as well as administration (Academic Affairs, Business Services, and Student Services) in order to promote collaboration and inclusivity (and transparency). This modification has, and will, avoid silos in strategic planning. The Program Review Committee also reviews the academic pathways (transfer, career and technical education, certificates and degrees), by altering the template and including program-specific data such as cert/degree completion numbers, the number of students that have declared a particular program of study, etc.