

**NORCO COLLEGE**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW MEETING MINUTES**  
March 24, 2016  
IT 218

**Members:**

Dr. Kevin Fleming.....Dean of Instruction, Career and Technical Education  
Dr. Alexis Gray.....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. 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  
Dr. Khalil Andacheh.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Monica Green.....Vice President of Student Services  
Beth Gomez.....Vice President, Business Services  
Miriam Torres.....ASNC  
Thelma Montiel.....ASNC

**Members Absent:**

Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer.....Vice President of Academic Affairs

**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 – March 24, 2016** (MSC: G. Zwart/L. Adams) Committee Approved.
- C. Approval of Minutes – February 25, 2016** (MSC: G. Zwart/T. Russell) Abstained: A/ Gray, K. Andacheh. Committee Approved.
- D. Discussion Items:**
- i. “Groupings” of unit reviews. Define all the variables we need to consider (workload, data interpretation, instructional and administrative, etc.) Draft some guiding principles for groupings.** This topic is to be continued for additional discussion at the next meeting. The committee should discuss and recommend the proper merging, separations of the disciplines/unit reviews. The goal is to regroup the program review but how do we accomplish that? Possibly by catalog, discipline, program, or go by class schedule? It is very complicated. The chair asked the committee to “think about the person who is doing the Program Review and what is their justification or reason to do it?” Dr. Zwart asked about disciplines that have the same core classes and how they should be combined (Real estate, accounting, Business management, etc.) We need to figure out what makes sense to the discipline. What student need does it satisfy? We need to look at faculty (how many), and workload to complete that task.

**Idea:** Considering the guidelines and provide them to the departments and ask them for feedback as well as faculty based recommendations that can inform the committees ultimate recommendation.

It was asked if any committee members received department feedback. Beth Wilmer did talk to math and science and wasn't able to discuss in depth because of time constraints. The concern is that a faculty should not be penalized by not contributing to a program review because that department might be short staffed, but in turn, they must understand that in the long run it ends of hurting that department since any short/long requests needed will not be addressed. The program review worksheet is a planning document and not just a 'resource request' document.

**Suggestion:** Dr. Gray proposed if we were to send forth an email or form for input from the departments. We can send out small list the considerations the program review committee would like from them (budgetary impact, no# of faculty within the discipline, and whether or not if they combined resources or would they have their own resources) to please ask them to identify which disciplines should be doing in program review and also to ask them to include if they have certificates or programs. Dr. Gray would like this to go out before the next department meeting.

Below are the variables discussed for possible questions:

1. **Budgetary impact:** Programs that are merging or not. Their ability to make resource requests. They need to identify if this request is shared with another unit, then perhaps they can do the program review together. If not, they should do their own program review.
2. **Workload issue:** How many fulltime faculty/employees are available in the proposed program review unit? How many faculty/employees are participating in the actual program review?

Dr. Fleming asked the committee members to identify what the questions and issues are so they can solicit feedback from their departments and come back to the next meet to discuss whether areas in their department (programs) should be merged/combined or not and why? The goal is to develop a proposal on paper to discuss. We need to clarify what is a program and Title V makes that clear. We need to engage everyone in this. In regards to assessment, how does it affect program review? Dr. Gray feels that the chairs also need to discuss this

**Task:** Dr. Fleming asked the committee members to go to their departments to ask "What makes sense for program review and allocation?" and to come back to the next meeting with a recommendation.

Dr. Gray will send an email to the department. We need this to be an action item for the department meetings.

- **Make recommendations to Academic Senate to approve the guiding principles.** Tabled. We will be making our recommendation based on the information we receive from the faculty recommendation.

- ii. **Revise the Academic Senate statement of purpose for the Program Review Committee.** The committee continues to rework our 'Statement of Purpose'. 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?"

Student services aren't listed in this statement of purpose and would like to engage in a conversation with this committee on what Student Services does and their processes. The committee edited the statement of purpose as follows:

"The Program Review Committee establishes guidelines, tools, and content requirements for the program review process at Norco College. We review and evaluate the annual and comprehensive unit reviews to facilitate intentional self-evaluation and planning in order to support program quality, improve student success and equity, enhance teaching and learning, and connect resource allocation to strategic planning."

Committee agreed to include as an action item the "Review/approval of Committee Purpose Statement" into the April 21st meeting agenda.

- iii. **Due Date discussion for return of rubrics: DUE April 20!!** We can expect to have them submitted by April 27<sup>th</sup>, but by May 20<sup>th</sup>, they all must be completed! The rubrics will need to be scored before our committee returns. On the 4/21 meeting, we will norm the scoring, and will need the scoring back no later than May 20<sup>th</sup>. Dr. Gray would prefer to have them done and submitted to her by May 13<sup>th</sup> so she can organize the scoring reports before the next meeting.

#### **E. Information Item:**

- i. **NAS:** Dr. Burnett was representing the Program Review committee at this event. Norco Academic senate is asking the chairs of the various committees to be non-voting members. Dr. Gray is to be a non-voting member of the Norco academic senate.
- ii. **Review draft APR reviewers.** Listed on the annual to be April 20th. Please review and provide suggestions to Dr. Fleming and Dr. Gray. Handout was provided, but additional revisions needed to be made. Nicole will work with Dr. Gray on the revising the document and send it to her for final review and distribution. Dr. Gray will be switching with Dr. Russell for Economics and Journalism. It was requested that the committee members please bring the rubrics for the comprehensive program review to the next meeting. 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 3:15 p.m. Next regular Program Review Committee Meeting: April 21, 2016**