

NORCO COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
September 22, 2016
IT 218

Members:

Dr. Alexis Gray..... Social & Behavioral Sciences
Dr. Gail Zwart..... Business, Engineering & Information Technologies
Beverly Wimer..... Math and Science
Dr. Kevin Fleming..... Dean of Instruction, Career and Technical Education
Dr. Laura Adams..... Social & Behavioral Sciences
Kris Anderson..... Communications
Quinton Bemiller..... Arts, Humanities, & World Languages
Dr. Carol Farrar..... Dean of Instruction
Dr. Tim Russell..... Social & Behavioral Sciences
Dr. Greg Aycock..... Dean, Institutional Effectiveness
Luis Velazio Miranda..... ASNC

Members Absent:

Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer.....Vice President of Academic Affairs
Dr. Koji Uesugi.....Dean of Student Services
Dr. Monica Green.....Interim President
Beth Gomez.....Vice President, Business Services

Committee Support Administrator:

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

- A. Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m. .**
- B. Agenda Approved – September 22, 2016** (MSC: G. Zwart/Q. Bemiller) Committee Approved.
- C. Approval of Minutes – May 26, 2016** (MSC: G. Zwart/L. Adams) Abstained: L. Adams, K. Fleming, L. Miranda. Committee Approved.
- D. Action Item:**
 - i. TRACKDAT:** We recommend that Norco College purchase TrackDat usage for program review. We will not change the program review cycle if we cannot obtain TrackDat. MSC: G. Zwart/B. Wimer. Committee approved
- E. Discussion Item:**
 - i. Proposed work for the year (Instructional rubric review at the following meeting):** Dr. Gray spoke to the committee on our goals to complete for the 2016/2017 and they are as follows:
 - 1) Need to read and review all program review reports submitted.** Dr. Gray said she will ask in the next APC meeting on what she needs from them. The idea of sending out a survey to faculty for feedback. The issue is that the committee reports are always at the end of the department meeting and therefore, they are not addressed fully. We need to address the concerns and issues faculty are having with the program review template.

We have not defined what which group makes a program review and therefore, Dr. Gray and Dr. Fleming will be working together to create a list. Our committee will be able to provide input on the list and it will be brought up it to be reviewed for approval or denial at the next meeting. There hasn't been any feedback received from the departments on requests for clarification.

- 2) **Make sure we are following our '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 and integrated into the College's Strategic Planning Processes. Suggestion on doing a Program Review boot camp on March 3rd in the NOC. Dr. Gray will email Melissa Bader (chair of the Professional Development committee) on coordinating this.
 - 3) **Need to establish frequency and types of program review**. When we going to do this during the year depends on our committee and establishing a workable project timeline. In the next meeting, we have to devote to assigning the administrative program reviews, discussing issues and have a norming session. The reports are still coming in.
 - 4) **Program Review Template**: We are aiming to review the template in December 2016. We need to address the concerns and issues faculty are having with the program review template. It was suggested for the template to be overhauled and moved into a three-year method. There is a program (not TrackDAT), that has the information where the faculty enters their information for each year and it is easy to extract information for additional reporting as well as combining it into a final three-year assessment report.
- ii. **Discussion re: change to a four-year system**: Dr. Aycock and Dr. Fleming looked into the cost to obtain the database and it is expensive. It is \$48K for year one and then \$18K commitment license per year after. It is still being discussed in the administrative level. The other colleges (MVC and RCC) are using TrackDat and they use it efficiently and effectively; whereas, Nicole has to manually read and extract the data from each report and enter it into various reports. It is very time consuming and susceptible to operator error. It is listed in Dr. Dieckmeyer and Dr. Aycock's Administrative Program Review report. TrackDat is a more user friendly program to enter, process and extract data. It automatically uploads your discipline. On this new cycle, every course gets assessed within a four-year cycle. On the fourth year, a program review is produced. In the interim years, a resource request addendum can be submitted. But essentially we would be doing comprehensive reports only. The District is committed to the comprehensive reports. We can send out a survey asking for feedback if faculty 'felt that doing a comprehensive every four years would provide them what they needed'. The survey will help us decide what we need and Dr. Gray and Dr. Adams will work together on that task. We won't be able to implement the TrackDat for the 2016/2017 program review cycle if we get it. It's a yearlong process to get us set up, develop training and have a few disciplines pilot the program as well as have a few beta testing groups to clear up any issues that come up. The goal is to have it ready (if we get it) in the Fall 2017. The target goal is to move to a four-year reporting cycle and advocating to acquire the TrackDat program for Norco College.

- iii. **Dates we want the APRS back.** We moved the due date last year to April 15 and this caused friction because it interfered in our process. By the time they all came in, school was over and Dr. Gray was rushed in combining the rubrics. She would like to move the date back to mid-March. The question as to why we would not want submit the reports in fall, and the reason for that is that fall is a busy planning time. For the annual resource allocation, it disrupts the process timeline for the faculty ranking for APC and the business planning council process.
- iv. **Disaggregated Data – Dr. Greg Aycock:** The discussion regarding how many data charts do we want to make available and not overwhelm the end users. At the moment, there are 28 data charts and it was suggested to reduce that to three to five. Suggestion to have a tutorial to help the end user understand the various charts. Census amongst the committee was that we need to determine what data we need and to effectively report it. We have some state requirements on the reporting of disaggregated data and where is it placed in the program review report. Dr. Aycock said program review needs to be disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery in order to meet accreditation requirements. We currently have that in place. It was decided that we return to offering the four types of data charts for the end-users to extract their data from to do their reporting. For the 2016/2017, we will be doing the program review report the old way.

F. Information Item:

- i. **Survey Results:** Dr. Gray went over the results with the committee. The results of this survey and portion of the minutes need to be sent to Peggy Campo. Our committee responded anonymously to the questions posed and we are all aware that there are some areas that we need to work on. The following are the results, submitted comments and committee discussion:

Survey Questions:

Q.2: Do you feel you have a clear understanding of the structure and purpose of this committee?

Answer: 88%=Yes, 6% Somewhat, 6% No.

We spent a lot of time this year discussing the meaning and purpose of program review. We have not been able to reach a consensus. Meanwhile, our forms and procedures get longer and longer and more and more involved. Because we don't know what we're trying to do, it is difficult to coherently fulfill our mission.

Dr. Gray agreed with that comment and strived to work harder to improve the restructuring of our committee and our established work goals.

Q3: Are agendas and minutes provided electronically prior to the committee meetings?

Answer: 100% Yes. Great job NICOLE! 😊

Q4: Are the agenda items usually completed within the meeting time?

Answer: 81% Yes, 19% No.

We will work harder is establishing an agenda that we can complete in the timeframe of the meeting. The difficulty is estimating the time for discussion and some topics take longer than estimated.

Q5: Are committee members given adequate information to make informed recommendations and decisions?

Answer: 94% Yes, 6% No.

Dr. Fleming announced to the committee members that if there is any point in time during the year that you feel you are not given adequate information in order to make informed recommendations and/or decisions, to please contact Dr. Gray or himself (Dr. Fleming), so that they have the opportunity to provide the resources you need. For this committee, there is a greater learning curve.

Q6: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements:

- All Members are encouraged to be actively involved: 81% Strongly agree, 19% Agree.
- Discussions are collegial, and differing opinions are respected: 75% Strongly agree, 25% Agree.
- Participating in the committee is meaningful and important to me: 50% Strongly agree, 50% Agree.
- The committee charge is understood and the members work towards fulfilling the charge: 50% Strongly agree, 44% Agree, 6% Disagree.
- Our mission and purpose is changing, so if you miss a few meetings, you can feel lost in trying to catch up on our progress since this committee is very busy with a lot of time consuming projects.

Q6 Continued:

- The purpose of the committee aligns well with the college mission: 75% Strongly agree, 19% Agree, 6% Disagree.
- Because the mission and purpose is changing, some committee members are unsure of the direction of this committee. Also, consistent attendance in this committee is essential. It was suggested at the bottom on each agenda, the committees mission and purpose statement can be added to remind the end user of our committee's charge.
- Overall, I am satisfied with the committee's performance: 44% Strongly agree, 50% Agree, 6% Disagree.

Q7. Do you regularly communicate with the members of the constituent group you represent regarding key items discussed and actions taken during committee meetings?

Answer: 75% Yes, 25% No.

Q8: Is there something that you would recommend to help the committee function more effectively?

Responses submitted:

1. Automate the integration of assessment into PR automate the process so that reports can easily be summarized college-wide for requests, assessment results, request feedback, etc. * *Another reason for us to have TrackDat.*
2. Meetings lack focus and clarity - we seem to spend more time on philosophical issues rather than actually getting things done. These comments are not a reflection of the committee leadership, but rather with committee composition and

function. This committee is likely too large to function effectively. * *Dr. Gray disagrees. Our committee isn't too large.*

3. Work groups and/or sub-committees will help streamline our meetings and make us more productive. * *Committee agreed. Dr. Gray and Dr. Adams are going to work together on the next survey.*
4. PR Template is too long; committee needs to automate the data analysis. * *Another reason for us to have TrackDat.*
5. Dr. Alexis Gray doing excellent job. My recommendation is the same as I wrote for professor Burnett. I think if, school gives extra release times to professor Burnett and professor Gray they work together coordinately, we may have a good results.
6. No
7. No, I think the committee is functioning well.

Q9. Please make suggestions on how this evaluation (survey) could be improved:
Responses submitted:

1. It is a good evaluation questions.
2. No suggestions, the evaluation is fine.

The committee has discussed the results on the survey, made suggestions and will make the necessary revisions from the results of the survey to improve our process.

- ii. **Report on Progress of return of the rubrics:** We received all the rubrics back that were annuals and combined them to be sent out to the report authors. There are two rubrics outstanding and they are for Philosophy. The two readers of philosophy were vastly apart in their review. The two readers are reworking on it again and the author is aware of the situation. Nicole is storing the combined and the original rubrics that were sent in.
- iii. **Time line for the Administrative review rubric return:** At the next meeting we will be assigning the readers for the Administrative Program Reviews and need to decide if there are changes to the rubric, and if no changes, then we are going to norming. We need to have them read and reviewed by November. We need to do a better job than what we did last year.
- iv. **Report on the approval of the new statement of purpose for the committee.** The new statement of purpose was reviewed and approved by the senate. It can now include that new statement of purchase to the bottom of the agenda. Nicole will send it to the IT person for them to update our program review website.

G. Good of the Order: NONE

Next Meeting: October 20, 2016