

## Program Review Committee Minutes for March 25, 2021

12:50pm-1:50pm Zoom

## **Meeting Participants**

### **Committee Members Present**

Laura Adams, Greg Aycock (co-chair), Araceli Covarrubias, Joseph Deguzman, Alexis Gray (cochair), Ashlee Johnson, Starlene Justice, Christopher A. Lugo, Tim Russell, Jose Sentmanat, Kaneesha Tarrant, Paul VanHulle, Jose Vela and Caitlin Welch.

## **Committee Members Not Present**

Michael Collins, Samuel Lee, and Jason Parks.

### Guests

Ricardo Aguilera, Tricia Hodawanus and Steven Marshall

### Recorder

Charise Allingham

## 1. Call to Order

• 12:52pm

#### 1.1 Reports/ Comments

Dr. Gray thanked the committee for all the work developing the 2021-2024 Program Review Prompts and Platform.

## 2. Action Items

## 2.1 Approval of Agenda

• MSC (Tim Russell/ Paul VanHulle)

#### 2.1 Conclusion

• Approved

#### 2.2 Approval of 10-22-2020 Minutes

• MSC (Tim Russell/ Laura Adams)

#### 2.2 Conclusion

• Approved, 2 Abstentions.

## 3. Discussion Items

## 3.1 New Nuventive Program Review Shell

Dr. Gray gave a brief background of the development of the new Program Review Nuventive platform and shared the new Nuventive platform.

• Please note that the URL for the new platform is different from the previous Nuventive Platform. Please use the new link available on the Program Review webpage.

Platform Highlights:

- Data Review section-
  - New Instruction Dashboards- Success, Retention, Program of Study & SEP and Program Awards.
  - Why is some data in red? Groups showing up in red are the groups identified as DI (disproportionately impacted).
  - Resources available on the <u>Equity and Data Coaching webpage</u> include two tutorial videos focusing on the Student Services and Instructional Data and data story templates.
- Assessment Review Section-
  - Live data dashboards available include Assessment Status, Mapping Status and PLO Direct Assessment.
  - A tutorial video will be available for the Assessment Review section on the Program Review Website.
  - If edits are made to assessment or mapping please allow 24 hours for updates to reflect in dashboards.
- Program Review Part One Section-EMP Goal Prompts
  - Not all EMP goals will pertain to all programs and departments.
  - A list of Measurable Objectives with Key Performance Indicators is provided for reference.
- Program Review Part Two- Curriculum Review and Program Review Reflections
  - Curriculum Dashboard provided-please note the dashboard will not provide live data. The data is a snapshot as of 3-25-2021.
  - Curriculum committee provided two questions:
    - 'Do you have proposals in progress for all the DE courses you intend to file?' And 'Do you require help to get your courses up to date?'
    - A report will be generated with requests for help and be provided to the curriculum committee.
  - In the Program Review Reflections section supporting documents can be linked from the Document repository.
    - A Document repository is provided to upload documents-available on 'hamburger' menu.
- Resource Request Section-
  - Resource Requests are now housed in Nuventive.

- Like before an excel sheet will be generated and distributed to the committees and councils for prioritization.
- Edits can be done in Nuventive.
- The section of program review with evidence to support the request can be linked.
- In the past we had a link to the TCO, for reference of costs will this still be available? Not in the platform but you can still download the most recent <u>TCO from 2019-20</u> on the <u>Program Review website</u>.
- On the 'source of evidence' question, can you choose more than one? Yes, you can click as many as needed from the drop down list.
- Submission section
  - Drop down to select 'Yes' or 'No'. When the author is ready to submit their Program Review they would select 'Yes'
- Review Process
  - Next meeting will include a norming session on scoring the Program Reviews.
- The first training will be a Boot camp for new faculty during First Fridays on April 2nd.
  - Timeline- Program Review will post by Thursday, April 1<sup>st</sup> and will be due the first week of May. Reviews will be due by the end of May then resource requests will be distributed to the committees for prioritization.
    - Final reports will be available on the website.
  - May need to move the next meeting if only a few program reviews are available in order to have a productive norming session.

# 3.1.a Rubric

- Will the rubrics will be available to the authors as they are filling out the program reviews? Rubrics will be available in the right hand data view section and also on the Program Review webpage.
- Will rubrics be viewable when the committee is scoring? Possibly! If not possible within the platform the rubrics can be downloaded from the website for reference.

3.1 Follow-up Items	3.1 Task of	3.1 Due by
Check if rubrics can be viewable while reviewing/scoring within the platform.	Dr. Gray	ASAP
First Friday boot camp notice/email	Dr. Russell and Dr. Gray	ASAP

# 4. Information Items

# 4.1 Chair Election Notice

Dr. Gray is looking for a successor. Next session will include a chair nomination. Selfnominations are encouraged.

Please only nominate individuals who are willing to serve.

Duties entail:

• Attending Academic Senate-

- Including providing a monthly report to Norco Academic Senate.
- District chair every three years- district meetings are usually only once a semester.
- .2 release time, except when also district chair then increases to .3 release time.
  - Last few years Norco has been district chair every other year.
- Roberts rules of order copy will be passed on to successor.

Suggestion- to merge the assessment committee and program review committee co-chair to the same person.

- o Pros:
  - To work towards integrating both committees
  - Both processes overlap.
- o Cons:
  - Very time encumbering roles for one person to take on.
  - Currently program review chair and assessment chair serve on each committee- providing collaboration between the two committees.
  - Healthy to have debate between the two committee chairs.
- Questions- Committee to think about having co-chair terms.
- The process to elect a new chair is the responsibility of the Academic senate. A chair is recommended by the committee to Academic Senate and they assign the positon.
  - Academic Senate prefers that the committee makes a recommendation.

4.1 Follow-up Items	4.1 Task of	4.1 Due by
Bring Committee chair nominations to next meeting	Committee members	April 22, 2021

# 5. Good of the Order

# 6. Future Agenda Topics

- Chair Election
- Norming Session

# 7. Adjournment

• 1:48pm

# Next Meeting

April 22, 2021 12:50- 1:50pm Location: Zoom

Area being evaluated	4	3	2	1	0		
Required responses	All EMP Goals responded to (including N/A)	Almost all responded to (10 or more) including N/A	More than half responded to (7-9) including N/A	Less than half responded to (1-6) including N/A	No Responses to EMP goal questions		
Goals	Current status and future goals are clearly stated with appropriate ties to EMP	Current status and future goals are clearly stated but link to EMP is nebulous or unclear	Either Current status or future goal is not present or is unclear <u>but</u> <u>makeswith</u> appropriate tie to EMP	Either Current status or future goal is not present or is unclear but an appropriate tie to EMP has been	No current status or future goal is stated and no link is present		Commented [TR1]:
				attempted Either Current status or future goal is not present or is unclear link to EMP is nebulous or unclear			<b>Commented [TR2]:</b> This block for the 1-point score is
Evidence	Evidence of support of EMP is clear with either assessment data or other appropriate	Evidence of support of EMP is present with either assessment data or other appropriate	Evidence is present but may not clearly support the EMP or evidence addressed but	Some type of qualitative evidence is provided that is not based on data	No Evidence is Provided		reads awkwardly. "Either Current status or future goal is not present or is unclear and a link to the EMP has not been attempted"? I am not sure if this changes what you were trying to say in the rubric, I am just offering an alternative wording to make each category more clearly distinct.
	data support	data support	unavailable Evidence is present but may not clearly support the EMP or evidence addressed but not analyzed in detail				<b>Commented [TR3]:</b> This part of this response is not clear. Can this be reworded to make it clearer, or cut altogether? Maybe reword it to say "or evidence was addressed but not analyzed in detail"? Or, "or evidence addressed but in a very limited fashion/way."
Resource Request	Existing resources identified and needs responded to with dollar amounts filled in and funding	Existing resources not identified but needs responded to with dollar amounts filled in and funding	Existing resources and needs not identified but,? Dollar amounts filled in and funding	Dollar amount filled in with no funding source addressed or missing dollar amount with	Missing dollar amount, missing identified needs and missing funding source		

Curriculum Review	source addressed (can be none or no request) All Curriculum is up to date (within the last five years)	source addressed. (Can be none)Existing resources not identified but need identified with dollar amounts filled in and funding source addressed (can be none) Majority of curriculum is up to date (no more than 10% requiring update) with those requiring update in progress	source addressed (can be none) Most of curriculum is up to date (no more than 25% requiring update) with those requiring update in progress	needs identified More than 25% of curriculum is out of date with those requiring update in progress	Any of the curriculum is out of date with no update in progress.		<b>Commented [TR4]:</b> This block reads awkwardly. Maybe "Existing resources not identified but needs responded to with dollar amounts filled in and funding source addressed. (Can be none).
----------------------	---	---	--	--	---	--	---