

## PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (PEPC) MEETING MINUTES

**Present**: Linda Kama'ila *(co-chair)*, Erika Endrijonas *(co-chair)*, Michael Webb, Cesar Flores, Armine Derdiarian, Mati Sanchez, Mike Ketaily, Jim Merrill, Bret Black, Jonas Crawford, Christiane Mainzer, Chris Horrock, Alex Lynch, Kevin Hughes, Mike Bush, Karen Engelsen, Carolyn Inouye, Ken Sherwood, Lisa Hopper, Veronica Isais, Elizabeth Lottman

Absent: Diane Eberhardy (proxy-Armine Derdiarian), Patty Mendez, Carmen Guerrero

Guests: Gail Warner, Robert Cabral

Meeti	ing Date: <b>(</b>	02/25/14	Minutes	s Appr	oved:	01/28/14	Recorded By: Darlene Inda
AN = Action Needed		eded A	AT = Action Taken		D = Discussion	I = Information Only	
DISCUSSION/DECISIONS							
I.	Call to O	rder		I,AT	The	meeting was called	to order at 2:03pm
II.	Adoption of the Agenda			I,AT	A motion was made by L. Hopper to adopt the agenda, M. Ketaily seconded, and <i>the agenda was accepted unanimously.</i>		
III.	Approval of Meeting Minutes			I,AT	The committee reviewed the meeting minutes of November 26, 2013. M. Webb moved to approve the minutes, L. Hopper seconded and <i>they were approved.</i>		
IV.	Public Comment		Ι	None			
V.	Study Session: Scoring Rubrics			I,D	form	for 2013-14. She s	e PEPR Review and Feedback tarted off with discussing wing comments were made:
					ii • L • C • C • C • A	t's discussed/explair Kamaila expects to have more students. changes are good to and can't go higher - G. Warner – looks for seating capacity. A. Lynch – spoke ab certifications.	ase basis and reviews to see if ned in the PEPR. o see "by law" that we cannot To explain good or bad do. If a program is at its limit - how do you score it? or physical limitations and out productivity related to

capped for safety and various reasons.

- L. Hopper looks if there was an increase in productivity but the success rate suffered because of it.
- J. Merrill some of these things are not quantifiable.
- K. Hughes likes to give a grade that will allow the program to grow.
- I,D The next item the committee discussed was success rates and L. Kamaila stated that you can go to the State Chancellor's datamart and find out what the scores are and pick colleges who have similar demographics like ours. B. Black said in the narrative, you want to compare it to your program. L. Kamaila asked what is considered a success rate and what is considered an improvement? It would be helpful to put their success rate in so it doesn't have to be looked up.
  - L. Kamaila said we should discuss programs that need assistance and provide suggestions for improvements.
    Because of accreditation standards we should be able to discuss and evaluate the program openly. E.
    Endrijonas added that the overall goal is continuous quality improvement. Another suggestion was made that programs that are flagged to have a meeting with a smaller group of PEPC members to discuss the program.
- I The group discussed Question #3 of the PEPR Feedback form where it asks to rate the program 1-5, with 5 being exemplary. It was recommended to add "and why" at the last part of the question so that the rating can be explained.
- I As far as the rating of the programs, it was decided that the process would be done electronically and each program would abstain from rating their own program.
- I E. Endrijonas said we don't know what the commission findings are yet, but when they met in early January they did some changes to the standards. Representatives have shown up with only one copy when going to conferences. She will post on the website and SharePoint, what the changes are with the letter and feedback form. They are going to be having hearings all throughout the spring and at the June meeting, they will vote on the standards which will then become final. They haven't gotten rid of the requirements but cut down on the redundancy.

VI. Accreditation

Т

- VII. Adjournment
- VIII. Future PEPC Meetings
- I, AT The meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.
  - February 25, 2014
  - o March 25, 2014
  - o April 22, 2014
  - o May TBD

I