



PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (PEPC) MEETING MINUTES

Present: Robert Cabral (*co-chair*), Erika Endrijonas (*co-chair*), Bret Black, Marji Price, Christina Tafoya, Mati Sanchez, Alex Lynch, Jonas Crawford, Lisa Hopper, Carmen Guerrero, Christiane Mainzer, Graciela Casillas-Tortorelli, Chris Horrock, Jim Merrill, Paul Olivares (ASG Rep)

Absent: John al-Amin (*ex-officio*), Carolyn Inouye, Maria Pinto-Casillas, and Patricia Mendez

Guests: Linda Kamaila, Gail Warner, Richard Duran

Meeting Date: **02/28/2012** Minutes Approved: **01/24/2012** Recorded By: Darlene Inda

AN = Action Needed AT = Action Taken D = Discussion I = Information Only

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

- I. Call to Order I,AT The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.
- II. Public Comment I No Comment
- III. Approval of Minutes I,AT The committee reviewed the meeting minutes of December 6, 2011. J. Merrill moved to approve the minutes, L. Hopper seconded and *the motion carried unanimously*.
- IV. Discussion: Implementation of AP4021 Program Discontinuation I R. Duran stated that AP4021 was presented to the Board and accepted. This is the process we are going to have to implement to prepare for decisions for the 2013-14 fiscal year. The decisions for 2012-13 have already been made and are still being evaluated with other cuts that will have to be made. He added that we are trying to keep our FTES at 4600. The cuts in 2013-14 can be from \$1.8 to \$2 million and anticipates that we will have rollbacks in management.

I R. Duran stated the proper implementation of AP4021 has to start with PEPC and this group's charge is looking at the quality of programs and making determinations, to be done by this spring. Decisions have to be made by late November early December. PEPC's recommendations will be made to PBC in the Fall who will take them to him, and he will then make the final recommendations to the Chancellor.

I R. Duran stated that the criteria he will be looking at

specifically are Items G, I, H, and J. One of the issues we are facing is access and success. One of the Boards goals is a 5% increase in the number of graduates. He stated that we are beginning to become an institution where more metrics are used. Completion, job placement, and transfer rates need to be a part of the metrics.

I B. Black stated that as we are looking at the programs, he foresees that we look at all programs and say “it’s a strong program” or “there’s no action needed”. R. Duran responded that we will be looking for data and how the decision was made. It seems to him that there are ways on how you can get to that and make choices based on priorities. Additionally, he is seeking an outside consultant who works on analyzing the data. If he can get this person in here they can help faculty to look at the data. He wants to provide extra support to track this data.

I L. Kamaila stated that speaking as *co-chair* of the Student Success Committee, they are looking at data that PEPC hasn’t seen and as a faculty person, she would have liked to see the data. She added that it’s not possible to say that all programs are equal. She passed out a form that they are using and following. She recommended that the committee devise a whole new process where Faculty reviews the data. She added that L. Hopper has been getting data out of the system specifically for Oxnard and the Deans have seen the data. She feels it is more fair if everyone got to see that data. She also mentioned that the way we did program discontinuance was that this body had a say and so did PBC as well as the Deans.

I,D M. Price stated that financial aid is going to be a driver in this process as well. E. Endrijonas responded that it has to stay in the back drop but it’s something we have to keep an eye on. She added that we need to help students become focused early in the process and give them the tools and help them understand that if they want a different goal, where they go for that. Students don’t have as much time as they did before. R. Duran added that students can’t linger in community colleges anymore because of the restrictions on financial aid where once a student hits 12 semesters of FT Pell Aid, the grant is gone. J. Merrill asked how students’ eligibility is measured and E. Endrijonas responded it’s a prorated amount, and we are trying to get students to register FT because there are better success rates.

- I E. Endrijonas reminded the group that the data elements from AP4021 are not absolute, they are possible suggestions. R. Cabral responded that some of the PBC members felt they didn't have the data they needed and so as we begin the dialogue, we need to find the data elements that we can embrace. R. Duran mentioned that the VFA data used in Student Success is general institutional data and is not program based. R. Cabral asked if we have the capacity of getting the data and L. Hopper responded that she is in the process but one of the major things needed is a denominator.
- I E. Endrijonas stated that the other issue is the student success taskforce which has an institutional scorecard and includes an emphasis on degree planning. She added that our district will be at the forefront of this because we are doing a Degree Works implementation. She also stated that part of the recommendations that came from Student Success were not wanting to fund classes that students are taking unless it's in their education plan, so she thinks that will help.
- I J. Merrill commented that some students will declare a major in order solely to get their financial aid. L. Hopper added because of this we can now monitor them.
- I A. Lynch asked about CTE programs and what data will be accepted to show that students are getting employment after graduating. R. Duran responded that we will work with C. Guerrero and E. Endrijonas to frame it out.
- I C. Horrock asked if we've identified those programs or schools that we can take guidance from and R. Duran responded that if you look at the ARCC data, they do provide schools that are like us and the benchmark. As we get our data, we will be able to see how we measure up, but we won't have a good sense of that until the summer.
- I L. Kamaila stated that she really wants program people to get a chance to defend their programs because it's the faculty who know best why it might not be hitting a mark in a certain area. She wants the faculty included to explain if something did or didn't go wrong. The CTE side will have a hard time. She suggested having two program review forms because we saw in this last

round that vocational was hit harder because they don't have these metrics. She wants everyone to have an equal chance because we don't have the same type of data for workforce classes.

- I,AN E. Endrijonas stated that we will need to look at our processes and at the criteria we are going to use, adjust our forms and start program review again. We will need to have that information for PBC in the Fall. We are only signed up to have 3 meetings by the end of the year and said that we can have dialogue about it but she doesn't think that we will have the decisions made them. She added that we need to have the data and don't know how long it will take to get it. She recommended starting with writing the program review report and having this committee evaluate the results as well as a numerical rating system. We need to possibly consider some additional meetings to have the dialogue once the information is written.
- I,D E. Endrijonas reviewed the criteria stated in AP4021. In going through the document the committee discussed programs meeting college mission, duplication of a services which was one of the criteria in the fall, what defines a program which is a course that is part of a general education pattern that provides a certificate or degree, AS-T's, AA-T's, and transfer data.
- I,AT E. Endrijonas stated that one of the things we need to consider is that we had eight programs go through the multi-year process in the fall and are we going to have the next 8 programs do a multi-year and everyone else conform to the unit plan? She recommended that the next 8 programs continue with the multi-year to stay on track. G. Warner has volunteered to be one of those programs. E. Endrijonas stated that she and R. Cabral will get together and review the criteria and send it out to the committee to review and ask for the next eight programs to do the multi-year process. She recommended that the committee add another meeting in May and the committee agreed.
- I R. Cabral stated that we've taken the AP4021 on the eleven elements that we don't have to adopt but that are suggested. We are going to see if it works for us or not although it seems to work because it already crosses against the PEP form now. He added that this has to be an add-on and we need to have an agreement as to which elements the program is heading towards so that we can apply what variables

we are going to use.

I,AN E. Endrijonas stated that at our March meeting, we need to talk about the rubric by which faculty are going to read the PEPRs and weigh in on the reports. We will then come up with a way on how we evaluate these programs. She added that we may be making a decision to discontinue a program purely based on budget so we need to have a way to evaluate this. She suggested a numeric rubric instead of a narrative so that we can quantify it. C. Horrock agreed that it needs to be measureable data and that we need to get away from the narrative as well. He added that we are proficient on the rest of it, the next stage is figuring out how all this can come together. This needs to happen to assist in providing a benchmark.

I,AN E. Endrijonas stated that she will take the AP4021, revise the PEP form, send it out to the committee and ask for feedback.

I R. Cabral stated that at the next meeting we will identify seven programs for the multi-year process since only G. Warner of Fire Tech offered.

V. Informational Item:
Accreditation

I No Update

VI. Adjournment

AT The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

VII. Future PEPC Meetings

- I
- February 28, 2012
 - March 27, 2012
 - April 24, 2012