



PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (PEPC) MEETING MINUTES

Present: Robert Cabral (*co-chair*), Erika Endrijonas (*co-chair*), Carmen Guerrero, Mati Sanchez, Christiane Mainzer, Lisa Hopper, Christina Tafoya, Bret Black, Alex Lynch, Jim Merrill, Marji Price, Chris Horrock, Patricia Mendez, Carolyn Inouye

Absent: Maria Pinto-Casillas, Jonas Crawford, Graciela Casillas-Tortorelli

Guests: Gail Warner, Tami Crudo

Meeting Date: **03/27/2012** Minutes Approved: **02/28/2012** 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 2:06 p.m.

- II. Public Comment I No Comment

- III. Approval of Minutes I,AT The committee reviewed the meeting minutes of January 24, 2012. B. Black moved to approve the minutes, M. Sanchez seconded and *the motion was accepted with refinements.*
 - I,AN G. Warner being a guest vs. a member of the committee came up and R. Cabral stated that the co-chairs will look into this when membership is addressed.

 - I R. Cabral reminded the committee that we still need to identify seven programs for the multi-year process as G. Warner has already volunteered Fire Tech.

- IV. Draft Unit Plan I R. Cabral passed out the current unit plan as well as the DRAFT unit plan and said that three assumptions were made; keep the essence the same, prescribed list of each campuses own metrics to use in evaluating discontinuation, and to only look at AP4021 because we only had a limited discussion. He also added that at the Senate meeting yesterday, a senator stated that ethnicity should be considered.
 - I In reviewing the DRAFT unit plan, R. Cabral took the liberty of taking the 12 metrics and listed them with no weighting. He reviewed the original unit plan, read through it and crossed what we are doing now to what

we are proposing on the new AP4021. He noted that there are 12 proposed metrics so we need to look and see what it looks like now and if it's viable and relevant. Once we agree on the unit plan we need to figure out how to quantify or qualify it to some sort of order.

- I E. Endrijonas asked if everyone agreed with the components and if so we need to decide how we are going to evaluate it. She doesn't feel the narrative is the best approach and thinks that individuals should submit their plan and have an option to provide a short presentation to the committee. The committee members can assign numerical values, add it up and have it be a ranking of sorts where the committee members can then see how each program ranks overall. C. Guerrero responded that if we do a numerical ranking, she would like to make sure that it's not weighted and that all criteria are the same.
- I,D R. Cabral stated that he would like to make sure that our campus has the capacity to get the specific data they need. The committee reviewed question #'s 2, 4, and 7 and discussed various types of data they would like to be able to receive.
- I C. Horrock talked about including the narrative after the data so that it can be used as a tool for foot notes or explanations of the data to use and compare. E. Endrijonas responded that she is not suggesting getting rid of the narrative for this because that component is important, her concern comes from the end result of the process. She added if you rate and assign values to 10 questions, then each person can offer up a numerical evaluation of each 10 issues and we will have some statistical value. As co-chairs she and R. Cabral can compile the data and let the committee know what the results are and then as a committee, decide how we want to report that out.
- I,D A. Lynch recommended reviewing the 12 possible criteria to decide which ones we really want to measure. The committee reviewed and discussed Item's 3, 7, 8, 10, 11 and their thoughts and concerns about whether or not they should be used.
- I C. Inouye asked what committee we discuss where the college is going and what we need to be. E. Endrijonas responded that's where the need to update the current Educational Master Plan comes in and the start is the environmental scan. The EMP that was written three years ago was aspirational and things were different

back then. The philosophy of the college has changed and if you look at the college goals, you can see that we are doing them except when talking about expanding to meet student demand. She added that the problem right now is that this committee needs to complete the program review cycle between now and the academic year and we need to start getting ready to submit recommendations to PBC. She expressed that we probably need to have a special meeting to complete this process.

- I J. Merrill asked if there is a way to capture program completers and people who have transferred. L. Hopper responded that the National Student Clearinghouse provides this information right now but once we get our majors in order, it will be easier for us to do. R. Cabral asked how recent the data is and L. Hopper stated that she's not sure how the four year colleges report their completions but the information we get is as soon as they are reported by a four year college and once they pass the four year college, the information comes from CALPASS.
- I Getting back to the form, R. Cabral asked if there were any specific changes anyone would like to make. The following suggestions were made:
 - 1. No change.
 - 2. Additional bullet point discussing demographics.
 - 3. No change.
 - 4. No change.
 - 5. Provide link to college mission in first bullet and link to strategic goals in second bullet.
 - 6. C. Guerrero and G. Warner will work on this item and provide revision.
 - 7. No change.
 - 8. Remove 1st paragraph, and reword questions a-c.
 - 9. Remove c.
 - 10. Provide title and revise questions.
 - 11. Move "Executive Summary" to last question and insert "Other Criteria Important to Program Plan".
 - 12. New Question – "Cost of Program".
 - 13. Change "Executive Summary" to read "Summary of Findings and Plan".

I,AN R. Cabral stated that we should formally vet this through and will make the revisions as requested, send it to the committee for comment and final approval.

I,D E. Endrijonas reiterated that we need 7 more volunteers for program review and C. Guerrero asked if this can be done at the Department Chair meeting and E. Endrijonas said yes. R. Cabral asked what would be done if he completed the multi-year program last year and E. Endrijonas said that he would do the annual review this year and next. C. Inouye then suggested having everyone do an annual review this year with the new form and E. Endrijonas stated that we could do that, however, we can't have a pass next year. C. Inouye responded that until we design a multi-year process we can't get going on it now. R. Cabral added that as we refined our one year review document, we need to test it to see if it's effective and he would hate to duplicate some of the efforts on the multi-year plan. He proposed putting everyone on the one year plan this year and see if next year it served its purpose. E. Endrijonas stated that they have to be reviewed and ranked by graduation but in the Fall if PBC has nothing to work with and the President comes to the committee for recommendation, we need to be able to have something to give him.

V. Informational Item: Accreditation I No Update

VI. Adjournment AT The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

VII. Future PEPC Meetings I

- o March 27, 2012
- o April 24, 2012