



PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (PEPC) MEETING MINUTES

Present: Dr. Erika Endrijonas (*co-chair*), Yong Ma, Carolyn Inouye, Gail Warner, Jim Merrill, Mati Sanchez, Patricia Mendez, Chris Horrock, Bret Black, Maria Pinto-Casillas, Carmen Guerrero, Marji Price

Guests: Dr. John al-Amin

Meeting Date: **04/26/2011** Minutes Approved: **03/22/2011** Recorded By: Darlene Inda

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

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

- | | | | |
|------|---|----|---|
| I. | Call to Order | I | The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. |
| II. | Additions to the Agenda | I | No additions to the agenda. |
| III. | Approval of Minutes | AT | The Committee reviewed the minutes of February 22, 2011. Bret Black moved to approve the minutes from February 22, 2011. Yong Ma seconded, and <i>the motion carried unanimously.</i> |
| IV. | Accreditation: WASC Rubric for Program Review | I | E. Endrijonas addressed the form and talked about the levels of implementation: Awareness, Development, Proficiency, and Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement. She added that the ACCJC created the Rubrics for Program Review, Planning and Student Learning Outcomes. She gave the Planning Rubrics to Dr. al-Amin for his use at the upcoming PBC meeting. |
| | | D | E. Endrijonas asked C. Guerrero and/or J. Merrill to talk about the Awareness portion of the Rubrics since she was not here when the PEPC process was devised. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• J. Merrill stated that when PEPC was developed, program review was not integrated with planning and feels that it needs to be reinvigorated.• C. Guerrero stated that before PBC, it was more of an informational receiving meeting with little recommendation. She added that when Program Reviews were done, there were presentations and feedback and one of the recommendations in the feedback was to make sure that recommendations were incorporated into your planning, but there |

was no planning or link from the planning to the budget and the budget committee was not part of that process.

E. Endrijonas asked if the original intention of PEPC was planning and program review, then how does planning get put back into it, because that's where she feels unclear as to what the mission of this committee was.

- J. Merrill answered by stating that we now have primarily a resource request form that everyone seems to be relating just to the EMP. He stated that they are referring to the PEPR but that they aren't stating what they really are going to do.
- C. Guerrero stated that in Section 12 where it talks about strengths and weaknesses, she feels it's the closest to justifying means and planning. She added that there is no one real area that talks about an actual plan.

D E. Endrijonas suggested pulling out a separate form that would have the planning piece to it that could be evaluated separately from resource request and program evaluation. She stated that as a charge of this committee all three things have to be done. She asked if this would be helpful since we are going into next year with the multi-year process. C. Guerrero felt that the forms should not be separate and stated that the Resource Request form should not be submitted without mentioning it in the Program Review. If the forms are done separately, the planning piece becomes diluted.

I E. Endrijonas stated that she would like to make the planning process more electronic rather than paper intensive. J. Merrill added that some will be research intensive and that we need to have something that has substance to it. C. Horrock added that he would like to go for the data and use the narrative because it puts a lot of pressure on key individuals to get it going. E. Endrijonas stated that we have the commitment from Dr. Duran that Lisa Hopper will be working on data collection this summer.

I, D The Committee reviewed the Program Review and Planning portions of the Rubric form and had the following comments:

- C. Guerrero feels that it should be based on data, not feelings.
- J. Merrill stated that it should be quantitative and qualitative.
- M. Price dislikes everything reduced to data and

would like our successes from this process shared campus-wide rather than on paper.

- E. Endrijonas stated that in reviewing other colleges, they have set goals and measurements and stated that we need to have the goals and the second set will have numbers put to it and we can then pull out those success stories.

D, AN E. Endrijonas addressed the Proficiency section from the Planning portion of the rubric which discussed documentation and stated this is something we have not done and need to address. She added that we have to measure success and be more diligent and creative on how we mine the data. This is a project she has on her plate for the summer which will provide a useful dataset.

I, D The Committee talked about data and ways to track the students:

- C. Horrock suggested tracking students through the Counseling office when they check-in and check-out to see if they completed their goals successfully. He also suggested student's doing more online to track their success.
- E. Endrijonas stated an experiment is in the works where students fill out a quick questionnaire on an iPad upon leaving financial aid. It's a pilot program to capture the data.
- C. Guerrero added that students are required to fill out a set of questions when they register but the data is not matching up and it's a problem because it affects funding. It's been suggested to survey the students in the classroom.

I, D E. Endrijonas reviewed the last bullet point under Part II: Proficiency and stated that we don't report out and don't incorporate results of the program effectively so we don't really know how other programs do their program review. C. Guerrero stated that we don't evaluate the program review and there's no feedback. She doesn't see that our reports are evaluating ourselves. J. Merrill feels that if done properly it could be used as an opportunity for introspection not just a justification. E. Endrijonas added that if we're going to meet these requirements of program review and planning, we have to work towards an annual Institutional Effectiveness Report.

AN The Committee discussed data analysis and how to go about it best and E. Endrijonas asked that everyone email her the data that they think is important because she feels that there will be a lot of commonality in terms

of the data that's being requested. She wants to have all the data ready to go by the time faculty returns from summer so this process can begin immediately.

I E. Endrijonas spoke about the narrative that analyzes the data and explains where things went. M. Price asked about including the ramifications and E. Endrijonas stated they do need to be acknowledged, talked about and decided what is going to be done to match the goal of the program. She added that it's not about the individuals writing the report but about what the program is and wants everyone to get away from the fear of analysis.

V. Resource Requests

I E. Endrijonas stated that all the Deans submitted the resource request forms to R. Cabral who originally uploaded them to OC Group Page and finally to SharePoint. At the last President's Cabinet they were given four goals and a series of activities that resulted from the College Task Force. Dr. Duran stated that he wanted the resource requests to relate to the goals. The Deans then went through and added the Goal# and sub alpha to each resource request.

AN E. Endrijonas asked the Committee how they want to go about ranking these requests and stated that it was clear last year not to have 3 different lists.

I E. Endrijonas stated that there are two different ways to look at these forms and that just because you've submitted, doesn't mean that PEPC has to prioritize every single one of them. As long as you've submitted them and their tied to your program review, you've articulated the need for them. PEPC can choose to prioritize these however they want to and report out to PBC how many were received and after consideration, how many were actually prioritized.

I C. Guerrero stated that the resource requests are good because they are a part of long term planning and it has now been documented for Accreditation. C. Inouye added that the process and the form were good and it allowed the departments to look at their requests and prioritize them.

AN E. Endrijonas stated that we need to come to the next PEPC meeting ready to look at these and make decisions. We need to break these into categories and have a sense on how they will be ranked.

- AT The Committee came up with the following categories to separate the forms into: Facilities, Equipment, Personnel, Instructional/General Supplies and Health & Safety. D. Inda will take all the resource request forms and put them into a spreadsheet by category with a ranking column.
- I J. al-Amin stated that once the resource requests get to PBC, they should be ranked 1, 2, 3, 4, etc... not by category level – they should all be intermingled.
- AN E. Endrijonas stated that by April 22nd, everyone needs to have their spreadsheets ranked so that at the April 26th meeting, we can review all the spreadsheets. She added that PEPC will have to weigh certain requests and decide where it should go but we need to provide PBC and ultimately Dr. Duran with one list.

Adjournment

4:10 p.m.

- VI. Future PEPC Meetings
- I ○ April 26, 2011