

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (PEPC) MEETING MINUTES

<u>Present</u>: Erika Endrijonas (co-chair), Linda Kama'ila (co-chair), Alex Lynch, Jim Merrill, Patty Mendez, Kevin Hughes, Marji Price, Lisa Hopper, Carolyn Inouye, Jonas Crawford, Christina Tafoya, Kim Karkos, Chris Horrock, Mike Bush, Mati Sanchez, Chris Mainzer, Carmen Guerrero, Bret Black, Robert Cabral, Karen Engelsen,

Absent: Michael Webb, Tami Crudo

Guests: Ishita Edwards, Gail Warner

Meeti	ing Date: 09/25/12	Minut	es Appr	oved:	08/28/12	Recorded By: Darlene Inda
AN =	Action Needed	AT = Act	ion Tak	en	D = Discussion	I = Information Only
DISCU	JSSION/DECISIONS					
I.	Call to Order		I,AT	The r	meeting was called	to order at 2:02pm
ΙΙ.	Approval of Meeting	g Minutes	I,AT I	April recor has ti appro <i>two a</i> M. Pri comr	30, 2012 and C. M nmended that a fol he draft minutes as oved minutes. <i>The</i> <i>abstentions.</i> rice mentioned whe nent and concern a	ove the meeting minutes of ainzer seconded. It was der in SharePoint be setup that s well as a folder for the <i>minutes were accepted with</i> en reviewing the minutes, her about the committee al consensus was not included
111.	Public Comment		I	and s		lected in the minutes.
			I	NU C	omment	
IV.	PEPC Ratings in P to Report out to PB		Ι	and e our g	everyone's totals a oals. She tried a f ess data and the n	ne data sheet* she put together nd said we need to think about ew different ways to look umbers relatively stayed the
			Ι	rubrio remo we ai	c and include those ve those that are r re at that point in th	v need to look carefully at our that are quantifiable and tot. E. Endrijonas added that the year where we need to look ture the PEPRs for the year

and feels there should be some language that addresses AATs. J. Merrill asked about losing points for that and she responded that you get points for working on it.

R. Cabral stated we need to establish a baseline and look at the difference of CTE vs. non-CTE and make adjustments along the way. He added that back in March he was given the charge from PBC that they wanted a better handle of programs for discontinuance and that PEPC needs to come up with some type of process and ensure that PBC understands it.

L

- I L. Kama'ila talked about the lowest scoring program; Legal Assisting and said this score was low because there was no full-time faculty member to provide an equivalent narrative to the extent of the other reports. She also discussed Engineering Tech which was another low scoring program.
- I E. Endrijonas spoke about last year and the eight programs that went through an in-depth process. She said that everyone needs to come to the table to discuss their ratings and what the program should be and as a committee come up with criteria and ratings.
- L. Kama'ila said PBC has to bring forward \$1.6 million in cuts by September 30th in case the tax initiative doesn't pass. The recommendation will go from PBC to the EVP, back to PBC, then to Senate and lastly to the President. She said that Engineering Tech has offered itself for discontinuance and feels we should inform PBC that we only identified one program to recommend for discontinuance and that all other programs are good. She added that although we didn't look at the financials, we will still have an opportunity to do so, because if by November we see a program has gone down we can still recommend it.
 - J. Crawford asked why we are only passing forward one program when we have to come up with \$1.6 million. R. Cabral asked what the instructional side of the house's portion is of the \$1.6 million and M. Bush responded that it's between 1/3 and 1/2 and it will be narrowed down because there is going to be an FTES reduction.
- I L. Kama'ila said she would put all of the programs on a 25-point scale and send it out to FT and PT faculty and see if they have comments which would be a chance

L

for everyone to comment on it. E. Endrijonas said it should just go out to PEPC committee members. A. Lynch disagreed and would like to leave it as is. L. Kama'ila said she will try to get the revised spreadsheet out tonight and asked everyone to return comments by noon the next day. E. Endrijonas added that when looking at the numbers if there are questions or concerns let her or Linda know as soon as possible. J. Merrill asked what to look for and L. Kama'ila responded that we will be looking at the resource requests and PEPRs and share as much information as possible on how to make the programs effective.

- V. Informational Item: I No Update Accreditation
- VI. Adjournment I Before the meeting adjourned, L. Kama'ila addressed the sign-in sheet and said that if you miss three meetings in a row, you will not be able to participate in the voting process so it's real important for all members to be present.

L

- I,AT The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.
- VII. Future PEPC Meetings

- September 25, 2012
- o October 23, 2012
- o November 27, 2012
- o January 22, 2013
- \circ February 26, 2013
- o March 26, 2013
- o April 23, 2013

CTE (with all data) 33 Prog 1, Prog 2, Prog 3 32 Prog 4, Prog 5, Prog 6, Prog 7, Prog 8 31 Prog 9, Prog 10, Prog 11 30 29 28 Prog 12 27 26 Prog 13 25 Prog 14 24 23 Prog 15 22 21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 Prog 16 Transfer 24 Prog 1 23 Prog 2, Prog 3, Prog 4 22 Prog 5, Prog 6, Prog 7 21 Prog 8, Prog 9, Prog 10, Prog 11, Prog 12, Prog 13 20 Prog 14 19 Prog 15, Prog 16 18 Prog 17, Prog 18 Original rubric (not final): CTE: 30-36 Current and vibrant 24-29 Attempts should be made to strengthen 17-23 Caution rating. Retention, possible reduction 0-16 Warning, consider discontinuance Transfer: 21-25 Current and vibrant 16-20 Attempt to strength

11-15 Caution, possible reduction

0-10 Warning, consider discontinuance

CTE

Our initial ratings plan had four categories that parallel the Board Policy language. We borrowed that language from Ventura. I have used the Board Policy language here – what language to use is something we need to discuss next Tuesday. It is the task of PBC, not PEPC, to consider how to "reduce" things. It is also the task of PBC to look at financial data. We did not look at that data in PEPC.

No Action Needed

33 Prog 1, Prog 2, Prog 3
32 Prog 4, Prog 5, Prog 6, Prog 7, Prog 8
31 Prog 9, Prog 10, Prog 11
30
5
Strengthen the program

29
28 Prog 12
27
26 Prog 13
25 Prog 14

Caution rating; reduce the program

Review for Discontinuance

Transfer

No Action Needed

24 Prog 1
23 Prog 2, Prog 3, Prog 4
22 Prog 5, Prog 6, Prog 7
21 Prog 8, Prog 9, Prog 10, Prog 11, Prog 12, Prog 13

Strengthen the program

20 Prog 14
19 Prog 15, Prog 16
18 Prog 17, Prog 18
17
16
15
14

the state of the state of the second structure of the second state of the second state

	AUS AL	Anth	TIA	10 AU	AIRL		LES		COMMIN		ELUII	CINGI		LJL		Laing		LIE JUI		MUSIC				1 1170 000	1 011 004		500	
Number of reviewers:	-35 - 33	20	20	37	24	15 33	25	35	23	33 34 235	22	25	0	24	35 34	22	19	25	24	21	31	23	22.5	17	20	17	22.5	21.5
	33 30	24	17	34 34	10	20 36	25	36	23	27 . 25.5 Bl	24	24	37	21		21	71	24	24	21	33	12	19	18	14	13	21	
	29 35	19	16	34	15	30 76	22	36	23	30 31 73	25	22	1	22	36 36	25	72	25	23	25	35	11	15	22	24	16	21.5	25
	32 29	23	19		19	31 18	22	35	15	28 21 34	21	24	10	23	25	22	- 22	24	25	20	34	25	19	22	21	22	22	28.14
	30 33	25	23	31 23.5	24	26 21	9	28	23	30 33 32	24	25	5	20	36 36	22	17	24	25	22	31	17	20	25	24	22	24	25
	30 33	24	19	30 33 -	22	26 24	21	31	24	30 32 33	20	25	0	24	35 35	24	17	22	25	21	36	24	25	25	21	20	21	T . 35
	36 35	23	16	30 30	23	28 29	19	26	23	-34 32 32	18.5	23	0	25	33 25	18	14	22	22	17	34	22	20	25	25	18	23	21
	29 33	24	23	34	18	33 28	22	34	25	- 32 33 25	16	25	1	18	33.5 36	21	20	22	24	11	32	15	23	23	22	17	24	25
	34 36	25	25	36 35	16	33. 21	22	29	25	31 24 34	20	19	38 3 86	24	29 35 1	19.5	34	20	21	17	30	7	23	25	23	23	23	22
	33 30	21	22	28	9	34 27	21	36	24	32 35 35	23	25	34	22.5	33 31	23		23.5	21	22	22.5	20	22	23	22	20	22	
-	27 33	23	22	B5 36	19	55	22	31	23	36 34 34	24	21.5	34	24		21	24	21	21	18	24	17	24	23	19	20	21	21
	18	21	21	31 30	19	THE REPORT	24	36	19	- 36 - 34 - 35	19	25	12	18.5		19		21	22	17	29	19	18	23	23	22	23	122
	- 35 - 33	19	18	31 82.5	21		23	35	21	31 33 35	21	23		15	36 34	20		25	22	17	32	19	21	24	21		16	17-22
	35 33	20	12	24 24			21	35	21	34 36	21	23		17	33 33			25	25	22	33	17	17					4. 2ª
							1000		100000				Tell Martine Social															PER AN
Raw score	436 451	311	273	442 444	239	320 260	298	463	312	413 432.5 442.5	298.5	329.5		298		77.5	238	323.5	324	271	436.5	248	288.5	295	279	230	284	1000 C
Average	31.14286 32.21429	22.21429	19.5	31,57143 31,71429	18.3846	2 27.61905 26	21.28571	23.07143	22.2857	1 31.76923 30.89286 31.60714	21.32143	23.5357	11.16667	21.28571	1 33.25 33.25 21.	34615	21.63636	23.10714	23.14286	19.35714	CH 14857	17.71429	20.60714	22.69231	21.46154	19.36364	21.84615	A SHORE
	And the second second second												1.14		and the second second second		Sector Contractor				大的法律的推动的						4	
CTT Design of Comments																												
CTE Range of Scores: 1 33.25		2		1		1 1		Trends		of Scores 18-24	22													1				
Aver : 29	31 32	15						Transfe	r kange	of Scores 18-24 Average: 21	19.5	Г																
Aver 29	32				-					Average: 21	18		}				- 1											
	32 32	13									21		17		1	_												
	28	11									22		15				-											
10 S	26					Contraction of Contraction					21		13			1												
	33	9									23.5			-		-												
	32				-	# Ser	ies1				21																	
	31	1									21		9					■ Series1										

5 10 15 20 25 30 35

28.9375

14-1