



# PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (PEPC) MEETING MINUTES

**Present:** Erika Endrijonas (co-chair), Linda Kama'ila (co-chair), Michael Webb, Robert Cabral, Patricia Mendez, Christina Tafoya, Mati Sanchez, Tami Crudo, Jim Merrill, Jonas Crawford, Christiane Mainzer, Kevin Hughes, Mike Bush, Karen Engelsen, Carolyn Inouye, Karen Gorback, Lisa Hopper, Carlos Gonzalez, Bret Black, Chris Horrock, Carmen Guerrero

**Absent:**

**Guests:** Gail Warner

Meeting Date: **10/23/12**

Minutes Approved: **09/25/12**

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 2:04 p.m.   |
| II.  | Approval of Meeting Minutes   | I,AT | The meeting minutes from August 28, 2012 were reviewed by the committee; J. Merrill made a motion to approve the minutes, R. Cabral seconded, and <i>the motion passed unanimously.</i>  |
| III. | Public Comment  | I    | No Comment   |
| IV.  | Review of Guiding Principles for Core Courses; Senate Reaction to PEPC's Principles | I    | <p>L. Kama'ila said this process is to see what is core and E. Endrijonas talked about general education. She asked the Deans to come up with two-year matrices so that it would become part of the planning tool and added that it's important when class cuts are going on.</p> <p>I L. Kama'ila said department planning is important in establishing what is core and recommended adding the Guiding Principles document*.</p> <p>I E. Endrijonas stated when AP4021 was accepted by the Board, they asked that DTRW review the graduation requirement again specifically looking at general education as they were concerned there was an emphasis on that procedure and to see if our general education procedure is still relevant.</p> |

\*Handout

V. Study Session: Creating Program Review in an era of Budget Cuts

- How to make the process more data driven

- I,D L. Kama'ila said the PEPR form and review need to start soon so everyone has more time to ask questions that are important to the student success and budget process. E. Endrijonas added that we need to follow-up what we did last year. She said next spring we will have to go through program review and do the rating and come fall, PEPC will be expected to relate those results to PBC as this is a permanent cycle at the college now. She also said the expectation is not that everyone has to do it every year and that's why we pick eight programs to do a more in depth review and all other programs do an annual unit plan.
- I C. Guerrero said it was discovered last spring that regardless of how the PEPRs were written, people around the table did not read them. E. Endrijonas spoke about not being anonymous and said we need to have a discussion of each PEPR as a group and reach consensus on what we believe as a committee the rating should be. This way it deals with those who haven't read them as well as allowing a chance to hear more than one perspective.
- I L. Kama'ila said it would be to this committees benefit to give more specific information to PBC and instead of talking about how many students, asking how much does each student cost? She said that PBC is going to ask us again about this so we should ask programs who have a high cost per student, why it's so high.
- I E. Endrijonas said that everyone has done their improvement plans so there is documentation to draw from, but asked if there was anything that they never got a chance to articulate. The following suggestions were made:
- Balance
  - Where do we want this college to be?
  - Vision
  - Mission into more positive process
  - More qualitative analysis
- E. Endrijonas said the consensus is that we need to ask fewer but better questions.
- I R. Cabral commented there is a common redundancy that every time we get in this discussion it always falls back and never gets traction and said maybe the EVP, Academic Senate and division managers take this to

the President's cabinet and have this discussion. E. Endrijonas responded that it's the role of the Educational Master Plan (EMP) which we should be revising and said she's not in favor of updating it before the District does because it's not productive use of time because if we do all the work and the District's EMP reflects a different vision, we have a problem but added that it is very important though to do it within the next year.

- How to make the process easier on faculty

I C. Guerrero spoke about a community survey where people have a place to have input as to what they want us to look like. E. Endrijonas responded that the only caveat is we need to do some informational campaigns to find out what we have to do. J. Crawford added that such survey was created by the marketing committee last year.

I J. Crawford spoke about a "smart tool" he used in athletics which was easy to use and assisted him when preparing his PEPR and said it helped to strengthen what they do as well as allowing him to work with specific areas. L. Hopper said there are some things on the chancellor's website she's been using.

- What ongoing work/homework should committee consider

I C. Inouye asked for clarification regarding program review as far as every sub-program needing to have a program review and L. Kama'ila responded yes, because we want it more data driven but we are the ones that should come up with the rubric on what to rate.

I E. Endrijonas suggested that everyone go back and review the PEPR form and send suggested changes to her or Linda and let them know what they'd like. She and Linda will bring a draft of what they put together. She added that she wants to have a PEPR that works for everyone. L. Kama'ila added to suggest what types of data elements you'd like.

- Proposals for this year's PEPC process (for consideration, no action)

I M. Bush said he understands that there is a big focus on program discontinuance but the process needs to be goal driven budgets because we want to know where we need to put our resources. C. Guerrero responded that the numbers are less than half the story and it's in the narrative, just looking at areas and data doesn't really explain it. E. Endrijonas added that she agrees but it's a lot to read and take in, we need to have an approach where PEPRS are reasonably supported by data that people will be willing to read. J.

Merrill mentioned that transfer disciplines address alignment with receiving institutions.

VI. Choosing 8 programs for intense analysis

I E. Endrijonas state that if you went last year, you don't have to go this year. The following programs volunteered to go through the intense program review analysis this year:

1. Life Science
2. Social Science
3. Economics
4. Political Science
5. Communication Studies
6. Culinary (CRM)
7. Addictive Disorder Studies
8. Fire Tech, Fire Academy, EMT

E. Endrijonas said we will unearth the recommended changes to the form from the April meeting and send out the revised forms and asked that feedback be sent to Linda or herself so they can come up with a revised draft in advance for the October meeting. They will also send revised data sheets.

VII. Informational Item: Accreditation

I E. Endrijonas stated the Board is reviewing the final follow-up report. She spoke about the Board meeting happening on campus at 3:00pm on October 9<sup>th</sup>. At this meeting, the Board will do a 2<sup>nd</sup> and final reading of the follow-up reports from all the colleges. She added that we got an audit letter which has already been responded to. She is currently working on the draft proficiency report due on October 15<sup>th</sup>. This report is similar to the annual report she files for the college and a copy will be on SharePoint.

VIII. Adjournment

I,AT The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

IX. Future PEPC Meetings

- I
- October 23, 2012
  - November 27, 2012
  - January 22, 2013
  - February 26, 2013
  - March 26, 2013
  - April 23, 2013