



PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (PEPC) MEETING MINUTES

Present: Robert Cabral (*co-chair*), Jim Merrill, Mati Sanchez, Christiane Mainzer, Denielle Wiley, Bret Black, Lisa Hopper, Chris Horrock, Carolyn Inouye, Graciela Casillas-Tortorelli, Marji Price, Mary Pinto-Casillas

Absent: Christina Tafoya (proxy to Denielle Wiley), Erika Endrijonas, Jim Petersen/Gail Warner, Alex Lynch

Guests: Andrea Baltazar, George Ortega

Meeting Date: **11/22/2011** Minutes Approved: **10/25/2011** 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 2:09 p.m. |
| Public Comment | I Public comments regarding program discontinuance were made by Andrea Baltazar and George Ortega. |
| II. Approval of Minutes | I The committee reviewed the meeting minutes of September 27, 2011. C. Mainzer made a motion to approve the meeting minutes with refinements, M. Sanchez seconded and <i>the motion carried unanimously.</i> |
| III. PEPR's – Update/Status | I R. Cabral talked about the revised changes to the new form and C. Mainzer said that the form uploaded seems to be the same one as last year. Everyone is using the old form until the revised version is uploaded. |
| | I R. Cabral talked about a new folder on SharePoint that shows 2011-12 DRAFT PEP Reports and stated that the same naming convention needs to be used (i.e. BUS_PEP_2011-12_DRAFT) so that it will sort in alpha and that once it is decided what we are going to do with the reports, we can take the "DRAFT" off and add it to the approved folder that will be created. |
| | I J. Merrill stated that the revised multi-year document needs to be uploaded. D. Inda will change the naming convention on the multi-year form. B. Black mentioned that there are some "letter-bullet" issues for questions #7 and #11. |

- I C. Mainzer asked for the status of the course outlines. R. Cabral responded that he doesn't know where the revised list is. C. Horrock said that a lot of it has been put off because of Curricunet and added that some of the outlines are out of date six months to a year, but still an improvement from before.
- I C. Horrock asked for clarification on the word "Headcount" as well as "Seatcount for students" and "Individual person account for Faculty". L. Hopper responded that the enrollment section is for those doing multi-year. She stated that there are three types of enrollment: FTES, enrollment in summary (duplicate enrollment in classes, and unduplicated headcount for students, which are student taking multiple classes within the program and are only counted once. L. Hopper defined "unduplicated" more by stating that someone taking three classes in English will only be counted once.
- I Questions about FTEF came up and L. Hopper responded that if a full-time teacher is teaching a class or part of the workload it gets rolled up into FT and if teaching an individual class, it then rolls into PT which is the way PPDR breaks it up.
- I J. Merrill asked what snapshot we are taking and C. Inouye responded that for 2011-12 we should review the 2010-11 complete year. J. Merrill stated that we need to be clear and not combine FTEF in one year.
- I The committee discussed the form and tracking the student transfer data and C. Inouye asked what program gets credit for the transfer and M. Price responded that it's not awarding credit to specific programs, its completion of a goal.
- I J. Merrill stated that the link to college goals would be really nice to have and R. Cabral responded that College Goals are under the Office of the President page on the website under strategic planning.

- IV. Resource Requests – Update/Status
- Faculty Position Rankings
- V. November 22nd Meeting Structure
- I R. Cabral stated at the past PEPC meeting he was charged to speak with PBC regarding next year's Resource Request Form using the same one with a date change modification and added that the new form is on SharePoint. E. Endrijonas reiterated that each form is used for each request and asked to include Faculty requests as well on this form. There were a few issues filling out the form that D. Inda will look into and fix.
- I R. Cabral stated that this item refers to the PEPRs on SharePoint and the planning that will have to be done, how we are going to do it, what the ambition will be in reviewing the forms and ranking them. He also stated that we may need to consider an additional date to meet as we are only meeting one more time this semester. He stated that one of the discussion points were that we wanted to go away from the feedback and more into the critical analysis – not to reintroduce a triad dyad process but a process of critical evaluation of the programs.
- I J. Merrill stated that from an Accreditation standpoint, the input from the committee is to inform and make recommendations to PBC. R. Cabral stated that this committee should provide guidance and recommendations to PBC and what we have in place now hasn't been effective in times like this. R. Cabral reviewed the form and stated that it is a scoring process for how things are valued. He spoke about the rubric that Ventura College created for program instruction and stated that they included elements for program discontinuance in this and said maybe we use something like this to rank. J. Merrill responded that in the past we have tried this and had a hard time scoring things like this and said that we can have concepts but points are not an easy way to do it.
- I B. Black stated that he is new to the process and asked what is most valuable – to sit down together and review what we have done, where we have been and where we want to go. He added that what was done last year was okay but he liked meeting with his group better. M. Price asked how to evaluate something as serious as program discontinuance, how to get to that point and how does the discussion evolve? R. Cabral responded that we struggle with trying to make decisions based on rubrics created along the way and data created along the way and there's no methodology. He added that it's the struggle at PBC.

- I R. Cabral asked how we plan on dealing with the PEPRs and rationalizing them – are we going to hear from the programs, read them ourselves and come up with scoring and rank them and how do we deal with those on the bottom?

- I J. Merrill stated that E. Endrijonas said that we are going to review the eight programs going through the multi-year process but what are we doing for the programs doing an annual review? R. Cabral responded that regarding the eight programs, we are going to do something above and beyond the annual review presentation but that we need to get guidance on what to do. He stated that next week program reviews should be done. He added that he doesn't know when PBC wants analysis of program ranking so they can start budget planning but it's usually in February/March, however we do have a constraint because we only meet two more times so we need to determine what to do with them.

- I C. Inouye asked for departments doing an annual review if they were comfortable with what this revised form produces? M. Pinto-Casillas responded that some of the questions mentioned at the time were that those doing in-depth vs. annual review should have been reorganized. R. Cabral responded that this came up at the last session and that one of the programs doing the three-year review wanted to go to the annual plan because they didn't want their program to stick out. The discussion on that was should Business still do a multi-year review or go back to an annual and under the direction of the Dean it was decided to stay at a multi-year. The program never came to this group – it started with PBC and has always been at the PBC level.

- I M. Pinto-Casillas asked in doing program review – are we to disregard the programs on the discontinuance list because she thought this would be the time and place to advocate for the programs. B. Black responded that he doesn't feel it's PEPC's responsibility to deal with budget issues and thinks that if anything we would send a list of "cautionary" programs to PBC. J. Merrill added that having been on PEPC since inception, PEPC wouldn't have recommended any of the programs that were identified as programs in danger. M. Price said she feels discontinuance is a function of this committee and that she feels decisions have been made without using this committee as it should be.

- I R. Cabral stated that we are going to move away from the feedback sessions and go back to the presentation dialogue and everyone would take ownership and hear from the department expert and determine an evaluation of where the program sits. He's trying to get a sense on what process we are going to have when reports are completed and added that one year will capture enough information for a sense of the program but will we have to identify a rubric or some sort of evaluation process? C. Horrock responded that if there was a rubric, there would need to be a different one for the annual review and one for the multi-year review because it looks at different things.
- I R. Cabral stated that C. Guerrero suggested having the 11/22 meeting for presentations doing the multi-year review and annual plans will be a desk review.
- I J. Merrill recommended for the multi-year review to have a discussion on each of them since we already have a model in the curriculum review process, we then come here and see who wants to speak to it, set time limits and have the discussion. C. Horrock gave an example on how to possibly numerically rank them. He added that you can't score everything but there may be a range of things that might be quantifiable for program improvement as something should be coming out of PEPC for budget. M. Price suggested "acceptable" or "needs improvement" and at the end show a tally of what needs to be done.
- I R. Cabral stated that on 11/22 we are going to look at the eight programs that went through the multi-year review, allow time for someone to speak about it and attempt to place them somewhere. As for annual review, we will agree to distribute "xx" amount to the Ad-Hocs who will be responsible for reviewing them. He asked if we need to have another meeting before January 24th. He added that everyone should come to the meeting having read all eight multi-year reviews and before reviewing them at PEPC we will agree on a 3-point system.

VI. AP4021 Program Discontinuance

- I R. Cabral stated that this is the final revision that came out of DCSL and was an action item for Senate which was reviewed yesterday and voted in favor of this draft. He stated that Senate did ask about page 2 regarding program metrics – outcome and analysis and the metrics determined by each campus separately. He added that the recommendation group at the campus

level will be 2/3 faculty. R. Cabral stated that one of the questions was to have a 5th course of action and place between 3 and 4 and include suspension of program. He said that he took it to Shannon Davis and she cited Title V where program suspension doesn't fall under discontinuance and that when you suspend a program you have 2 years to do something with it and you are not allowed to enroll students in the program so it doesn't fit under the criteria. He added that the ambition for the future is to see how to integrate it into our program review process.

VII. Informational Item:
Accreditation

I No Update

VIII. Adjournment

AT The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

IX. Future PEPC Meetings

- I
- November 22, 2011
 - January 24, 2012
 - February 28, 2012
 - March 27, 2012
 - April 24, 2012