

Oxnard College Mission Statement

Oxnard College promotes high quality teaching and learning that meet the needs of a diverse student population. As a multicultural, comprehensive institution of higher learning, Oxnard College works to empower and inspire students to succeed in their personal and educational goals and aspirations.

As a unique and accessible community resource, our mission is to provide and promote student learning:

- Transfer, occupational, and general education, second language acquisition, and basic skills development;
- Student services and programs;
- Educational partnerships and economic development; and
- Opportunities for lifelong learning.

Oxnard College intends to lead its community to fulfill its highest potential.

AUTHORITY

The Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee (PEPC) was created to analyze each Program's Program Effectiveness Plan (PEP) and to make recommendations to the Planning and Budgeting Council regarding said Plans.

PURPOSE

The Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee makes recommendations to the Planning and Budgeting Council on all matters related to program effectiveness and program planning. In making those recommendations, PEPC receives a Program Effectiveness Plan from each and every College program.

MEMBERSHIP

Members come from divisions and departments and are comprised of the Department Chair, Coordinator, Supervisor, or designee in such departments, etc. In addition, all members are to have a designated alternate attend in the event of their absence.

Members have the following responsibilities:

- Assist their departments and/or divisions in providing PEPC with each Program's PEP by mid-November of each year
- Report information from PEPC back to their division/department
- Present the views of the division/department they were chosen to represent, not solely their own views
- Attend PEPC meetings per the schedule outlined in the Program Effectiveness and Planning Process and Timeline (Please refer to diagram in Appendix A for a visual representation of this Process and Timeline.)

OXNARD COLLEGE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF PEPC November 23, 2010

2:00 P.M. at the President's Conference Room

1. Attendees at Meeting.

Paul Houdeshell, Erika Endrijonas, Robert Cabral, Yong Ma, Gail Warner, Carmen Guerrero, Lisa Hopper, Graciela Casillas-Tortorelli, Chris Horrock, Matilde Sanchez, Patricia Mendez, Bret Black, Marjorie Price, Andrew Cawelti, James Merrill, Mary Pinto Casillas. Recorded/Minutes by: Darlene Inda

2. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 2:06pm

3. Additions to the Agenda.

There were no additions to the agenda.

4. Approval of the September 28th meeting minutes.

The minutes from the October 26, 2010 meeting were reviewed and approved with changes. It was noted that a list of the names should be included in the minutes. A list of attendees from the 10/26/10 meeting were added on this meeting's sign-in sheet and will be updated on the minutes from the last meeting. A motion to accept the minutes was offered by Paul Houdeshell and seconded by Andy Cawelti.

5. Discussion: PEP Resource Request, PEPC Roll-Up to PBC, and PBC Feedback.

The committee discussed the PEP Resource Request form and the submission of the form to PBC and the President's feedback. Robert asked for guidance and direction from PEPC on how to prioritize the Resource Request list due to feedback from PBC and the President. One of the challenges from the President was that he had a hard time understanding the form due to a lack of detail and the criteria

on how PEPC made such selections. As for PBC's feedback, they were interested in seeing other things ranked rather than just faculty. PBC shared the same feelings from the President that not enough direction was given nor reasoning or criteria on how to prioritize the list. Jim shared that in prior years there was a

whole other set of criteria and that this form would not have been used for faculty positions. Erika then spoke on what the core set of principles is for the positions and Jim spoke on the very specific faculty criteria.

Even though criteria cannot be uniformly created, in order to provide the President and PBC with a list of requests, the requests need to articulate and identify the reasons for it. Erika and Robert both stated that, ultimately, it's the President's right to decide on what request is granted, and it may or may not be based on any order, but that if the President was provided with more criteria, he would know exactly why the request was made. Erika stated that, originally, there were only 3 positions that were going to be filled, but now there are 6. Erika stated that if a faculty member retires after April 1st, the position does not need to be filled for the year. Erika did mention that Dr. Duran has made his decision on 4 of the positions, which are two general counselors, one in physics and the other in history; and he will figure out what the last two positions will be. Graciela was concerned that all the work put into choosing positions on the list didn't mean anything, but Erika told her that that wasn't the case but that PBC spoke about what was most important and had the form provided a ranking with reasoning than each choice would have been more significant. Jim said this document will not facilitate that type of information. Robert stated that the biggest challenge is comparing apples to oranges and making things simpler. Erika also mentioned that Accreditation reviewed the form and also had a very hard time understanding it. Paul made a point that he has made recommendations for non-faculty resources in the past 3 years and each request was never honored. Robert stated that the President is relying on PEPC's voice to take direction and provide the information he needs to make his decision. Erika stated that when making decisions on what positions to request, a lot of the information is within the PEPR. Graciela was concerned about how such information makes it on paper and Erika said that the Co-Chairs, Robert and herself, will have to report to PBC. Jim suggested a two-stage process; prior to ranking, have a discussion and process and reasoning for ranking. Erika agreed that the process needs to be more thorough. Robert made a point that everyone needs to be challenged to read reports to have awareness. The experience from last year was that the goal was to remove some of the workload from committee members because there was a big fall off in prior years. Feedback sessions were created that still kept the rigor of work but what happened was that feedback sessions happened but information stopped there. Even committee members were inclined to just read PEP reports – they felt job was done. When the ranking process happened last year, they took from resource list that departments decided to complete and used it as a beginning list. When the committee ranked the faculty positions, we didn't get into a discussion why, we just used a dot process. The outcome was provided to PBC. A lot of work was done but it wasn't reflected properly at PBC. Chris felt that it didn't seem outrageous to look at 10-12 cases to see different points of view so people can compare apples to oranges and come out with single consensus which might work and for the resource request as well. We should be able to come to consensus together rather than one particular department.

The committee looked at the Resource Request form to make some alterations. One of the biggest concerns were the items at the bottom of the form, and the consensus was that they should be at the top. Carmen stated that the reason they were on the bottom was because they wanted to make sure that the fields were there and also because the items on the bottom didn't fit on the top unless done on legal size. To make things simpler, Erika stated that the form should show the resource requested, a description of what it's going to do and lastly, how much it's going to cost. Carmen requested that the list have a ranking of the priorities. Robert stated that Erika is going to revamp the form and review with him before presenting it to John for feedback and then send it to the committee electronically. It is best to get co-leaders' input as soon as possible.

6. Discussion: Program Review Feedback Calendar and Report-Out Process

Robert suggested that the committee look at the PEPC feedback calendar as it changes often. He requested that the committee members send an email to him and he will schedule appointments.

7. Discussion: Data Points for Multi-year Planning

Erika recommended that there was a need to enhance program review to add a multi-year cycle, which was a more in depth analysis of programs to look at effectiveness and weakness. The general consensus was a

concern over data. What kind of data are we offering right now? The point is to look at trends and to look at classes. She then left it open to discussion. Carmen stated that multi-year planning was the direction and the trends of the industries for what we're preparing our students for. The discussion was that there needs to be a way to figure out how curriculum tracking is working and whether it looking at a particular course in sequence, a certain major, etc. The problem is that students don't always declare their major. If that information was provided, it would help provide more direction. Chris asked if "major" information was available and Lisa stated that it's available in Banner but the data is pretty poor because students come in and are either undecided or choose a major but then decide to do something different and never change their major. Even though there is a mechanism to do that, the students aren't always advised to do it. Chris mentioned that it would be important to know what students are at the College for transfer and those who are there for a certificate program. Lisa stated that there are certain courses that are identified as "upper level" courses which means that a student would only be taking that course if one were going to transfer or going towards a degree program. Erika would like to see what students are going towards a "major" course versus being undecided. There was also talk about tracking transitional students to get an idea if they're moving into upper classes. This could create a trend to see what things are being done or look for something else. Erika stated that in order to produce results, we have to figure out where these students are and where they're stopping. Robert noted that it would be helpful to know if a student starts at Oxnard College but then leaves the campus if we can track the migration data. Carmen mentioned that when Darla was here she did a report for her where she selected zip codes to look and see how many students from those zip codes were attending OC in Business Courses and 55-60% came from Oxnard zip codes which was very significant. Carmen called a handful and she asked them why they were attending Oxnard College and they said they had a variety of choices. But if we didn't provide a choice, they left to attend another college. Jim noted that the useful data points are qualitative things to look at students that have taken service courses and how are they doing in disciplines? Are they doing better or the same? Something that may affect a student is if enrollment goes up or down and how does it affect a program? Gail asked a question as to why Oxnard College does not have mandatory advising and Erika responded because of Title 5. She stated that we can advise them what courses to take but we cannot require them to declare a major in order to enroll. When students register, they don't have to put a major down; they can simply state "undeclared". Carmen stated that sometimes what the student thinks is a major is and what it really is are different. Bret would like to see the same course compared between the summer and the 2-week schedule and 4-day/week. Jim inquired about Distance Education and Erika stated that it comes with responsibilities and that we have to make sure the course has academic quality. We need inform students that it's not less work than a classroom course. Erika stated that we have to get to the point as an institution that people do not feel threatened or endangered if we ask questions and track students. What is going on in programs and what is working? We need sustainability. We have to ask questions. The Accreditation Site Visiting Team wanted to know and a progress report needs to provide data for what programs are working but what programs are not working. Robert requested that we look at different data from a day vs. evening class and how it differs and what quality points are we missing. Jim stated that it would be interesting to look the age of students, length a student has been there and why they haven't graduated yet. Erika raised a question as to whether the College does a Student Satisfaction Survey and Lisa responded that it was done out of the district and previously through email, fax and mail and that it would be more useful if faculty presented these surveys in the classroom because some students don't have access to a computer. A request was made to Lisa to start working on a survey. Erika closed the discussion with saying that we need to keep in mind what's happening with students.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:56. Next meeting scheduled for January 25th – or at feedback session.

Meeting Schedule
4th Tuesdays @ 2PM

8/24

9/28

10/26

11/23

1/25

2/22

3/22

4/26