

NORCO COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
September 22, 2016
IT 218

Members:

Dr. Alexis Gray..... Social & Behavioral Sciences
Dr. Gail Zwart..... Business, Engineering & Information Technologies
Beverly Wimer..... Math and Science
Dr. Kevin Fleming..... Dean of Instruction, Career and Technical Education
Dr. Laura Adams..... Social & Behavioral Sciences
Kris Anderson..... Communications
Quinton Bemiller..... Arts, Humanities, & World Languages
Dr. Carol Farrar..... Dean of Instruction
Dr. Tim Russell..... Social & Behavioral Sciences
Dr. Greg Aycock..... Dean, Institutional Effectiveness
Luis Velazio Miranda..... ASNC

Members Absent:

Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer.....Vice President of Academic Affairs
Dr. Koji Uesugi.....Dean of Student Services
Dr. Monica Green.....Interim President
Beth Gomez.....Vice President, Business Services

Committee Support Administrator (Dr. Gray): Proposed work for the meeting): Dr. Gray spoke to the committee on our goals to complete for the 2016/2017 and they are as follows:

- 1) Need to read and review all program review reports submitted. Dr. Gray

We have not defined what which group makes a program review and therefore, Dr. Gray and Dr. Fleming will be working together to create a list. Our committee will be able to provide input on the list and it will be brought up it to be reviewed for approval or denial at the next meeting. There hasn't been any feedback received from the departments on requests for clarification.

- 2) **Make sure we are following our 'Statement of Purpose'**. The purpose of this committee will be to review and accept the Norco College Comprehensive Instructional Program Reviews and the Annual Instructional Reviews and forward them to the District for posting to the web. The information from these Program Reviews will then be forwarded and integrated into the College's Strategic Planning Processes. Suggestion on doing a Program Review boot camp on March 3rd in the NOC. Dr. Gray will email Melissa Bader (chair of the Professional Development committee) on coordinating this.
 - 3) **Need to establish frequency and types of program review**. When we going to do this during the year depends on our committee and establishing a workable project timeline. In the next meeting, we have to devote to assigning the administrative program reviews, discussing issues and have a norming session. The reports are still coming in.
 - 4) **Program Review Template**: We are aiming to review the template in December 2016. We need to address the concerns and issues faculty are having with the program review template. It was suggested for the template to be overhauled and moved into a three-year method. There is a program (not TrackDAT), that has the information where the faculty enters their information for each year and it is easy to extract information for additional reporting as well as combining it into a final three-year assessment report.
- ii. **Discussion re: change to a four-year system**: Dr. Aycock and Dr. Fleming looked into the cost to obtain the database and it is expensive. It is \$48K for year one and then \$18K commitment license per year after. It is still being discussed in the administrative level. The other colleges (MVC and RCC) are using TrackDat and they use it efficiently and effectively; whereas, Nicole has to manually read and extract the data from each report and enter it into various reports. It is very time consuming and susceptible to operator error. It is listed in D4.3 ()JTJ 0 T (us)-2 (c)-2 (ep)10.5 (t)7F

- iii. **Dates we want the APRS back.** We moved the due date last year to April 15 and this caused friction because it interfered in our process. By the time they all came in, school was over and Dr. Gray was rushed in combining the rubrics. She would like to move the date back to mid-

Q5: Are committee members given adequate information to make informed recommendations and decisions?

function. This committee is likely too large to function effectively. * Dr. Gray disagrees. Our committee isn't too large.

3. Work groups and/or sub-committees will help streamline our meetings and make us more productive. * Committee agreed. Dr. Gray and Dr. Adams are going to work together on the next survey.
4. PR Template is too long; committee needs to automate the data analysis. * Another reason for us to have TrackDat.
5. Dr. Alexis Gray doing excellent job. My recommendation is the same as I wrote for professor Burnett. I think if, school gives extra release times to professor Burnett and professor Gray they work together coordinately, we may have a good results.
6. No
7. No, I think the committee is functioning well.

Q9. Please make suggestions on how this evaluation (survey) could be improved:
Responses submitted:

1. It is a good evaluation questions.
2. No suggestions, the evaluation is fine.

The committee has discussed the results on the survey, made suggestions and will make the necessary revisions from the results of the survey to improve our process.

- ii. **Report on Progress of return of the rubrics:** We received all the rubrics back that were annuals and combined them to be sent out to the report authors. There are two rubrics outstanding and they are for Philosophy. The two readers of philosophy were vastly apart in their review. The two readers are reworking on it again and the author is aware of the situation. Nicole is storing the combined and the original rubrics that were sent in.
- iii. **Time line for the Administrative review rubric return:** At the next meeting we will be assigning the readers for the Administrative Program Reviews and need to decide if there are changes to the rubric, and if no changes, then we are going to norming. We