

**NORCO COLLEGE**  
**PROGRAM REVIEW MEETING MINUTES**  
October 22, 2015  
IT 218

Dr. Gray chaired this meeting.

**Members:**

Dr. Alexis Gray.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Khalil Andacheh.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Gail Zwart.....Business, Engineering & Information Technologies  
Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer.....Vice President of Academic Affairs  
Dr. Laura Adams.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Dr. Greg Aycock.....Dean, Institutional Effectiveness  
Beverly Wimer.....Math and Science  
Dr. Monica Green.....Vice President of Student Services  
Dr. Sarah Burnett.....Social & Behavioral Sciences  
Quinton Bemiller.....Arts, Humanities, & World Languages  
Dr. Carol Farrar.....Dean of Instruction  
Kris Anderson.....Communications  
Dr. Tim Russell.....Social & Behavioral Sciences

**Members Absent:**

Dr. Koji Uesugi.....Interim Dean of Student Services  
Beth Gomez.....Vice President, Business Services  
Dr. Kevin Fleming.....Dean of Instruction, Career and Technical Education  
Thelma Montiel.....ASNC

**Committee Support Administrator:**

Nicole C. Ramirez.....Office of the Dean of Instruction

- A. Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m.**
- B. Agenda Approved – October 22, 2015** (MSC: G. Zwart/K. Anderson) Made correction to wording on “reflective”. Committee Approved.
- C. Approval of Minutes – September 24, 2015** (MSC: G. Zwart/G. Aycock) Committee Approved. \* Made corrections to section E3, F1 and H, as requested.
- D. ACCJC Presentation: Anderson, Dieckmeyer:** Kris Anderson spoke to the committee about the language changes from the 2002 accreditation standards related to program review’s ‘reflective’ component to the new 2014 standards. A handout was provided and key changes that are reflected in the 2014 new standards were highlighted in blue font as well as discussed with the committee members what we need to focus on. We need to not only list that we are doing these goals but how are we accomplishing them. The ACCJC has a 2016 manual for institutional self-evaluation. That manual is useful for the comprehensive self-evaluation we are scheduled to do in 2016. Dr. Dieckmeyer encouraged the committee to read the manual and mentioned that there are some suggestions to make to the program review template. The details on the new will be discussed at the next meeting.

1. **Title of document:** Dr. Gray spoke about the possible name suggestions. On the first page and headers for each section, Dr. Fleming would like to put "Unit, or Program/Certificate" so people recognize that you complete this form if you are a unit of a discipline or a program. If it is a program review for a whole group of things, (Ex. Life sciences, etc.) then you can list the disciplines that this program review encompasses. Expect to see the change and vote on it at the next meeting.
  
2. **Reflection portion of the document**
  - i. **Draft sentence:** We need to draft a sentence that will go in this portion and Beverly Wilmer and Dr. Sarah Burnett will be working together to provide that. Dr. Gray read examples "Please list last year's equipment requests that did not receive funding and has the unit has been negatively impacted by those resources not being funded. If yes, then describe the negative impact." Should this be listed under each section or the other option, under the template where there is question #2, we can add the new question after it. For this new question #3, we can list the following questions: "List the resources that you received in the last academic year as a result of Program Review: How did the resources impact student learning? If you requested resources and did not received them, how did it impact your unit?" We cannot say student learning is only impacted through instruction. We have to include everything. For example, Facilities, food services. All the resources needed to be supporting student services; otherwise, one should not be requesting it.
  - ii. **Due dates on Form:** After much discussion, the new date has been changed to April 20<sup>th</sup>.
  - iii. **Date after which it will not be scored.** It was decided as a committee that we would not include the date after which a program review will be scored on the form. We decided as a group that the reviews that come in well after the deadline will not be scored.

**E. Information Item:**

1. **Table of current and outstanding CPRS:** We are on different years on what district thinks is outstanding and what we think is outstanding. If district expects it on October 2014 and we consider it on-time Spring 2015 because Norco moved the timeline. 2016 is the next run. We still need the ones that were due 2014 and 2015 to come in for spring 2016. The question we have is the ones that are actually due 2016 in October, are we also going to call them in spring 2016? If we do that, we can get back in the timeline that they district has called for us. If not, then those due October 2016 can be received in the spring of 2017. The recommendations should go to the senate and those discussed are:
  - #1. It should speak to the issue of what is combined and what is not. (Ex. Biology, chemistry, etc.) This is what we are recommending and do you support it?
  - #2. This is our recommendations for what happens when someone doesn't complete their reports.Committee agreed that Dr. Gray go to the senate regarding the Program Review. We also need to rewrite our statement of purpose and update membership list.

2. **CPR annotation on website by Jefferson:** Dr. Gray let the committee know that the system discussed in the last meeting was implemented by Jefferson. CPRs will be listed with a different link under the annual section that takes the reader to the comprehensive page. This will allow anyone at a glance to see that program reviews are being done every year.
3. **Assigning of Administrative PR's:** Nicole to provide a list to Dr. Gray to be distributed to the committee members.
4. **Re visitation of Admin rubric \*\* TABLED to further discussion in December meeting.**

**Norco Program Review Action Items:**

1. Document revision ratification **\*\*TABLED\*\***
- F. Comprehensive Program Review Submissions: **NONE**
- G. Good of the Order:

**Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m. Next regular Program Review Committee Meeting:  
November 10, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. until 3:30 p.m.**

2002 Standards	New Standards (2014)
<b>Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness</b>	<b>Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity</b>
<b>B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness</b>	<b>B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness</b>
<p>I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.</p> <p>I.B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.</p>	<p>I.B.5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.</p> <p>I.B.9. The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short-and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (also part of ACCJC Eligibility Requirement 19)</p>
<b>Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services</b>	<b>Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services</b>
<p>II.A.1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.</p> <p>a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.</p> <p>b. The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the</p>	<p>II.A.1. All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution’s mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer. (See also ACCJC Eligibility Requirements 9, 11)</p> <p><i>As a slide from the April 2015 ACCJC conference notes, this standard shows “New emphasis on <u>student attainment and achievement</u>, rather than SLOs existing and programs qualifying for degrees, certifications, employment or transfer.”</i></p>

<p>objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.</p> <p>c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.</p> <p>II.A.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.</p> <p>e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.</p>	<p>II.A.2 Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty and others responsible act to <u>continuously improve</u> instructional courses, programs and directly related services through systematic evaluation to ensure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote success.</p> <p><i>A slide from the April 2015 ACCJC conference points out, “New emphasis identifies the actors instead of generally stating ‘the institution’” and “New emphasis on continuous improvement (rather than episodic activities).”</i></p> <p>II.A.16. The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.</p>
---	--

 Glossary- Academic Quality: A way of describing how well the learning opportunities, instruction, support, services, environment, resource utilization and operations of a college result in student learning and student achievement of their educational goals. The Accreditation Standards, collectively, are factors in determining academic quality in the context of institutional mission.

Glossary- Student Learning: Competencies in skill and knowledge gained by students who are at the institution. The knowledge and competencies are expressed for segments of study or activity through measurable learning outcomes at the institutional, program, degree, and course levels.

Glossary- Student Achievement: Student attainment that can be measured at defined points of completion, including successful course completion, certificates and degrees, licensure examination passage, post-program employment, and other similar elements.

NOTE: Glossary items are quoted from ACCJC’s document titled Accreditation Standards, Annotated (June 2014).

# Norco College – Program Review Committee

Rubric for Administrative Program Review

Reviewer:

Administrative Unit:

Contact Person:

Area of Assessment	0 no attempt	1 some attempt	2 good attempt	3 outstanding	Review Comments
<b>1. There is evidence that program review processes are ongoing and systematic.</b>	This is the first year of their program review	Program Review has been done for one complete cycle	Program Review has been done for two cycles	Program Review has been done for more than two cycles	
<b>2. The unit goals and objectives are aligned with the goals of the Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan, and College Mission.</b>	There are no links on the current goals and objectives to the EMP goals, no identification exists on how the unit serves the mission of the college	Some on the current goals have links to the EMP goals	More than half of the current goals have links to the EMP goals	All of the current goals have links to the EMP goals and there is documentation on how the unit serves the mission of the college	
<b>3. Assessment of service area outcomes is ongoing and systematic.</b>	No assessment of outcomes is included in the program review	Some of the previous year's outcomes are assessed and included in the program review	More than half of the previous year's outcomes are assessed and included in the program review	All of the previous year's outcomes are assessed and included in the program review	
<b>4. Assessment of area outcomes is used to improve institutional effectiveness.</b>	No assessment of outcomes is included in the program review	Reflection question was completed in the program review	Previous year's assessment included use of results	Reflection question was completed as well as previous year's assessment results in the program review	
<b>5. Resource requests contain assessment and justification.</b>	Program Review had no resource requests	Program review contains resource requests	Program review contains resource requests linked to EMP/Strategic Goals	Program review contains resource requests linked to EMP/Strategic Goals with clear links to support current unit goals	
<b>6. Resource requests requiring funding have the estimated dollar amount.</b>	Resource requests contain no dollar amounts			Resource requests contain dollar amounts	
<b>7. The document is completed in its entirety.</b>	There are many sections of the program review left blank	There are a few sections of the program review left blank	Most of the sections in the program review are complete	All of the sections in the program review are complete	
8.					
<b>Average Score:</b>					