NORCO COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
November 10, 2016
IT 218

Members:
Dr. Alexis Gray………………… Social & Behavioral Sciences
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
Dr. Khalil Andacheh……………..Social & Behavioral Sciences

Members Absent:
Dr. Diane Dieckmeyer…………..Vice President of Academic Affairs
Dr. Gail Zwart…………………... Business, Engineering & Information Technologies
Dr. Koji Uesugi…………………...Dean of Student Services
Luis Velazio Miranda…………… ASNC
Beth Gomez………………………Vice President, Business Services

Committee Support Administrator:
Nicole C. Brown………………. Office of the Dean of Instruction

A. **Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m.**

B. **Agenda Approved – November 10, 2016** (MSC: G. Zwart/Q. Bemiller) Committee Approved.

C. **Approval of Minutes – September 22, 2016 (**MSC: G. Zwart/L. Adams) Committee Approved.

D. **Information Item:**
1. **Review of progress on Administrative Program Reviews.** Of all the reviewers, only three of the same reviewers are back. Not all have submitted. Still working on the rest.
2. **District Program Review Meeting report:** They had their first meeting in November by phone. Other two members have no experience and Dr. Gray is the only member that has completed a program review. New charge to create best practices. Dr. Gray will be drafting it. They will be meeting throughout the year. Please send any comments or suggestions to Dr. Gray.
3. **Survey Report:** Dr. Gray went over the survey with the committee. On question 6, a committee member questioned the possibility of removing the assessment portion from the program review. We need assessment for program review, because it is supposed to drive our resource requests. The departments need the assessment portion, and there is a mandate from accreditation that we link our assessment to our strategic plans and our resource allocation requests. Friday, March 3, 2017 is the new faculty program review training workshop in the Operations Center.

E. Discussion:

   1. Template Modification: The great news is that we get TracDat next year! The bad news is that won't be able to fully use it until the 2017/2018 academic year.

   The programmers need us (program review) to figure out what goes into the online template and set it up appropriately for optimal efficiency. We will be looking at the MVC and RCC templates for their TracDat structure and revise our template to fit what is best for Norco College. Our charge will change and adapt by the end of next year.   We need to modify the current template and they will be minor. The suggestion is we will be removing the portion with disaggregated data. Instead, we will embed a link in the document that will direct the author to the disaggregated success and retention data. We will ask them to reflect on the success on their retention data. We will go back to the question we asked the year before. We will have three charts to make it user friendly and should hopefully have some beta testers for the next cycle of comprehensive and annual program review reports.

   - We will be having a January 19, 2017 meeting, but it's not mandatory. We can discuss how to make the scope and cycle of work flow on the new TracDat program. The issue is whether we will we be doing comprehensive and then updates or doing an annual report for three years and then a comprehensive report at the 4th year.
   - We will ask the program review committee to look at the comprehensive and annual program review reports and ask questions such as:

   Q. Based on the comprehensive and annual report templates, what do you see is important to include in TracDat? What portions?

   Q. How do you think we can make the transition for a comprehensive only with an annual update?

   Q. What kinds of questions so you see as important? Where do you see it fitting in? What questions would go in the comprehensive report or the update report?

   Q. We can look at Chaffey's report outline.

   a) Resource allocation issues with current template: Nicole will address what the problems were and the allocation issues.   How can we fix them in order to get the information out quickly? Dr. Fleming provided proposed revisions that the Technology Committee would like to embed into the new template. The Technology committee needs additional information in order to do their portion of resource allocation instead of having the Equipment section in the template be lean and then having units complete another form from the Technology committee. Dr. Fleming looked at the eleven items that they needed, and revised the equipment form on the template to meet the Technology committee needs. **MSC: K. Anderson/ L. Adams. Committee approved modification of Equipment & Technology worksheet in the template.**

   b) Disaggregated data. We will have three reports/charts to make it more efficient and less confusing to the end user.

   2. Changing the cycle and the scope of PR: The intent of this committee is to move to a four-year cycle that will involve a comprehensive program review with an annual addendum. The details regarding the cycle and coordination with assessment will have to be considered and suggested at future meetings. One consideration is how much assessment will be included in the comprehensive and will this lead to an assessment cycle of eight years. That feels that would be kind of long, but Dr. Aycock doesn't have any evidence to argue any reason not to do it.

Dr. Gray said the idea is to do every SLO assessed for every course in a four-year cycle. So we can get faculty to get half of the course completed by the first comprehensive review and then the other half completed by the next review. We would keep track of it. We can put a question or check off box on the program reviews to ask if they have all been done. Then we can double check were we are in the cycle. If it is not possible to do it in an 8-year cycle, but we are able to do it in a six-year cycle, how are we going to manage the cycles for each report? Dr. Aycock said that we can ask the department/disciplines how many they have and how do they think they can meet that 6 year or 8-year cycle?

To be in full compliance of Title 5, the six-year cycle might be best for some disciplines that missed completing the report in the third year, but can still get it done in the fourth year, which will meet compliance with COR Update requirements. We can address this in the annual update to ask them if their COR's have been done in the last three years? Academic Affairs needs them to list all their courses.

Right now, TracDat doesn't talk to the new CurricuNET-META. META can hopefully provide a more comprehensive list of the COR's. If TracDat can integrate a list that could be refreshed, that would be ideal. We might be able to do it through WebAdvisor.

One concern is that some disciplines wont want to do an annual because they don't need anything. But we can put a warning trigger to notify those disciplines that they still must update their CORs in a report every three years, regardless if they need additional resources to keep in compliance with Title 5. We need everyone to do their comprehensive report and have a full base. We can backfill/grandfather those that recently did theirs. This discussion is ongoing. How we plan will determine what is comprehensive and what is annual, as well as what we are going to call it (ex. Base report or just Unit Review) will determine how the report will look like. We need to develop a plan on how we will move forward in this project. Quinton offered the suggestion to invite other people from other colleges (e.g. Chaffey) that already implement this to give us advisement on their best practices is a great idea and the committee approved.

3. **Comprehensive for Blended Disciplines: The** Business Administration faculty have voted to recommend lumping together their disciplines and programs/certifications into one program review. The concern is that the Accounting comprehensive report is due this academic year (2016/2017). Accounting has asked if they have to do it at all and not do the comprehensive report. The end result is that we wont have an actual comprehensive report from Accounting over a span of six years from their last report. Dr. Farrar said that this is fine, as long as they are OK with their equipment needs being met and they have what they need as well as their curriculum is up to date. We are doing a program review, not a discipline review. This needs further discussion in future meetings.

Question: Can the departments themselves decide to blend their disciplines into a single Program Review process/document or does the Program Review committee decide?
Answer: The Program Review committee makes these decisions on behalf of the Academic Senate and the college, not individual departments/units.

F.   **Action Item:**
1. **Equipment Modification – (MSC. K. Anderson/L. Adams) Committee approved.**
2. *** By consensus, the program review committee recommends to the academic senate that we adopt TracDat for our program review process. APPROVED.**

G.   **Good of the Order: NONE**

Next Meeting: December 01, 2016