



**Program Review Committee
Minutes for September 26, 2024**

2:30- 3:45 pm

Operations Center (OC) 116

(Zoom link for guests) <https://rccd-edu.zoom.us/j/85634329059>

Meeting Participants

Committee Members Present

Greg Aycock (co-chair), Svetlana Borissova, Caitlin Busso, Rosalio Cedillo, Araceli Covarrubias, Joseph DeGuzman, Vivian Harris, Ashlee Johnson, Starlene Justice, Daniela McCarter, Lindsay Owens, Tim Russell (co-chair) Kristin Rigby, and Dana White.

Committee Members Not Present

Quinton Bemiller

Guest

Hayley Ashby, Cheryl Cox, Eric Doucette, Sara Nafzgar, and Desiree Wagner

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 2:30 pm

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda

- MSC (Vivian Harris/ Starlene Justice)

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

2.2 Approval of May 23, 2024, Minutes

- MSC (Lindsay Owens / Svetlana Borissova)

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Confirm Membership

The committee reviewed the current membership. Chairs have sent emails out to the following areas asking for representation.

- School of Visual & Performing Arts
- School of Applied Technologies & Apprenticeships
- School of Human & Public Services

- Counseling
- ASNC

3.2 Program Review Improvements

Over the summer, in response to the feedback provided by the committee and the reflection section of the program review, any Nuventive formatting and structural updates were made.

- These included adding document uploads, removing duplicates, correcting fields, and updating the Resource Request Dashboard to reflect the 2024-27 cycle.

Reviewed the May minutes to refresh the committee on the areas that were discussed.

- CTE provided that the current program review forms and questions don't completely capture CTE. The committee discussed the need for more CTE representation on the committee.
- In response to the feedback on the types of data needed- The IE office has already started to address these requests. For example, the IE office provided updated faculty hiring data to APC to assist with their prioritization process.

The committee discussed the implementation of the committee by providing qualitative feedback instead of providing a quantitative score. The authors appreciated this new feedback.

The committee was asked to provide any suggestions to make the program review more meaningful.

Suggestions:

- Program Goals:
 - Suggestions include providing a prompt or section in the form to reflect, update progress, and close the loop.
- Equity:
 - Suggestion to clarify the need to submit a professional development resource request if a need for training is identified.
 - Request to pull all requested training and put together a report to be shared with areas such as DEIA, IEGC, FPDC, and VP of Planning and Development.
 - The committee discussed the possibility of developing a dashboard with all flex equity training by discipline provided. This seemed unattainable but will need to be explored to determine its feasibility.
 - Suggestion to provide more training on how to reach out to your area to gather the data needed for the completed equity section, especially to identify what kinds of training have been completed and what training is needed.
- Faculty Hiring Resource Request:
 - A concern was raised about faculty having an opportunity to request one of the three faculty positions that were not filled and the timing of the rankings for APC. APC was currently in the process of prioritizing to make a recommendation to the president.

- The need for possible alternative data resources for counselor and Librarian positions was also brought to the attention of the committee. Currently, in the faculty hiring form, these areas have different sections to be completed.
- Suggestion to come up with a standardized set of data that is available to the requesting faculty and APC for faculty hiring requests that can be provided in a dashboard.
- The co-chairs met with APC and decided that they needed to address the training to better prepare people when filling out the form, especially for the data sections.

The Resource Request dashboard on the website was reviewed.

- The dashboard is available on the program review committee website page. It includes four reports:
 - Resource requests (items, budget, and staff)
 - Faculty Hiring requests
 - Faculty professional development requests
 - Mapping (resource requests mapping to program goals, EMP objectives, Equity plan, and the data review section).

The co-chairs received a request for the committee to consider incorporating a section about Credit for Prior Learning (CPL). This will be a future agenda item.

3.3 Program Review Cycle

- The committee is revisiting the idea of aligning with the new strategic planning cycle, which would be a 5-year cycle in place of the current 3-year cycle.
- Suggestion that if moved to a 5-year cycle, the need to complete annual updates will be more important. This would make annual updates more critical and encourage continuous improvement.
- This year, the strategic plan is being updated, which includes an update to the EMP objectives. By next year, the mapped objectives, goals, and resource requests will be outdated. By aligning with the strategic plan cycle, this will eliminate this issue, especially when the Education Master Plan goals are updated.
- Suggestion of developing a simplified annual update with items like reporting on the status of goals and equity training. This direction will provide an annual update that reflects on progress and continuous improvement.
- Suggestion that completing annual updates makes it easier to reflect on the last comprehensive and write the new comprehensive.
- Because the strategic plan is going through approvals this year, the decision to move to the 5-year cycle would need to be made this year to be implemented next year.

3.4 Accreditation Discussion

The accreditation reflection worksheet and Standard 2.2 were discussed.

- The goal is to collect evidence and to guide the committee in planning going forward. This will also help the committee address gaps in the short term and create long-term goals.
- What difference are we making in relation to equitable student outcomes?

- This standard focuses on the delivery and design of program and student service goals.

Questions:

What do we do to align with the Standard?

- The committee designs questions for program review that invite people to look at equity or achievement in their own programs and areas.
- The committee is a group that coaches people to look at their disaggregated data.
- Program review may be the only time that the program looks at EMP goals and objectives. It encourages us to take a holistic look at the program or the discipline.
- Program review has a history of being responsive to feedback and suggestions and implementing them into the process. For example, Alignment to Career and Transfer questions in the 2021-24 comprehensive Assessment review area came from a guided pathways project team suggestion. The equity section came from a racial justice taskforce project team suggestion.

Where do we think we align with the Rubric for Institutional Alignment and Transformation?

- The rubric was reviewed. The program review committee felt like they were highly developed.

Motion to add 5 minutes. (Starlene Justice /Ashlee Johnson)

What opportunities do we have to stretch ourselves to deepen our practices to

- Opportunities:
 - Implementation of an annual update that focuses on progress and continuous improvement.
- Providing the identified equity training needed to the correct areas that can possibly provide the training.

How does our reflection and learning inform our institutional plans for action, improvement, and/or innovation?

- Reflection:
 - We use feedback to actively change our process. Reflection section in program review.
 - Survey of effectiveness and report of effectiveness.
 - Take people's suggestions seriously.
 - Everyone is included in the conversations, the committee has membership from all constituency groups and actively works to have representation of all areas.
- Uses of technology and dashboards available on the website.
 - Student Services development and use of the SSIPP framework that is getting attention from other colleges.
 - As a college, we are always looking to improve.

The accreditation team will be providing feedback and identifying gaps for the committee to consider.

4. Information Items

4.1 Program Review Annual Update

- Last year, the comprehensive opened in November and closed in March; the plan is to use the same timeframe for the annual update this year.

5. Good of the Order

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)

7. Adjournment

- 3:51 pm

Next Meeting

Date: October 24, 2024

Proposed Credit for Prior Learning Addition to Program Review

CPL is one of the state Chancellor's projects and part of the CCCCO Vision 2030. It is also a requirement of Title 5 and Title 38 (Veterans). The Dept. of Defense and VA are doing audits to ensure our community colleges are offering CPL to our Veterans and their families. Recently, a community college lost its financial aid funding because while it said it did, it had no proof and could not pass the audit. Other colleges are being put on notice.

Because of this, there is a request for CPL to be considered in the program review process. This would allow us to capture the data on whether schools/disciplines are offering CPL, awarding CPL, or not. This will allow us to stay in the good graces of all stakeholders involved in the legislative processes of CPL.

Four simple questions to ask our faculty writing or updating their program review:

1. Do you offer any Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) within your discipline?
2. If yes, which course/s has your discipline approved as CPL and the type (JST, Standardized Exams, Credit by Exam, Industry Credential/Certification, or Portfolio Review)?
3. If not, please explain why, and include a timeline when CPL can be discussed within your discipline.
4. How often has your discipline awarded or reviewed potential awards of CPL in the last two years?

This inclusion will help identify access and equity opportunities and make our programs stronger.

Summary of the Responses to the Program Review Equity Section

This summarizes the requested training and professional development identified in the Equity section of the Administrative, Instructional, and Student Services Program Reviews. The question used to assess:

- What additional equity-related professional development/trainings do you seek to better support your area?

Although many units identified areas of completed training, approximately 20% (10 out of 52) did not request any further training or professional development. The requested training and professional development areas, along with their frequency, are outlined in the table below.

Training	# of Requests
Equity/ DEIA/underrepresented populations	24
Care-Empathy	2
Cultural Competency/ Responsive training	4
Discipline-specific pedagogy training	9
Modality specific -DE, Hybrid, In person	3
STEM	4
LGBTQ+	2
Specific training- CORA, @ONE, POCR,	3
Implicit Bias	3
OER, Zero cost textbook	2

*n=52

Specific training requested:

- Peer Online Course Review (POCR) <https://onlinenetworkofeducators.org/course-design-academy/pocr-resources/>
- California Virtual Campus Online Network of Educators (CVC @ONE) <https://onlinenetworkofeducators.org/>
- Center for Organizational Responsibility and Advancement (CORA) <https://coralearning.org/>

Sample of noteworthy quotes:

“CARE Team training for classified staff as we interact with hundreds of students per day.”

“Training schedule needs to consider specialized training by constituency group and proficiency levels (beginner to expert).”

“I believe we should have a session educating faculty on how unique our student population is here within the district. Additionally, educating faculty on some of the cultural values of our student population could help us better understand our students.”

“...more equity-training related to providing academic support to special populations, especially incarcerated students”

“Explicit professional development for teaching hybrid classes. These classes increase access and flexibility for our students, but we have not received training in course design for the hybrid format.”

“If I could "request" anything, it would be dedicated time so that all faculty could participate more frequently.”