

Program Review Committee

Notes, May 7, 2015

Alfred Guzman, ~~Craig Gawlick, Roland Amit~~, Cara Miyasaki,
Simon Pennington, , Andrew LaManque, Pat Hyland
~~Dawn Girardelli~~, Elaine Kuo, ~~Cindy Fransisca, Teresa Zwack~~
Draft

Tri Chairs – Al, Andrew, Simon

1) Review PaRC Discussion

The PRC recommendations passed on second read on May 6. A couple of programs were discussed in detail.

a. Spanish

The PRC recommendation to move a full "FTEF" or faculty member assignment to De Anza was modified by PaRC to say "load," meaning a few classes rather than a whole assignment.

b. AUO process

There was a lengthy discussion at PaRC on the AUO process and what areas should be included or covered. The VP Student Services AUO included an item related to moving the transfer center and this was not included in the transfer center program review. If PRC had recognized this they could have requested the transfer center redo the program review and include it. However, the transfer center program review was an annual this year so the PRC did not see it.

PaRC recommended that the Integrated Planning and Budget committee (IP&B) take a look at the issue this summer.

All other PRC recommendations were accepted by PaRC.

c. Other updates

Andrew met Monday with Gay Krause to discuss the PRC suggestions on the KCI PR. He suggested that KCI staff meet with PRC in the Fall before starting the next PR process.

Andrew briefed the group on recent Academic Senate discussions around PR. One request was to provide more of an analysis to the departments in the fall. For example, outlining trends in the data and items the PRC thinks the department should address. There was also discussion about having departments present their work at PRC so that there can be more of a dialogue and discussion. We could have 2 or 3 prompts that we used to guide the presentations. Scheduling will be challenging but this is something to talk about when PRC plans next year.

PRC members suggested that we should look into the possibility of videotaping the presentations. This might help make it transparent, but we will need to weigh pros vs cons in more depth. Voicethread might also be an option.

The group talked about the need to put the PR template online. We may need to hire a temporary person or consultant to do it. We also need to look into whether TracDat can do it.

2) 3:30pm Discussion with Pass the Torch - Staff

Natalia Menendez, Leticia Delgado, Robert Garcia, and Nicole Gray attended.

Andrew reviewed PRC's comments on the Pass the Torch program review and asked the Pass the Torch members if they could spend some time providing an overview of the program, its mission, who it serves, and the expected outcomes.

Pass the Torch Staff indicated that the primary purpose was to provide tutoring for under-represented students to help them get through basic skills math and English courses. They also indicated that they saw benefit to the tutors, some of whom are also under-represented, in terms of leadership skills, intellectual growth, and enhanced communication skills.

PRC indicated that what was written seemed to imply that the primary audience was the tutors, many of whom were not from under-served populations. The Pass the Torch staff indicated that was not the case and that the form was confusing in terms of where to put things. Pass the Torch has courses in instructional divisions and counseling and has a service component. Since the PR form asks questions about SLOs which are part of the instructional component of the program, that component was addressed primarily in the Program Review. The Counseling 51 class was not included in the PR form either, as it falls under the Counseling

division. PRC committee members asked Pass the Torch staff to include data from reflections in CNSL 51 when doing the next comprehensive PR.

There was a discussion about the missing assessments for some of the courses and service learning outcomes and the group went into TracDat to find that some (but not all) were up to date but had not been attached to the program review. Pass the Torch staff agreed to work with PRC in the fall for help in getting all the materials included.

Discussion continued on the types of data available on the outcomes of students in the program. There was recognition that there needs to be an appropriate comparison group – the comparison should be to similarly situated under-served students and not necessarily to the rest of the class. Qualitative data in the form of student reflections are also appropriate and can be included to describe the outcomes for students. The goal is two-fold: to provide an analysis of the program that helps Pass the Torch staff to improve the program and second to provide information to the campus on the benefits of the program. The information is then used by OPC when looking at the programs goals and resource requests.

If support for tutees is also a benefit of the program then this should be articulated and their outcomes should be examined and included in the writing as well.

The group went through the rest of the PRC suggestions including the recommendation by the Dean of Counseling to house the program under the Dean of Language Arts and housing the program with the TLC. Pass the Torch staff agreed to discuss and reflect on this in the PR next fall (the comment was added this year after they had completed their PR).

They will also address the comment about serving DRC students, which they do.

In the end all agreed it was great to have the opportunity to discuss and learn from each other about the program and the purposes of program review.

3) Plan for meetings / reports for those we asked for follow up

June 11 next PRC meeting – we will review the materials submitted by the programs listed below.

June 17 last PaRC meeting

Need to schedule a meeting later in October for items request by October 15.

We also talked about having IP&B consider a modification to the PRC charge to consider duplication of services between programs. Are there opportunities for some of programs to collaborate?

Also spoke about the need to shorten the annual. Should annual program reviews go to PRC to review? Comprehensive - some of the questions need to be asked. What needs to be on the comprehensive? Should we ask for a presentation?

Equity discussion – PR template can ask departments to address college initiatives.

Items Requested by PRC

- a. Dean Language Arts – Revised PR by June 1
- b. Music General Assessments by June 1
- c. Geography / GIS – Assessments by June 1
- d. Spanish – Remediation plan by June 1
- e. Pass the Torch – meet with PRC spring 2015
- f. Business –meet with PRC by October 15
- g. Assessment and Testing - Assessments by October 15
- h. Puente – Analysis by October 15
- i. Nano – Report by October 15
- j. Health Services – Student feedback by October 15
- k. Meet with KCI