PROGRAM EVALUATION COMMITTEE (PEC)
Thursday, October 17th, 2024
Zoom Meeting Link (see below for full invite)

AGENDA

Michael Medel, Dean (co-chair, non-voting)
Joshua Ramirez, Academic Senate President (co-chair, non-voting)
Liz Auchincloss, Information Technology (voting)
Stan Bursten, Social Sciences div. (voting)
Monica Campbell, School of Extended Learning (voting)
Vandana Gavaskar, English div. (shared vote with other English div. rep.)
Sean Kelly, Sciences div. (voting)
Jennifer Loftus, Mathematics (voting)
Lisa Lopez, CSEA rep. (voting)
Mariah Messer, Faculty, School of Extended Learning (voting)
Kim Monda, English div. (shared vote with other English div. rep.)
Michele Obritz, Ed Support div. (voting)
Nicole Oldendick, Institutional Assessment (non-voting)
Vanessa Pelton, ALA & Enrollment Services (voting)
Diana Zapata, Director, Human Resources (non-voting?)

Resource Personnel Members:
Cornelia Alsheimer, Faculty Association (as per AP3255, "Resource personnel attend meetings of the Program Evaluation Committee when requested to by one of the Program Evaluation Committee co-chairs. There is no requirement placed upon resource personnel to attend every meeting.")

Vacancies:
One Business Services representative (voting); One Educational Programs Representative (not represented by faculty-led areas); Business Division; Fine Arts Division; Health and Human Services Division; PE/Health/Dance/Athletics Division; School of Modern Languages/ESL Division; Technologies Division; ASG representative.

Members absent: Liz Auchincloss, Lisa Lopez (attended until 2:50), Vanessa Pelton, Joshua Ramirez, Diana Zapata.

PROCEDURAL ITEMS:

1. Kim will take minutes today
2. Approval of minutes from the 10-03-24 meeting (M/S/C Lisa/Stan)

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Approval of 3 new CTE Certificates from PE/HE (Coaching Youth Sports, Fitness Trainer, Pre-Sports Medicine)

- Michael explains that PEC co-chairs are in the chain of approvals from CAC: they are brought to PEC so that we are aware of these changes.
- New certificates are exciting: really help students build their skills for employment.
- Low-unit (within 16-20 units range).
- Backgrounds about CTE programs: they have advisory boards that include people in the industry that weigh in on certificates and their value for employment.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Debrief about CIA Event (PEC Breakout Session) (very rough notes from session)

- Lisa shared that she thought the afternoon event was really good: we got a lot of good feedback from the participants about the areas that we needed to report back on. (In

the reporting at the end in A211, we seemed to have more specific feedback to provide.)

- Sean was struck by how enthusiastic the attendees who were not on PEC were about Program Review. Kathy O'Connor spoke up about how we need to get more people involved: exciting that they are on board with making positive change for the college.
- Michael was pleasantly surprised: a lot of passion there, liked the feedback. We were on the same page in terms of where they want us to go. How important it is to be inclusive of everybody, how we get everyone involved. How we make it applicable and relevant. And it would make a really strong statement if we devoted the fall inservice to it.
- Agree we want to keep the momentum going: reach out to SEL, for example, with workshops and how people want to be involved.
- Sean: great message from CAC–we should dialogue more with the Curriculum Advisory Committee–great collaboration, not just in your program but across the college. The focus of Program Review does change depending on what the College wants to focus on as a community.
- Michael: the morning session was about shared governance and how to make it more effective. What stood out to him was our role as a committee member is not only the work you do in the meeting, but the hard work of communicating out and how to help get others involved. Lisa added: and being focused in our committee work.
- Kim praised Michael's slides to start the afternoon workshop, and especially that he presented the nine areas that mention program review in accreditation, which empowered
- Sean: agrees we have an obligation to inform people about our committee work. And for program review: great for his division—scientist, scientific progress—and that is what program review does–methodical approach to solving issues. And involve everyone–we need to hear about the rough areas we can be working on. Great chance to get inspired!
- Kim highlighted: our comprehensive program review questions in Year 1 did include the data that María mentioned at our breakout session: "Ensure that programs are receiving student success data (successful course completion, retention -- broken down by ethnicity and modality) and ask them to assess their programs and establish program improvement plans whose activities will be tied to resource requests." YES–and for the comprehensive review in the spring we need to get this data and analyze it and see if there has been any progress.
- Mariah: excited to hear about this vision! Yes, it is a heavy lift, but nice to focus on the benefits!

2. In person meetings moving forward (how many would like to attend in person; we would have a Zoom option as well)

- We agreed that we always want a Zoom option for access, so it would be a hybrid meeting.
- Agreed we are staying on Zoom for now :).

3. Begin discussion about what the Program Review Year 4 Template should be. For Reference these are the original questions asked in the Year 1 Comprehensive Program Review.

- Michael went over the attached questions. Sean reminded us that equity was the focus across all the areas. Michael pointed out: if a program has lower head count by

ethnicity, for example, they would reflect on why they were lower and what they might to to improve access.

- We asked them to run data for fall and spring (not sure if folks did that). For the spring final report, Kim hopes we can add running both fall and spring data to see if there are any major differences.
- Let's make a shared template so everyone fills out the same chart and also area for narrative discussion of the data as well.
    - Agreed we want consistency. Recommend we have them post their action steps, then their data, then their analysis.
- Request: guide so that people are sure to compare the same data they looked at in the Fall 2021 Comprehensive Program Review with their current data.

Additional Notes:

Revisiting Year 1 - Comprehensive Program Review Questions

- Stay with the Google Suite template and sharing
- Continue to use this for instruction

Section 1: Access

- Questions about DEI; set goals based on Access (Fall headcount; trends; calls out any disproportionality as it relates to certain student groups. Why is their headcount lower? What goals do you want to set to address disparity among pockets of students)
    - Sean: The three questions were all about equity (observing whether your program is equitable)
    - Monica: Should these be Spring headcounts? (Michael: But this would include data from three Falls (back to 2020 through 2023), and does not include the 4th year's current Fall).
    - Kim: Why not include Spring? Spring is a 'different animal' (Sean: Give departments a choice: Fall or Spring? Action steps will apply to the entire year, anyway).
    - Michael: Choose to analyze the semester that has the most disparity.
    - Michael: What should departments/programs summarize for Year 4?
        - Based on your Fall 2020-Spring 2021 headcount, detail any actions that the department/program has taken to address the disparities. (Kim: We don't want programs to simply jump into the results)
        - Direct departments/programs back to their original data points. Are there increases/decreases in headcounts? What helped you accomplish your goal or fall short?
            - Stan: Is it fair to suggest that what we find with the larger groups will be true of the smaller groups among underrepresented groups (like

Pacific Islanders, especially if these groups are far less represented
    - Sean: admittedly we also have comparatively fewer Black students. It's a challenge of representativeness of the disproportionality.)
- Kim: Do we want a chart/template for departments to fill in? (Sean: the template should have the ability to insert pictures/graphs; writing this out is cumbersome).
    - Maria: Give a narrative requirement; You want a visual and a written analysis--narrative is important.
- Michael: Offer a mock example of an analysis and reflection.
- Sean: Provide programs guidance on how to grab data and graphics from Tableau
- Kim: Can we get Nicole to help with the template? Put your action step (incorporating all four years), then data, then analysis.
- Sean: We want programs to think about the next cycle and to say 'What action steps did *not* work?"

Section 2: Progress

- Kim: New template will very much stay the same as the last Comprehensive Program Review template.

- Agreed can use the same template for all three sections for instructional programs: what did you say your actions steps were, data from then and now, then analysis.
- On to Operational and Student Support: agreed we do get to follow the same template. List the action steps they committed to. (IS THERE ANY DATA for their action steps?) Then analyze the results of their action steps.
    - There will be some data: how many people you served, for example.
    - But for this spring's wrap, every program will submit something.

Additional Notes:

Section 3: Operational Student Support Services

- Nicole's department is the only one who can speak to this at PEC for 10/17 meeting.
    - Past academic year: We didn't have departments think about what they did in Year 1.
    - For operational: "...it seems we're doing summative assessment." Not everyone has data to report out otherwise. (See Kim's note above: Not all programs will be able to follow the same template as instructional)
    - Mariah: We don't want to discourage some service departments (like Student Services) that did collect to report out. (Michael: Some

departments may not have to go to Tableau; pull from your internal data).
    - Kim: Some will have data, some won't. That's OK. But we are going to have everyone submit something comprehensive in the Spring.
    - Sean: Whatever our process is, we should be able to say how we are going to serve students better.

Next Meeting:

- Michael: Let's see what a **sample template** can look like

Future Meeting Items:

1. ~~Do we want to try to meet in person? Experiment with Hyflex meetings for 2024-25?~~
2. Update the AP to reflect what the Program Evaluation Committee is actually doing.
3. Review the description of PEC's membership and charge in the Resource Guide to Governance and Decision Making

PEC Fall 2024 Meetings

- ~~September 5th~~
- ~~September 19th~~
- ~~October 3rd~~
- October 17th
- November 7th
- November 21st
- December 5th

FYI: PRT/Institutional Effectiveness Committee (2nd/4th T 3:00-4:30)

- Oct. 22nd
- Nov. 12
- Nov. 26
- Dec. 10

PEC Spring 2025 Meetings

- February 6th - Feb. 11th
- February 20th - Feb. 25th
- March 6th - March 11th
- March 20th - [Spring Break March 25th]
- April 3rd - April 8th
- April 17th - April 22nd
- May 1st - May 13th
- (May 15th if needed)

Full Zoom Invite if needed:

Join Zoom Meeting
https://sbcc.zoom.us/j/85797880257?pwd=hEd24gHvkAsEvrhk29vWrjaKX2vMNq.1

Meeting ID: 857 9788 0257
Passcode: 329677

One tap mobile
+16699006833,,85797880257#,,,,*329677# US (San Jose)
+16694449171,,85797880257#,,,,*329677# US

Dial by your location
• +1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
• +1 669 444 9171 US
• +1 719 359 4580 US
• +1 253 205 0468 US
• +1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)
• +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
• +1 689 278 1000 US
• +1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)
• +1 305 224 1968 US
• +1 309 205 3325 US
• +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
• +1 360 209 5623 US
• +1 386 347 5053 US
• +1 507 473 4847 US
• +1 564 217 2000 US
• +1 646 876 9923 US (New York)
• +1 646 931 3860 US

Meeting ID: 857 9788 0257
Passcode: 329677

Find your local number: https://sbcc.zoom.us/u/koMigAwxo