

MVC ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING
September 22, 2010, 3:00—4:30 PM
HM 106

1. Call to order and Roll Call: 3:05 PM by Sal Soto

- **Voting Members (Department Chairs or designees) and APC Chair:** Ree Amezcuita, Matt Barboza, Gregory Elder, Felipe Galicia, Natalie Hannum, Delores Middleton (absent: illness), Sal Soto
- **Non-voting Members:** Cordell Briggs, Patricia Bufalino, Wolde-ab Isaac, David Kroh, Michael McQuead, Ann Yoshinaga, George Zottos
- **Guests:** Sheila Pisa, Monte Perez

2. Approval of Agenda: Galicia/Elder/Unanimous

3. Approval of Minutes of 8/26/10/10: Galicia/Elder/Unanimous

4. Information Items:

- a. **Accreditation:** Ready for visit; specifics not yet available—probably the beginning of November/
- b. **Strategic Planning:**
 1. 2010—2015 MVC Strategic Plan approved
 2. Monthly meetings of SPC on third Thursday of each month, college hour in PSC 11
 3. Discussion at Academic Senate Meeting 9/20/10 regarding relationship of SPC and Academic Senate
- c. **Strategic Enrollment Management:**
 1. No additional sections as compared to 2010
 2. Only cut sections PHP (Chancellor's directive in Spring 2010)
 3. Winter 2011 Schedule: Download on 9/29/10 @ 7:00 AM
 4. Spring 2011 Schedule
 - Rollover 9/22/10
 - Proposed schedule back to IDSes 10/1/10
 - Download @ 8:00 AM 10/18/10
- d. **MVC President: Monte Perez** provided information to all present.
 1. New MVC VP Student Services:
 - At its meeting 9/21/10, the RCCD BOT appointed Mr. Gregory Sandoval as Vice President of Student Services at Moreno Valley College.
 - He is a proven manager and leader. He is a bridge builder and team supporter with his work at Los Angeles Southwest College and Southwestern College in San Diego.
 - He brings experience (thirty years) with depth (Director of EOPS and Financial Aid) and breadth (Dean of Students and Vice President of Student Services for more than 10 years).
 - His start date will be October 4. There will be a welcoming reception scheduled before the next scheduled MVC Management Council Meeting (2:00 PM in PSC 11).
 2. New College Funding:
 - Much of the allotted funds have been used for the 3 RCCD to MVC transfers:
 - Music Faculty Member
 - Dean of Financial Aid
 - Director of Enrollment Services
 - The Chancellor's hold on filing new and replacement position continues; Dr. Perez must personally "make a case" for each proposal. The previously generated APC Recommendations for Faculty Hiring remain, but no anticipated new positions at this time.
 - Operating the college in the midst of the current state budget crisis requires stringent and austere measures, but we will not be closing our doors.

Dr Perez: VPSS

5. New Business:

Waitlist Caps/Policy Recommendation

1. Concerns regarding realistic expectations for students on waitlist
2. District Core Operations Advisory Team (COAT) discussion on 9/13/10 to develop a recommendation to the District Executive Cabinet regarding possible change.
 - Recommendation: 25% of Section Capacity be the Waitlist
 - Executive Cabinet to bring forward recommendation to District Academic Senate 10/11/10.
3. Norco APC discussion developing a policy to guide faculty in use of waitlist
 - Multiple models for use of waitlist by faculty—no problem with that
 - What is a problem is when faculty misunderstand the waitlist and the mechanisms for adding students to sections
 - Not giving waitlisted students authorization codes on the first day, telling them that the student will be automatically added (WRONG)
 - Requiring that students attend class up to the add deadline before issuing authorization codes; non-enrolled students should NOT be attending class.
 - Policy would be recommended to the Norco Academic Senate and then brought to the other senates.

Discussion:

1. General consensus of agreement with proposed recommendation to decrease the waitlist numbers.
2. Concern regarding the ability of WebAdvisor to accommodate the volume of students/faculty attempting to use the system just prior to and during the beginning of each academic term.
3. Also concern regarding false optimism generated by current waitlist system.
4. Policy on use of Waitlist should be transparent and readily accessed by all (students, faculty, staff).

Action:

1. Encourage attendance at planned IT Audit/Forum 9/30/10 3:00 PM in HM 206
2. Keep topic on future agenda as “old business” to monitor issue.
3. MVC APC will develop its own recommendation regarding guidelines for use of waitlist
 - a. Natalie will circulate info provided to PT FIT faculty.
 - b. APC members to dialog and share suggestions via e-mail; invite department faculty comments and suggestions as well.
 - c. Develop a recommendation to the MVC Academic Senate @ the October APC Meeting.

6. Old Business:

a. Program Review Transition Plan:

1. Proposal (see pages 3—7 of minutes) from District Program Review Committee distributed for discussion among faculty.
2. E-mail from MVC Faculty Assessment Coordinator also shared with APC (see page 7)
3. Brief discussion at MV Academic Senate meeting 9/20/10; follow-up scheduled for Oct. 4th meeting.
4. **Action:** APC members to review and discuss transition plan with department members and bring back information for action at Oct. APC Meeting.

b. Strategies to Encourage Faculty Compliance with Electronic Signature Requests: no further information

c. Faculty Hiring: Addressed earlier in discussion with Dr. Perez.

7. Other: Cordell Briggs, Dean of Public Safety Education and Training Programs

- a. Provided information regarding the Congressional Earmark of a FIPSE grant to fund curriculum development using course portfolios
- b. Trainers needed; requested suggestions of faculty who might be interested in working on this project; stipends available.

8. Next Meeting: Oct. 27, 2010 3:00—4:30 PM in HM 106

9. Adjournment: 4:35 PM.

Program Review Transition Plan

(Adopted by Program Review Committee on 9/16/2010)



Program Review

Office of Institutional Mission & Effectiveness

Mission Statement of Transition Plan:

Program Review is a collaborative goal-setting and assessment process designed to assist faculty, staff, and administrators across the colleges with improving and refining college services. Therefore, as the District is transitioning to three Colleges, this transition plan seeks to identify each component of the Program Review Process and provide a plan on transitioning the organization design and responsibilities to each of the three Colleges and the appropriate component parts to the District.

Vision Statement of Transition Plan:

Declaration of the direction and changes currently being implemented or considered:

- The position of Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness will not be refilled once vacated in December 2010.
- Program Review Duties and responsibilities will be transferred to each of the three colleges, with the option of having the some or all of the collection of reports done at the District Office. As these duties and responsibilities evolve, the necessity of making adjustments in positions will need to be considered in the following areas:
 - District Staff – Administrative and support staff who will be responsible for submitting the annual reports using Program Review information. Staff responsible for collection and distribution of Program Review information and posting of this on web site. Share Point data collected, processed and distributed also will be included here.
 - Program Review point person (coordinator) at each of the college sites.
 - Maybe coupled with Faculty Development Coordinator
 - Maybe linked with the Assessment Coordinator
 - Maybe linked with Student Success
 - Maybe linked with Dean of Instruction
- The timeline for this Transition Plan is this Academic Year (2010-2011), ending on June 30th, 2011.

- Therefore, as of June 30th, 2011 each college will assume full responsibility for the Program Review process at their individual institution and the District will delineate the residual responsibilities into the administrative structure.

This transition plan will include:

1. A summary of the existing structure and organization design of the Program Review Process, including the timelines now utilized and the documentation which is currently collected.
2. A description of the proposed structure and organization design of each of the three individual colleges as they integrate the Program Review Process.
3. A description of the proposed structure of the District Program Review Committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness relative to each of the Program Review components.
4. A timeline for the transference of information and responsibility to each of the three colleges.

Values used in this Transition Plan

The Riverside Academic Senate discussed and formalized the Program Review process at a meeting in April 2001. The Senate indicated that the following **principles** should guide the design and implementation of the Program Review process:

1. **Flexibility:** the process needs to be open and flexible enough to accommodate differences among units
2. **Collegiality:** the process should be a collaborative process guided by a spirit of open and honest inquiry
3. **Relevance:** the process should result in answers to important and relevant questions for units
4. **Practicality:** the process should:
 - a. Minimize the reporting burden on units.
 - b. Have measures that are few in number, simple, easy to implement and interpret, and useful for program improvement purposes
 - c. Provide the necessary data resources to assist with the self-study process
 - d. Be tested and refined prior to implementation.
5. **Effectiveness:** the process should result in a clear sense of direction and accomplishment for participants. To facilitate the implementation of plans and the accomplishment of goals, resource needs identified through the self-study process will be linked with budgeting, facilities, and human resource planning.

Philosophy of this Transition Plan

The Program Review process should result in a clear sense of direction and accomplishment for the participants. The process should also align itself with the regulations and requirements of the State Academic Senate and the Accreditation Standards.

Alignment of this process to the State Academic Senate Purposes

The state Academic Senate has recognized that, “the principal purposes of the review process are to recognize and acknowledge good performance, to enhance satisfactory performance and help programs which are performing satisfactorily to further their own growth, and to identify weak performance and assist programs in achieving needed improvement...” (“Program Review: Developing a Faculty Driven Process,” Spring 1996).

Alignment of this process to the Accreditation Standards relative

Program Review will examine each of the following areas to demonstrate its effectiveness of improved institution and program performance:

Effectiveness in Program Review

1. Verify that the Program Review Processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.
2. Verify that each College reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.
3. Verify that the results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.

Strategies and Action Steps:

Strategy 1: Develop a comprehensive transition Plan which will include all three colleges and the district office.

Action Steps:

1. Discuss this development plan with the committee and administration and revise and modify if needed. Input from the following individual and groups will be utilized for the formation of each development plan:
 - a. The College Presidents
 - b. Appropriate and designated Vice Presidents and Deans
 - c. Academic Senates
2. Approve a chair, co-chair (for the Spring semester), and secretary (for minutes).
3. Begin discussing and formulating how the plan should be implemented including who will participate, when and where (this will be sub-divided by college and district).
4. Establish a check-list which can be used for each of the implementation steps.
5. Articulate and delineate the units which will be involved in each of the process areas.
6. Establish meeting dates and times for the academic year.
7. Establish a timeline for each of the evaluations which would work for the unit being assessed.
8. Agree on how the data should be collected and the format of the annual report.

Strategy 2: Identify the faculty, staff, and administrative leadership which are able to provide leadership and evidence of effectiveness in the proposed program review processes.

Action Steps:

1. Identify leadership members of faculty at all 3 colleges.
2. Identify leadership members of Student Services.
3. Identify leadership members of Academic Affairs.
4. Identify leadership members of Administrative Work Units.
5. Identify leadership members of District Administrative Units.

Strategy 3: Arrange for planning sessions with members from: Faculty, Students Services, Academic Affairs, Administrative Work Units, and District Administrative Work Units.

Action Steps:

1. Inform Administration, Faculty, and Staff concerning the Development Plan with an explanation and justification.
2. Arrange a planning session schedule during the Academic year that best serves the interests of each constituent group.
3. Develop and validate an administrative process for the implementation of this transition plan, including appropriate documentation (either by adoption by Senate, by college, by Board of trustees or all or none).

Strategy 4: Arrange for a meeting to compile the evaluation information and write the annual report.

Action Steps:

1. Determine the audience and establish an appropriate format to best process the information.
2. Compile a draft and then discuss with the Program Review Committee for additional input.
3. Write the report and include the recommendations from the committee for improvement.
4. Submit the report and begin the process again for the next academic year.

Some specific reference information relative to Program Review from Standard I

Standard I.A

Standard I.A.1 The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

Standard I.B

Standard I.B.1 The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

Standard I.B.2 The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Standard I.B.3 The institution assess 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, implantation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Standard 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.

Standard I.B.5 The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies. (*Assessment Committees*)

Standard I.B.6 The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Standard I.B.7 The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

From: Tovares, Carlos

Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 8:37 AM

To: Gibbs, Travis; Bufalino, Patricia; Sinigaglia, Nick; Pfeifle, Ann; Thompson, Eric; Bocharova, Jean; Honore, Cheryl; Zapata, Valarie; Hannum, Natalie; Williams, Edd; Baciuna, Nicolae

Cc: Perez, Monte; Conyers, Lisa

Subject: College Program Review Committee

Hello,

Patti raised an important issue at the Academic Senate meeting on Monday. We need a college Program Review Committee coordinated with the Assessment Committee in order to improve our assessment review process.

We need a timeline for sending out the annual program review forms so that faculty cannot say they were surprised or not given enough time.

We need a formal decision about having the assessment component be part of or separate from the annual program review. The more information we give faculty, the more comfortable they will be.

We need to be sure faculty members know what they are supposed to do and when to do it. Sending one email at the end of the spring semester is not going to work. We need a written plan that can be shared with faculty and repeatedly announced well in advance so that everyone knows what to do and how to do it.

We should get this done this semester. I think it would be bad to put this on the back burner and be rushing in the spring. Of course, the committee should have representation from our adjuncts.

I am going to suggest that the Faculty Assessment Coordinator have immediate access to the assessment reports in order to prevent what has been happening over the past few years, such as faculty sending in blank forms just to comply with the submission deadline. I would like to have access to the submissions to spot issues right away instead of contacting faculty in the fall, months after they turned something in, or failed to submit, or after having submitted the wrong form, etc.

Carlos