

Minutes



Committee Name: Program Review Committee

Date: September 27, 2019

Time: 10:00 AM

Location: MB 350B

Present:

Suzie Ama, Michael Erskine, Lisa Fuller, Karee Hamilton, Jaclyn Kessler, Maura Murabito, Steve Rogers, Sylvia Sotomayor, Shelly Tannehill

Absent:

Ryan Khamkongsay, Heather Ostash

1. Call to Order

- 10:03 AM

2. Approval of Agenda

- Agenda Approved

3. Approval of Minutes and Action Items

- August 30, 2019 - Approved

4. Studio Arts for Transfer Program Review – First Review

Approved for a First Review. Excellent first draft. The following revisions are requested for the Second Review.

There was general discussion about the onerous task of converting Tableau data into tables that are accessible to people with disabilities, which currently involves copying and pasting or manually entering hundreds of numbers into table cells. The Program Review Committee agrees this is a problem that needs to be solved and will work with Institutional Research for a solution.

Spelling/Grammar/Style/Formatting

- Use tables for MIS data provided in template, rather than images of District data tables so as to make the content more accessible for people with disabilities. The tables in the template are already formatted correctly for accessibility. Just enter the data, and add new rows, if needed.

Content

Overall Impressions

- Excellent First Review draft. Well written, mostly complete, good critical analysis.

Minutes



- We discussed that you seemed very hesitant to discuss all of your needs. Even if there is slim chance of getting funding to meet all needs, and even if you have to repeat your needs in Program Reviews and Annual Unit Plans for years to come, never omit anything. Repetition will make your case even stronger when there are funds to meet needs.
- The committee appreciates the problem of how narrowly focused the community college mission has become, turning away many people in the community itself.
- Be sure to clearly tie goals with analysis of program strengths and gaps.
- Always use formal course identification and name (e.g., ART C121 Drawing I) within narrative content. In tables, the formal discipline and number is sufficient (without the name).
- Convert rasterized data tables to an accessible Word table. Reach out to Sylvia if you need assistance with this—she is happy to help.
- Reference the Art History program only if a comparison with the Studio Art program is necessary. Omit all other data or references to the Art History program because this Program Review pertains specifically to the Studio Art program, and Art History will have its own Program Review.

Executive Summary

- Fix sentence: “There is now a stable program via which students can graduate with a Studio Arts degree and transfer to a California State University or University of California campus.”
- Para 6 – add “and” in front of traditional in the fourth line, remove there in line six
- Spell out IWV in the last line.
- In section 1.3, the 2nd paragraph and 2nd sentence would be good in executive summary as a strength of the program.
-

Part 1 – Definition

- 1.2 Letter the PLOs so the matrix is more easily interpreted
- 1.2 Spell out SLO and PLO at first usage
- 1.3 List courses prior to the table with names of courses. This can be helpful when reading 1.4 when Drawing I and 2D Design are referred to.
- 1.3 In the table of courses, change Art C101 to ART C101 (capitalization) to maintain consistency. In the same 1.3 row, center the X in Column PLO B.
- 1.4 Convert pathway information to an accessible table. Reach out to Sylvia if you need help with this. Omit the Art History pathway information, as this will be addressed in the Art History Program Review.
- 1.4 Use formal course identification (e.g., ART C121 Drawing I)
- 1.4 Omit courses from the long-term schedule that are not part of the degree (e.g. ART C107 and ART C108)
- 1.5 Remove comma in “student demand or staffing issues” and the comma in “options for students based on their”

Minutes



- 1.5 there is a smiley face emoji that needs to be removed. Suggest that after the smiley face the word “note” be removed so that the sentence begins with, “The offering of upper level sections is fluid”
-

Part 2 – Demand

- 2.1 Remove comma in “student feedback surveys and individual meetings”
- 2.1 (page 9) use a bulleted or numbered list for college goals.
- 2.1 Pg 10 3rd paragraph, grammar problem: “It is our belief that because we are mainly an interactive studio type classes,”
- 2.2 – Avoid lumping the Studio Art and Art History programs together (e.g. “There are no other programs at the college that offer studio art or art history courses”) Remember that this is a Studio Arts PR, not an Art History PR, but this discussion will help to explain the place of the Studio Arts program in the curricula. But do discuss the rationale and development for both SA and AH to explain the relationship between programs. Explain that there is not unnecessary duplication, and explain the different academic pathways and career endpoints for each, as a comparison.
- 2.3 Last Paragraph: Change “... outreach visits to Tehachapi high school...” to “Tehachapi High School”
- 2.3 (page 11) suggest that the “strategies we have initiated include:” be bulleted or indented.
- 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - Replace rasterized data tables with accessible tables provided in the original template. Reach out to Sylvia if help is needed.
- 2.6 Discuss the problem of turning away lifelong learners.
- 2.6 Spell out distance education, as it is not really used frequently enough to establish an acronym.
- 2.6 – Thoroughly discuss student demand issues at all of the sites (this is alluded to in 3.3).
- 2.7 Use full and formal course abbreviations, numbers, and names in narrative content.
- 2.7 Provide discussion about Open Education Resources (OER).
- 2.7 Do not use abbreviation VPA. This is the first instance of the use of ESCC. Spell out completely, followed by (ESCC). Same with IWV. Use city names with campuses.
- 2.9, 2.10. 2.11 – In the original raw feedback, someone recommended deleting these sections, but don’t delete them. You have addressed these appropriately with N/A.

Part 3 – Support Needs

- 3.1 – Replace rasterized data with accessible tables provided in the original template. Reach out to Sylvia if you need assistance.
- 3.1 – Thoroughly discuss staffing needs and gaps at all sites (this is alluded to in 3.3).
- 3.3 Define campus abbreviations with first use. Use city names as well. The city is Mammoth Lakes not Mammoth.
- 3.3 In the first paragraph, 3rd from last sentence: “... is integral to launching and maintain a successful studio...” change maintain to maintaining.

Minutes



- 3.3 The discussion on ESCC should also be addressed in staffing (3.1) and student demand (2.6)
- 3.3 – Itemize/list each significant facility/equipment gap at each site (especially Tehachapi). Provide a table detailing the lifecycle of each major equipment item with a replacement cost and schedule. It doesn't matter that the replacement cycle will likely not be adhered to because of funding. In the program's best interest, get this information in every PR and AUP. Repetition keeps this on the budgetary radar.
- 3.5 Does the art department participate in outreach events such as Career Exploration day, I'm Going to College (5th grade event), Open Houses?? If so, suggest listing the departments involvement in these outreach events.

Part 4 – Achievement of Outcomes

- 4.1 - "Over the course of the past five years, retention rates in Studio Arts have remained consistent, and consistently high in both on campus and online courses (averaging 90%)." Remove comma after consistent.
- 4.1 - Looking at the tables at the bottom of page 23 there is an upward trend over 5 years in both retention and success. Why not give your department a shout out instead of saying they have remained consistent?
- 4.1, 4.2 - Replace rasterized data tables with accessible tables provided in the original template. Reach out to Sylvia if assistance is needed.
- 4.4 – Assessment method is blank on PLO 2-4. Please complete.
- 4.3a and 4.3b should be 4.4a and 4.4b. (Sorry this is our fault, but if you could correct this on your copy, that would be great)
- 4.4a and 4.4b should be 4.5a and 4.5b. (Sorry this is our fault, but if you could correct this on your copy, that would be great)
- 4.4b (new numbering—PLO section) - Discussion needs to be more developed. What are you happy with specifically? The score indicates students barely met the target, so what analysis is done to determine where there may be gaps in 1) assessment method, 2) assessment data/reflections, 3) instruction, etc.?
- 4.4 - On pgs 26 & 27 the PLOs are numbered. Earlier in the document they were lettered, and they were bulleted when first presented. Consistency throughout would be better.
- 4.4 – The Outcomes Assessment Committee (OAC) has requested that the PLO verbiage be provided prior to the tabular results.
- 4.5 - The Outcomes Assessment Committee pointed out that outcomes can be moved around in eLumen, so over time, the number may change. The OAC asked if the outcome verbiage can be included in the chart in section 4.5. The Program Review Committee does not want course SLO outcome verbiage in the tables—it would make the document much more difficult to read. But when your Appendix is compiled prior to

Minutes



presentation to Academic Senate, include a full list of courses and their outcomes, so the number and the outcome itself can be correlated.

- 4.5b – From the OAC: You mention alignment of course SLOs with ILOs. What specifically is aligned? Provide the SLOs. Also, programs should be aligned to ALL of the ILOs. Not every SLO or course needs to be aligned, but at least one SLO in the program(s) should align to an ILO. Previous information provided to OAC for ILOs included the following (see chart below) and have been mapped in eLumen for Art History and Studio Arts. If these are not applicable, which we cannot tell from the PR language, then they need to inform the OAC chair with the updates.
- 4.6 – From the OAC: Recommend that assessment occur earlier to allow SLOs to be reassessed if necessary. Unless you are revising courses through CIC they should not be waiting until year 3 and 4. Also, some are gen ed and should be assessed every 2 years. Double check to be sure that assessment schedule aligns with long-term course offering schedule.

Part 5 – Actions Plans

- General input - After the previous sections this part seemed to be underdeveloped. The first goal of orienting new faculty members is not appropriate (especially, as stated, that this is already a developed college process). Focus on department level strategies that support the discussion throughout the PR. Be specific. Both 2- year and 5 year strategies. Describe what it looks like. Separate issues out.
- 5.1 – Typo: In the third paragraph, should it be “the opportunities we offer related to the examination *of* art”?
- 5.2 - Access to facilities outside of class time mentioned here first. Needs to be discussed earlier. What problem would this solve? Same with the wider range of courses. Which problem would this solve? Discuss the problems earlier in the document.
- 5.3 – From the OAC: “Collect a full round of SLO data. Fully process and analyze this information. This goal is complete. SLO data have been collected for all courses. However, challenges have been encountered in the transfer of that data to the current eLumen platform.” Seems that it would be appropriate for more discussion of what challenges were encountered and what has been done to resolve.
- 5.4 – Strategies should be action items that you implement and control. Faculty orientation is managed by the Office of Academic Affairs. 2-year strategy 1 should be omitted.
- 5.4, 5.5 – Some strategies encompass more than one action item. Separate these out so they can be clear, specific, and measurable. Also, strategies are actions that you can take. For example, to obtain a functioning facility in Tehachapi, what specific actions will you take, and how will the completion of your actions be measured? Strategies should

Minutes



not include the element of chance or dependency upon the actions of others. Focus on actions that you can assume responsibility for.

5. Updates

- Conveyed status of past-due Program Reviews. Human Resources is almost ready, and we should see it soon.

6. Future Meeting Dates

- October 11
- October 25
- November 8
- January 31
- February 14
- February 28
- March 13
- March 27
- April 3
- April 24

7. Adjournment

- 11:05 PM

Meeting Chair: Suzie Ama

Recorder: Suzie Ama