### Fullerton College

### Program Review and Planning Committee meeting notes

### 28-Apr 22 meeting, 3-4:30P, Zoom

**Present:** Mary Bogan (faculty, co-chair), Josh Ashenmiller (faculty, co-chair), Dave Brown (faculty, Lib), Doug Eisner (faculty, Hum), David Grossman (Dean of PE), Megan Harris (OIE), Chuck Helms (classified professional, ASC), Barry McCarthy (faculty, Bus/CIS), Luciano Rodriguez (faculty, Math/CS), Ken Starkman (Dean, Tech/Eng), Todd Smith (faculty, Fine Arts), Matt Taylor (Pathways Coordinator), Cal Young (Nat Sci)

1. **Agenda and notes from last meeting (14-Apr 22) approved**
2. **STEM Center SAP**
	1. Josh misspoke at the Senate meeting when a question came up about it.
		1. It was an SAP in the Nutrition & Foods self-study.
		2. Josh said it was in Horticulture.
	2. Cal clarified the proposal contained several options for a new building, which will include Horticulture facilities and a STEM Center.
	3. New construction is not something that gets approved through program review anyway, but Nutrition & Foods included the STEM Center as an SAP in their self-study, so Josh had to include it in the list that we sent to Senate.
	4. The good news is that the Senate approved the list, Josh sent it to VPAS Rod García, and PBSC will be discussing the list of requests at its meeting next week on Wednesday.
3. **Institutional Integrity Committee (IIC) Memo**
	1. IIC members read a sample of 11 self-studies and wrote a memo, with these observations:
		1. “SLO data provided using our current system made it difficult for programs to assess their SLO equity data in a meaningful way.”
		2. “Across the program reviews, there was inconsistency on how data was addressed in the selected sections.”
		3. “Not all equity plans addressed the equity gaps evident in the data provided to programs.”
	2. IIC made recommendations:
		1. “The College extract SLO student level data and provide it to the research staff in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) so that they can use the extracted data to build dashboards on the Tableau platform”
		2. “Dashboards will provide outcomes disaggregated by different variables, including race, which can be used by programs to enhance CSLO assessment.”
		3. “The College [will] provide more intentional training and support to programs on completing the program reviews in general, and specifically the equity plan in section 3.2.”
	3. The Committee discussed at length this memo, which it largely agrees with.
		1. Does this mean ditching eLumen? Or maybe eLumen would work better with a dedicated staff person, rather than one faculty member with partial reassigned time?
		2. Would this suggestion get through the Senate, which has long maintained a firewall between SLO data and OIE? Extracting data might still expose courses taught by a single person, or single-person departments.
		3. The last time something like this happened, it was adding ISLO and Institution-Set Standards to the PR annual update form, which some faculty resented.
		4. The Committee agreed on the need for all faculty to have basic training and support on how to make an equity plan and how to analyze OIE and SLO data. It should not just be something PRPC puts in the template, but something that the Faculty Senate requires for all departments.
4. **The non-instructional template**
	1. The managers working on this are still working on it.
	2. We might see a draft in time for our last meeting, or it might go over the summer.
5. **Committee goals**
	1. Improvements to the PR process
		1. How do we handle proposals for new things that cross programs, such as the STEM Center?
		2. How can we ease the program review workload on small departments? Can departments in the same division team up, especially when they have the same request (such as the STEM Center?)
		3. Should all departments write self-studies every four years, or should ¼ of them go every year?
	2. Improvements to the PR instructional template
		1. Fleshing out the equity plan
		2. Eliminating repetitive, tautological, pleonastic redundancies
	3. Review of Program Review
		1. Should the PRPC oversee the program review process for non-instructional programs?
		2. PRPC is a Faculty Senate Committee, so it makes sense that it would oversee instructional program review, but why non-instructional?
6. **Remaining Spring 2022 meeting dates (2nd & 4th Thu, 3-4:30P)**
	* 1. 12-May: suggested location The Pour Company, 136 W. Wilshire Av., 92832