

Meeting Minutes for
CAPC Standing Committee
Program Review

Meeting date: September 6, 2007

Present: Theresa Bossert, Kathy Chamberlain, Phil Getchell, Joan Perlman, Katrine Poe, Donald Quirk, Cheryl Richards, Normah Salleh-Barone

Absent: None

Call to order: 2:40 pm

Announcements: None

Approval of minutes: No official minutes to approve, although brief notes from the group meeting within the last CAPC meeting were passed out.

Old Business:

Discussion Items:

Review goals—

A. Continued progress toward more timely cost analysis data—Normah told Ralph Gaulke and Todd McDonald that we need the cost analysis data in two weeks, and got the response that it was not a priority because they just finished two audits. In March the request was made for the cost analysis to be completed over the summer so that department chairs could begin work in September. Normah will continue to e-mail Todd and Ron Ally weekly to keep on top of the situation, and may also talk to Jim Batson. It was suggested that Ralph and Todd be invited to the September 27 meeting, and that the cost analysis be done a year ahead and be done on all courses, not just the program reviews so that there is data for comparison. Phil asked if the ultimate goal is to meet cost effectiveness. The reply was that it is an important part, but the assessment of the program effectiveness is crucial for ICCB mandates.

B. Narrative guidance booklets—Kathy likes the new workbooks because they lean much more heavily on data. It was suggested that examples of last year's reviews be shown to the current reviewees as a benchmark, especially for how narratives are written. Often it is hard for the reviewees to compare the current review to their former reviews because the format has changed. Discussion ensued: would examples stifle creativity, is there a difference between MCC and state requirements in writing the program reviews, is there a need to be consistent stating course numbers **and** titles within the reviews, and shouldn't acronyms be listed out. Kathy also mentioned that "Occupational" classes should really be called "Career and Technical Education" to be consistent with the ICCB. Theresa, as a former department chair, thought the idea of examples was a good one to jump-start the process. Joan suggested giving them the checklist first, then examples after they begin

the process. Cheryl proposed the possibility of having a workshop through Professional Development to help department chairs through the procedure—Donald responded that the data specialists can help immensely by knowing the right questions to ask.

C. The finalization of the timeline is in progress.

1. Spring prior to review—talk to department chairs about the process. (Done)
2. Continue calling them to see how they are progressing. Katrine mentioned that not once in three years has any of the department chairs called her to ask questions prior to the actual review. It was suggested that each committee member mentor a reviewee.

#1—AOM—Kathy
#4—CAD/Drafting—Katrine
#5—Construction—Joan
#7—EMS—Cheryl
#9—Engineering—Joan
#10—Fire Science—Theresa
#12—Mathematics—Kathy
#13—Manufacturing—Katrine

The committee only meets with Baccalaureate and Career Tech Ed departments—the rest go before Jim Gray.

3. Phil will be the starting point for a one-on-one with the department chairs to begin the review process by going over OIRP data.

Final notes:

Last year the Executive Deans were to do the updates. This year they decide if they want to do it, so the reviewees need to be aware of that fact.

Kathy brought up that it is difficult to have hard data in less than one year, and that one can only say if any transformation was made, not whether it was good yet.

Joan said the committee needs to ask hard questions such as: Should this program continue? Are you willing to fight for it? Theresa asked that the committee be careful not to forget the positive aspects of holistic development on low enrollment classes.

Homework—Go over the booklet, and be ready to continue work on the checklist next week.

Adjournment: 4:45 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Missy Spengel