

MEETING MINUTES FOR
CAPC STANDING COMMITTEE:
(Program Review)

Meeting Date: February 5, 2009

Present: Jim Blaz, Charlie Huang, Robert McCord, Katrine Poe, Sarah Ruthven, Normah Salleh-Barone, Sally Selcke, Meghan Waterbury

Absent: Tami Krohn, Cheryl Richards

Others: Don Curfman, Ann Esarco

CALL TO ORDER: 2:40 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Electronically approved

OLD BUSINESS

Action Items: None

Discussion Items: None

NEW BUSINESS

1. Accounting Program Review (Don Curfman, Ann Esarco)

Katrine will send grammatical corrections later.

p.1 The same parenthetical expression "Seems to overlap with critical thinking" needs to be deleted. Meghan will change the master.

In general, leave no box unfilled in the charts. Use zeros or NA if not applicable.

Sally asked if ethical awareness is really only a minor objective; Sarah asked if effective communication was also only minor. Both are listed above as program objectives. Robert asked if there were any interpersonal scan skills to be listed if group projects are used. Don will consider those adjustments. Ann asked about defining the word "systems" under scan skills.

p. 2 There are six departmental objectives listed on page one; only five show up on ensuing charts. They should match up. Don decided to delete objective A because it was also a part of objective B. This will streamline everything.

Table 1 needs to have information from the last two objectives filled in.

p.3 Sally again mentioned the template issue of defining N ratings. Table 2 was missing objective A—Meghan will check into where that is falling apart even though Don has decided just to remove A to streamline.

Meghan asked why 25% of students don't realize they are doing critical thinking. This sparked a discussion on this being a trend in all reviews. As assessment liaison, Sarah mentioned that this is a brand new assessment skill. Katrine said it is necessary for the instructor to actually point out to the students that they are doing this within the class.

p.4 Fill in the blanks in Table 3B. There is no data in the 2007-2008 column because the data is run in summer, and this is a fall-to-fall retention rate. A footnote could explain that fact.

Sarah asked if the negative changes needed explanation, especially the one which lists a -1% change from 74% in 2002-03 to 74% in 2006-07. Meghan explained that it could be accounted for by rounding up or down each year. A note can be made that it was an insignificant change due to rounding procedures.

Also in Table 3b, the top of the retention rates section is about new students; the bottom part is about total completions for the year. That is why the numbers do not match.

p.5 Don was complemented on the great student survey results in Tables 4A and 4B.

p. 6. In Table 5, fill in 100%, since both fulltime instructors have masters degrees. Put a sentence under the table to address the negative changes.

p. 7 Add to the narrative that the High School Accounting Bowl may increase enrollment and retention, and how this can be tracked. Also mention the Free Income Tax preparation which is offered; it shows up on page 11 in the summation, but must be seen within the report and not just in the summation. Also add who sits on the committee—adjuncts, former students, CPAs, etc.

When TracDat was mentioned, a short discussion ensued. As Appendix A, it needs to be attached to the final copy given to Deb Gallo. In reality, the assessment should be checked by the department's assessment representative rather than by the Program Review Committee. Katrine suggested having a sign-off for TracDat on the last page similar to the library sign-off.

p. 8 In Tables 7A, 7B, and 8, add NA and zeros as necessary. Meghan and Sally will check the data from the Academy for 2006-07 to explain the blank. Add a statement about the shift from traditional classes to on-line offerings.

p. 9 Explain that a change in personnel (e.g. losing higher-paid people to retirement and replacing them with neophytes) would shift department expenses. Also, with the reorganization of departments there will be more shifting of expenses. Katrine suggested that a generic statement be used next year due to the amount of changes we will be dealing with.

p. 10 The table is referenced as 3-1 and 3-2; it is actually Table 9.

p. 11 Check at least one thing on the Principle Assessment Methods. It must be hand checked, as the boxes are not working.

p. 17 Delete. Appendix B is not required, it is on a “need to know” basis.

2. Developmental Math Program Review (Charlie Huang for Diane Terlep)

p. 2 Again, N Ratings needs to be defined. Perhaps add a note under Table 2 to explain why developmental students perceive a lower value of math (e.g. they don't believe they will ever be in a job which requires it.)

p. 3 Fill out Table 5 in 2007-08. Put footnote under Table 3 about insignificant negative changes. Robert was amazed that there were 30-35 students in a developmental class; with the help they need, it seems counterproductive.

p. 4 Switch paragraphs three and four for more logical progression. Normah stated that these were excellent explanations. Meghan would like to actually have hard numbers on the percentage of developmental math/developmental reading students and on the actual numbers in paragraph four.

p.5 Give actual percentages here as well.

p.7 Fill in with NA. Define why on-line only shows up in 2003-04 and 2005-06.

p.8 Robert complemented the department on having a study manual for the placement test and taking it seriously.

Other business:

Meghan is working with divisional requests to change the order of program reviews due to the reorganization. For example, it was asked if in 2010 the Humanities division could do MUS and THE, and move ART and HUM to 2011, as it would be very difficult for the new department chair to do all four in one year in basically unfamiliar disciplines. There

was also a request from Assessment to move from 2011 to 2012, as they are training the new department chair. Meghan will send out the current “work in progress” version to the executive deans and ask for their input. A memo would then go from us to CAPC, and from CAPC to the ICCB.

Robert mentioned that he should be able to tweak the old rubric to fit well enough to use this year. Any major changes will wait until next year.

MOTION/S TO CAPC: None

ADJOURNMENT: Sally moved to adjourn; Sarah seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.