

**MEETING MINUTES FOR
CAPC STANDING COMMITTEE:
(Program Review)**

Meeting Date: November 12, 2009

Present: Teresa Bossert, Lindsay Carson, Charlie Huang, Robert McCord, Normah Salleh-Barone, Steve Socol, Meghan Waterbury, Cheryl Ziszik

Absent: None

Others: Doug Goostree, Tony Miksa.

CALL TO ORDER: 2:40 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Meghan will not be leaving us until the end of the semester. Tim Seitz (PHI) and Jay Geller (THE) will present program reviews to us on December 3 and go to CAPC in January.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Electronically approved

OLD BUSINESS

Action Items: HHP and MET will go to CAPC on December 10.

Discussion Items:

Meghan reported that Bruce Spangenberg (HRT) will present his program review to us on January 21. On February 4 will be Mike Hillstrom (MUS) and Joan Flanigan (Nursing/BNA). Marketing, the Academy, Distance Education, and Learning Communities don't have all their data yet; Meghan will be assisting them.

NEW BUSINESS

Meghan brought up the question about the CTE workbook. The section on completion and retention rates needs either improvement or elimination, as it is not accurate in representation or quality for specific programs. The three-year completion rate table has the same problems. One improvement would be to filter down to the full-time freshman rate. There are one-semester certifications, two-semester certifications, and two-year programs which really can't be compared. We could customize the programs, but would the extra work and computations give enough data value?

Robert said it seemed the data was both misleading and non-accurate. Would a more valuable measure be the actual number of degrees awarded?

Steve brought up the point that many students transfer and are successful in the field without completing the associate's degree. Meghan asked whether we could look at employment records and satisfaction scales. Cheryl inquired about how we could track that information. She mentioned that there are state competency exams which give a lot of data, but not all CTEs have them.

Meghan responded that we have had a decent response rate for the graduate follow-up survey (about 50%, through an outsourced company). Normah asked how the data is being used. It goes into the ICCB report on satisfaction.

Teresa brought up the point that students change their mind and their major often, so it really doesn't accurately reflect the quality of the program they start in.

The following questions were raised: What is the history of this workbook? Who developed it and why was it put into place, and can we just delete it or does it need to be voted on by CAPC?

Normah was curious as to what the criteria were at other community colleges. If none of them do this, it would reinforce our elimination of it.

Robert will talk to Donald Quirk about the history of the document.

The committee welcomed Tony Miksa, who spoke about Academic Planning and Transformation. The executive deans are updating and the faculty is editing both mid-year and year-end updates. This will help administrators to plan long range goals for equipment and upgrades. Robert asked what the reporting mechanism should be from the Program Review committee to Academic Planning. Normah mentioned that the Executive Deans can pull up the program reviews to help support updates to the academic plan. Robert recommended that Tony might want to address the assessment team as well. Tony suggested that the academic plan should come more to the forefront, as it can be used to promote one's program. Lindsay asked if it is coordinating with TracDat; the answer was that TracDat is more connected to gen ed goals, while the academic plan is connected more to college goals.

The PHI and THE program reviews will be presented at the December 3 meeting. There will be no meeting on December 17.

MOTION/S TO CAPC: None

ADJOURNMENT: Cheryl motioned to adjourn; Normah seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.