

Administrative Response
EEFS Program Review
June 4th, 2010

First, thank you for a thoughtful, well organized written review addressing all of the items noted in the Program Review Guidelines. You started with a video overview of the program setting the stage for a thoughtful, thorough and well organized presentation.

This response contains 4 sections: 1.) a listing of highlights from the review/presentation 2.) areas for further consideration, 3.) response to recommendations/areas of SAC needs and 4.) closing comments

Highlights

- Placement of EEFS in the broader context of the profession
- EEFS program outcomes changed to reflect national professional standards
- EEFS outcomes relative to PCC outcomes
- Outcomes differentiated between degree and certificates
- How EEFS program meets PCC Values
- How EEFS relates to PCC Goals
- NAEYC (National Association for the Education of Young Children) standards cross walked with ECE courses
- DL offerings and plans to add ECE 120 and ECE 234
- Use of Service Learning in specified courses
- Connection of EEFS and ESOL
- Advisory committee engagement in NAEYC accreditation review
- Monthly/Semi-monthly meetings of EEFS SAC
- Listings of barriers to degree/certification completion – practicum
- Offerings of specific classes in Spanish as an outreach/retention tool
- Contributions to the college and profession
- Professional development
- Attendance at National Association for the Education of Young Conference
- NAEYC year-long self study
- The identification of 8 CCOGs to be updated during the 2010-20121 academic year
- Connections to Adelante Maestros to internationalize the curriculum
- Use of student portfolios for purposes of assessment
- Connections with high schools through PAVTEC
- Awarding credit for not-for-credit experiences specifically from CDA, Oregon Registry Step 7, and NW Nannies Institute
- Passionate, knowledgeable faculty

Areas for further consideration and/or clarification

You referenced contract language which limits Distance Learning enrollments at 25 per section. *The contract is silent on this issue. Please discuss with your Division Dean/Administrative Liaison.*

The ad hoc use of your EEFS Advisory Committee should be revisited given PCC guidelines for holding meetings. In your presentation, you commented on your desire to work more closely with your Advisory Committee following their regular input during your self-study. We commend you for this and offer the following citations.

Oregon State Regulations specify that, "State regulations require advisory committees to assist in the development of career technical education programs. Advisory Committees provide current business, industry, labor and professional support and advice to existing programs. The Advisory Committee and the staff of the corresponding career technical education program are to work together to ensure that the program addresses current business, industry, labor and/or professional employment needs. Many Subject Area Committees (SAC) have benefitted from High School participation."*
<http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/standards-practices/documents/A108April2010.pdf>

Additionally, PCC's Academic Standards and Practices Section 108 states, "The Advisory Committee and the staff of the corresponding Program work together to ensure that the Program is delivering learning that is current, up-to-date, and relevant to current business, industry, labor, and professional employment practices. Advisory Committees provide support and advice to academic programs. They may also assist in the development of new Career Technical Education programs. An ad hoc committee may be established for this purpose.

In addition to best practice standards, Federal Perkins grants and Accrediting bodies also identify the expectation that Advisory Committees are utilized to open a dialog of exchange with members of a broader society. It is further required that a description of the committee involvement and contribution to curricular and program development and assessment be periodically submitted with accreditation and/or other official college documents. The purpose of these committees is advisory in nature as members of the community provide external input into internal processes."
<http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/standards-practices/AcademicStandardsandPractices-AdvisoryCommittees.html>

Therefore, we ask that you formalize and document, in minutes, the meeting of and interactions with your Advisory Committee and hold meetings on a regular basis to address the roles and responsibilities noted above.

Under the section on future employment you provided general information, but not Oregon specific. For local details please refer to the Oregon Labor Market Information System (OLMIS) at the following link: <http://www.olmis.org/olmisj/DoQuery?itemid=00004804>

You mentioned that it can be difficult to determine when a student completes a practicum as that decision can be 'subjective'. *We urge that you review the outcomes associated with these courses. Evaluation based on outcomes should minimize subjectivity. Additionally, during your presentation there*

seemed to be some confusion, mostly for us, over the use of the terms practicum and laboratory. As this program grows throughout the district, please work to better define and differentiate them to minimize further confusion.

You stated, "There are times when practice in the CDC does not reflect what is taught in ECE course work. This creates some disequilibrium for practicum students who want to know why the disjunction is occurring." We agree this could be very confusing for students. Does this happen with other sites? And if so, how is it addressed? Please work closely with the CDC leadership and your Division Dean to better understand why this happens and, to the degree possible, to minimize the impact on students. Additionally, we understand that actions by HR to down grade certain positions in the CDC, have contributed to this issue. Your Division Dean will work with you and HR to re-evaluate their decision.

"Practice with children in "real world" settings requires application of specific skills and issues beyond the content knowledge acquired during other courses." Seems to us this represents an opportunity to reexamine your course work and adjust outcomes accordingly to minimize this disconnect.

"When students are hired into the CDC positions (regardless of their skill level), the classroom can no longer be used as a practicum placement site as the use of current students creates a conflict of interest in the placement of other current students under their supervision." Again, please work closely with the CDC leadership and your Division Dean on ways to minimize the impact on students. Additionally, your Division Dean will work with the Campus DOI to document and communicate to PCC Human Resources the programmatic implications of down grading the Mentor Teacher position.

We noted that the ECE Instructor Qualifications provided in Appendix 3 are not the same as those posted on the Instructor Qualifications website: <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/instructor-qualifications/ece.html> . Please submit the SAC-approved Instructor Qualifications for approval -- instructions and the form may be accessed at: <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/instructor-qualifications/revision-instructions.html>

Assessment was identified as an area of focus for PCC during our very recent accreditation visit, and the April 2010 Interim Accreditation Report notes that: PCC must document "progress in demonstrating, through regular and systematic assessment, that students who complete their programs have achieved the intended learning outcomes of degrees and certificates. Further, the college must begin to demonstrate, in a regular and systematic fashion, how the assessment of student learning leads to the improvement of teaching and learning."

The SAC is in an excellent position to demonstrate regular and systematic assessment of student learning in the form of the detailed scoring forms (Appendix 7) for the NAYEC competencies and accompanying rubrics (not included in the Program review). Important next steps include documentation of the assessment results, analysis, and identification of areas that may be improved are logical next steps. Closing the loop by implementing such changes and [hopefully] showing improvement in the subsequent

assessment round will document the iterative cycle of assessment-drive improvement that is an expectation of PCCs accreditation.

Recommendations/areas of SAC needs

1. The primary recommendation of the SAC relates to the functioning of the Sylvania Child Development Center as a lab school. Given the CDC's role as an instructional component of the EEFS program, the EEFS SAC strongly recommends a collaborative and comprehensive review of the CDC's current organizational structure and funding levels.

We, also, believe this is your primary recommendation. We suggest, if you haven't already done so, considering inviting Deborah Sipe to join your Advisory committee. We, also, suggest that regular meetings of EEFS and CDC leadership with your Division Dean occur with a focus on these issues. Given the connections of this recommendation to the following recommendation, we realize this will neither be a simple nor short term task, but could prove beneficial to the District as Child Development Centers are constructed at other locations.

2. The EEFS SAC strongly recommends the development and implementation of new budgeting procedures that 1) break out the costs of providing service child care, providing quality, and providing a lab school component, and 2) change funding models such that the costs of providing the lab school component is derived from instructional funds in the institution.

Your presentation helped us better understand the scale and scope of these issues, but also helped us realize there is no quick solution. In as much as the Bond will be providing CDC operations at Rock Creek, Cascade and SE Center these issues are both timely and far reaching. We recommend that you work with your Division Dean and DOI to determine costs to the CDC associated with being a lab facility for EEFS. Campus and district leadership will use this to help inform staffing and funding of CDC operations throughout the district.

3. The EEFS SAC is extremely concerned about these practices (the hiring of ECE students who have not completed their Associate's degree who, therefore, can't serve as 'mentors'.) and strongly recommends an examination and evaluation of the administrative resources available to the program with the goal of effectively and consistently maintaining the instructional functions of the lab.

We urge that you work closely with the CDC leadership and your Division Dean to further explore this, and determine possible remedies.

4. Support to establish stable funding for bi-annual early education and family studies symposium.

Please work with your Division Dean to develop logistical and fiscal requirements needed to support this recommendation. In turn, your Division Dean will work with campus leadership to locate possible funding.

5. The EEFS SAC will likely seek curriculum development funding to support comprehensive review and revision of the practicum levels and competencies in the coming year.

We applaud you for your vision and commitment to continuous improvement.

6. The EEFS program faculty strongly suggests that the PCC program review process for nationally accredited CTE programs be re-examined with the eye toward avoiding parallel review questions/evaluations where accreditation materials are not quite sufficient to meet program evaluation criteria.

We understand that some redundancies occur for programs that prepare documentation for professional accreditation. However, the questions that are asked on the PCC Program review are necessary for supporting the college's accreditation. Not all of the issues and concerns are the same. We expect that some elements of the Program Review Document can be taken directly from a recently prepared professional accreditation document where such exists. Other parts will surely not be included in such a document (Core Outcomes, for example), but do need to be addressed. Because professional accreditation documents vary a great deal, it will be problematic to take a position that elements covered in the professional accreditation can be omitted from the Program review.

In closing, we want to thank you for your well organized, thoughtful review. We applaud your dedication to ethics, professionalism and continuous improvement. We concur that your single most important challenge is working closely with CDC to resolve issues and better align programs. While joint meetings focusing on the CDC bond project may appear to be the natural vehicle to achieve this, we urge that additional joint meetings focusing on other aspects of program compatibility and connectedness be held.

Administrative Response developed and submitted by Jeff S. Triplett in collaboration with other review team members.

Scott Huff
Craig Kolins
Birgitte Rylsing
Jeff Triplett