Committee Members Present: Bob Klier, Janet Young, Chris Wells (Additional committee members did not attend but provided written comments)

Faculty/Program Representatives Present: Juli Soden, Kristi Daniels-DiGregorio

Committee Recommendations – 2013 Human Development Program Review

1. Overview of the Program
   - Here and perhaps in Section 2, make clear reasons why program was affected especially hard by cutbacks (i.e. EOPS cutbacks influencing Human Development offerings, etc.)
   - Discuss distinction from Academic Strategies and why your program is “Human Development”.
   - Include information about who your students are and their various groups (i.e. dedicated sections for EOPS students versus other groups) and how students get to you (i.e. program, student/teacher referrals).
   - Consider Including discussion of Student Success Trask Force and influence on Human Development earlier in document.
   - Adjust status of full-time faculty in section 1.d

2. Analysis of Research Data
   - Consider use of more direct measures such as pre/post testing and consider working with IRP to develop any additional needed survey instruments. This could be used as a recommendation for this and/or section 4 material.
   - Include additional explanation regarding student success rates and influence of program thinking/philosophy regarding grades in Human Development courses rather than Pass/No Pass option (2.a.3).
   - Address 5-week classes.
   - Address Human Development 8’s 75% retention rate in 2012 (page 18).
   - Include any additional recommendations at end of section 2.

3. Curriculum
• Update section 3.b based on upcoming meetings. (Does Human Development fulfill Area E?)
• Clarify nature/basis of “research based” statements in 3.e.

4. **Assessment and Student and Program Learning Outcomes (SLOs & PLOs)**
   • Consider whether Human Development should be ranked at the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level on the ACCJC SLO Rubric (4.e).

5. **Facilities and Equipment**
6. **Technology and Software**
   • Consider increasing to 50 seat count of requested lab space so space can be shared with other programs.

7. **Staffing**
   • What you are arguing for is apt, but note that 75/25% rule is a college-wide average and not program-specific.
   • Re-prioritize faculty-hire.
   • Consider expansion of argument/evidence relating to need for full-time position here and elsewhere in document.

8. **Future Direction and Vision**

9. **Prioritized Recommendations**

10. **CTE Review (if applicable)**

Revised human Development Program Review document will be submitted to the APRC by Friday November 1, 2013.