MINUTES
Friday March 16th, 2012 Meeting

1. Introductions and welcome
Meeting started at 9:05AM

In attendance: Teresa Ciardi, Hanzel Salva Cruz, Miriam Golbert, Barry Gribbons, Lee Hilliard, Ann Lowe, Nicole Lucy, Mojdeh Mahn, Lisa Malley, Daylene Meuschke, Patty Robinson, Paul Wickline.

2. Review of Goals for spring 2012
   a. Offer administration (primarily Barry Gribbons’ office) suggestions for improving the process for the P.R. 2012-13 update, Tabled for next meeting
      i. Consider also the types of data provided – additional data desired?
      ii. Text box size
   b. Establish policies and procedures for the program review committee Tabled for next meeting
      i. Mission
      ii. Duties and Functions
      iii. Membership
      iv. Management
   c. Examine how to best utilize the results of the departmental program reviews to establish a college-wide dialogue directed towards improving institutional effectiveness.

The committee expressed the need to find the connectedness of Program Review with all areas of the college to have effective planning. Teresa Ciardi expressed the need to add some kind of a ratio or percentage on the Data table to reflect sections requested instead of FTEFs change. Since departments use this Data table when presenting to Academic Staffing committee, a marked change from one year to the next may indicate that the department is declining and not that sections requests were less than previous years. Barry mentioned that even though we need some improvements, the PRs are exceptional when compared to the paper versions of years past. The committee was in agreement that the on-line process is a lot better and that the faculty is appreciative of these efforts.

   d. Plan Program Review training sessions and flex workshops for department chairs in fall 2012 Tabled for next meeting

   a. Arrangement of Program Review Components
   b. Suggested Changes
   c. Concerns?
   d. Suggestions?

Two sets of flash cards were provided to visualize the current PR organization. Several suggestions were made. Barry will draft the proposed changes as he would like to start working on most of them as soon as possible with Noris in Computer Support.; here are some of the suggestions from the committee:
   • SLOs table needs to be explained so everyone can report and understand it the same way (maybe an example on the heading)
• SLOs table for assessing cycle should be limited to digits, indicated also semester and year (not a narrative)
• SLOs need to be connected somehow with new objectives as they seem disconnected from the entire PR. Barry suggested maybe to embed new objectives option on SLOs table OR/AND have an option under New Objectives that prompts to identify the new objective with a specific SLO.
• Review previous objectives and place them with new accomplishments before New Objectives (all on the same section)
• Make cancelled objectives not visible OR have two separate lists (Departments think there is a need to see a beginning and an end of the 3-year cycle objectives)
• Add majors to the Data table (useful to connect number of students in the program to majors reported)
• Place Data Trends under Internal Factors
• Roll over information such as Interdisciplinary Collaboration (maybe add other sections as will that need to be rolled over)
• Improve formatting (especially on the SLOs table. It is difficult to print even when using Landscape
• Try to eliminate italics when printing, difficult to read
• For yearly updates, should we stay with the “Update” tabs, or “Optional” tabs?
• There is the need to either make sure faculty has guidelines, a rubric, or even a handbook on procedures to have consistency across the disciplines (this will be important if and when a peer review is established for easier comparisons)

4. New Business  **Tabled for next meeting**
   a. Establish spring 2012 meeting schedule (Note: Leap dates are Feb 24, Mar 2, Mar 23, April 13, April 27)
      **Next meeting scheduled for Friday, April 13th, 9:00-10:30AM.**
   b. Generate questionnaire for department chairs about process
      i. What worked for you?
      ii. What didn’t work?
      iii. What recommendations could you make for improving the format? (Either clarifying, combining, adding or removing sections or questions?)
      iv. Was the data provided sufficient?
      v. Other?
   c. Establish goals for next meeting
   d. Reading materials for next meeting
      Paul gave the committee members some handouts on other colleges’ PR process to review for next meeting.

5. Adjourned at 10:30AM
MINUTES

Meeting started: 9:00 AM

In attendance: Hanzel Salva Cruz, Miriam Golbert, Barry Gibbons, Lee Hilliard, Nicole Lucy, Mojdeh Mahn, Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline

Barry provided an overview of discussion with Norris concerning timeline for updates to APR. Goal is to open the APR for faculty access by end of spring 2012.

Discussion held about issues with “saving” the APR while working on it. Daylene and Barry indicated that system will be tested thoroughly.

Discussion held about CurricuNet vs. SLO tables – where does official information “live?” Reminder that it lives in CurricuNet since this is the Curriculum Committee approved information concerning SLOs.

Suggestion was made to make certain that information from CurricuNet overrode information in Program Review since Program Review isn’t the place for placing intended changes course SLO’s. Program Review SLO tables should be a direct reflection of what is in CurricuNet.

Barry discussed confusion with Budget submission process in APR and has offered a change to clarify and improve process for faculty.

Decision was made to accept the list as outlined and implement all changes.

Paul noted importance of opening up the SLO tables by the end of spring so department chairs can update the information by fall.

Question raised about changing SLO’s in Program Review. Faculty reminded that any change to curriculum, including SLO’s must go through Curriculum process in CurricuNet.

Barry reviewed and discussed UPDATE TAB vs. ALL TABLE AVAILABLE WITH SOME OPTIONAL for 12-13. Note was made that some faculty seem to believe we do an annual APR, when we actually do a year APR.

Statement made that both faculty and administrators need to be reminded that this is a 3-year process with annual updates. The myth exists that we do a yearly program review and would be helpful to limit what faculty have access to within the year 2 and 3 APR’s to help dispel this myth.

Decision made to use the “UPDATE TAB” for 2012-13 update. This will also speed up the process for Norris since he will only need to focus on what is required in the UPDATE TAB and can work on the other changes in the future.

Decision made to hold one more meeting on Friday, May 11th.

Daylene requested agenda items for next meeting:
1. Streamlined version for some department that are required to complete accreditation (Nursing, etc.)
2. CTE Addendum on next meeting agenda.

Paul directed committee to look at pages 40-44 of the PROGRAM REVIEW: SETTING THE STANDARD concerning an evaluation of the APR process. Text mentions that an analysis of the APR process is needed for ACCJC proficiency and the good of the institution. Barry mentioned that some feedback is asked for in the faculty/staff survey and that he is working on and open to examining the planning processes campus-wide.

The committee noted that the minutes from previous APR committee meetings note an assessment and analysis of the process with suggested improvements.

Daylene suggested that time at department chair retreat is used each spring to discuss APR to receive feedback from all concerned. Because the department chair meeting is so late in April, it is too late to receive feedback and make changes in time to reopen this spring for access.

Paul noted it is important that we advertise ways that the APR has resulted in improvements for various programs. He suggested that we look at positive results from academic program reviews and prepare a list of these for all faculty to see.

Paul noted that the committee now needs to focus on the following in successive meetings:
   a. Examine how to best utilize the results of the departmental program reviews to establish a college-wide dialogue directed towards improving institutional effectiveness
      i. Discuss establishing policies and procedures for the program review committee
         1. Mission
         2. Duties and Functions
         3. Membership
         4. Management

Goal by the end of the spring is to begin a discussion of this.

(NOTE: By the end of SEPTEMBER, APR committee policies and procedures should be in place and proposed to Academic Senate.)

Daylene mentioned that the APR committee might want to look at CRAFTON HILLS and connect with Keith Warz (presentation of RP website). They received an award concerning the APR process. Daylene will look into this.

Paul passed out packet of mission statements for committee consideration.

Discussion ensued about possible purposes of the APR committee and theme arose that this is an ADVISORY committee similar to the purpose of the restructured SLO COMMITTEE.

Meeting adjourned @ 10:10 AM.
1. Minutes from last meeting (4/13/12) were approved with an amendment: page 2 name correction to Wartz.

2. CTE addendum
   Daylene explained that we may want to change the addendum for CTE on reporting employment data. Surveys to graduates through Institutional research does not bring good returns. In the future: Get information from EDD. The reported information that is on PR right now is compliant with Ed Code.

3. Daylene and the PR committee will look into programs with external accreditation requirements (Nursing, Paralegal Studies, ECE, etc) to try to streamline the process and avoid duplications.

4. Meeting schedule for Fall 2012: Miriam will send a request for all members to find a suitable time for everyone. Members in attendance expressed that if the committee continues to meet on Fridays, the start time should be 10:30AM. The committee agreed to meet twice a month. First meeting in the Fall has tentatively been schedule for 9/7/12.

5. Committee Mission and specific goals: a draft document was created with committee suggestions and is being reviewed by Academic senate president. It will be send to committee members after this review.

   Membership: The committee discussed the committee membership and agreed on having at least one representative from each division with possible alternates to attend in case of absences. This is a working committee and updating members not attending slows down the pace. Members need to notify co-chairs of absences and send a representative. Members will be allowed 2 absences per semester, after that, the committee may request the Academic Senate to appoint a new member representative. Members will be appointed by the Academic Senate. It was discussed that Deans will be invited to participate. The committee discussed the possibility in making this a more inclusive membership by inviting other campus areas to be represented, but this will create a larger committee and it would also mirror what CPT already does. All these proposed items need to be approved by Academic Senate.

6. Proposed Timeline 2012-2014: Miriam suggested that some department can participate in a pilot run for the next two rounds of annual PR and the committee agreed. Co-chairs will be contacting departments starting in Fall.

7. Other Items: Daylene suggested that a “handbook” should be developed along with a website where we can organize all the available resources (members please check Crafton Hills community college web site on Program Review).

   Lee suggested that we need to maintain fluid communication with each Divisions and it was suggested that the division reps should report on this committee at their respective division meetings.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 AM
Attendees: Paul Wickline & Miriam Golbert, Co-Chairs; Edel Alonzo, Nicole Faudree, Barry Gribbons, Andy McCutcheon, Daylene Meuschke, Cindy Stevens, Garrett Tujague.

Meeting began at 10:40 am.

1. **Refreshments** – Paul Wickline generously provided the committee members with a continental breakfast.

2. **Review minutes** – Minutes from the prior meeting were approved unanimously.

3. **Review revised mission statement** – the committee reviewed and approved the revised mission statement to clarify the purpose of the Program Review committee.

   The purpose of the Program Review Committee (an Academic Senate subcommittee) is to provide training, advisement and assistance to College of the Canyons faculty and staff to facilitate and improve the PR process. The committee will provide leadership and guidance by reviewing comprehensive program reviews, annual plans, SLO assessment cycles, and evaluating the program review planning process.

4. **Discuss membership** – As part of the establishment of the procedures of the Program Review committee, the committee engaged in a discussion regarding membership and voting rights. The committee reviewed other community college’s membership rules for program review committees. The proposed rule regarding absences was a concern about having representation from all divisions. The committee also discussed voting rights. The committee members did not want large departments to be able to outnumber smaller departments my allowing anyone present at the meeting to vote. The committee decided that the membership rules could be revisited every year, thus allowing for flexibility and modifying the member and voting rules.

5. **Goals** –
   a. **Develop Program Review handbook/website.** A DROPBOX file was created to help facilitate the housing information and documents related to this goal. Daylene graciously volunteered to help lead team to create handbook this fall for
faculty and staff. To that end, Daylene presented her ideas for a handbook for the faculty.

i. **Screenshots** – Daylene suggested that screenshots be part of the handbook to accompany/clarify/illustrate the text.

ii. **SLO Table** – faculty need assistance with what is needed in each part of the SLO table, including sample responses.

iii. **Objectives** – Those who complete program review also need guidance on objectives especially how to determine if an objective is active, cancelled, SLO-related, or new.

iv. **Budget** – As always, faculty and staff need training regarding the budget component of the program review.

v. **College-wide Data** – A suggestion to have a bubble button where faculty can access key information without having to close the program review and open additional windows.

vi. **Glossary** – Moreover, a committee member suggested a glossary of key terms, phrases, and data is accessible while in the program review.

vii. **File upload and size** – Another suggestion was to allow additional files and increase the size limit, along with examples of what should be included if programs want to upload documents into the program review.

b. **Initiate and maintain a peer review process (pilot 2013-2014 with volunteer departments/programs)** – the committee briefly considered the pilot peer review process. A suggestion was made for self-assessment/review as well as peer review thereby allowing a department to reflect on the whole program review content and process. For both the self and peer review, the committee believed that guidance such as a rubric would be helpful so that the committee sees quality analysis and reflection.

c. **Develop a procedure to evaluate the planning process** – tabled for discussion and analysis at a future committee meeting.

d. **Conduct regular Flex sessions for training** – the committee will work with Barry and Daylene to offer Flex sessions this fall on Program Review topics.

e. **Maintain ongoing communication with Departments/Divisions/Administration** – tabled for discussion and analysis at a future committee meeting.
6. **Meeting schedule** – The committee scheduled 2 more meeting for fall semester. October 26\(^{th}\) at 10:30 am and November 16\(^{th}\) at 10:30 am.

7. **New Business**

   a. **Program Review of Program Review** – tabled for discussion and analysis at a future committee meeting.

   b. **Key performance college-wide indicators** – Barry asked for the committee’s feedback about including more data in program review such as transfer rates, retention data, success, class size, etc. Concern expressed that some of data currently provided (as requested by departments in past program reviews) should be revisited. Concerning key performance indicators, departments would set goals or a target. Each year, the program review would contain data in these areas and departments would be able to comment upon and set goals regarding this data or the indicators. Many other colleges already include key indicators in program review and they are needed for accreditation. A lengthy discussion was held regarding the key indicators and how the goal-setting would work given that a lot of what is requested is dependent upon a myriad of factors, many of which are out of the faculty’s control.

Meeting adjourned at 11:57 am.
Program Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 26, 2012

Attendees: Paul Wickline & Miriam Golbert, Co-Chairs; Edel Alonzo, Nicole Faudree, Andy McCutcheon, Daylene Meuschke, Cindy Stevens, Garrett Tujague.

Meeting began at 10:40 am.

1. **Refreshments** – Paul Wickline generously provided the committee members with a continental breakfast. Daylene delivered compliment from Barry: “Paul has the best refreshments of any committee on campus.”

2. **Review minutes** – Minutes from the prior meeting were approved unanimously.

3. **OLD BUSINESS**

   A. **APR Handbook:**

   Daylene reviewed current draft of APR Handbook with committee as members asked questions and made suggestions. The following questions and concerns were raised:

   i. **Access to APR site:** Who has access, chairs only? Who can read and who can edit? How many chairs do multiple PR?

   ii. **Discussed having a generic password for “read only” access.**

   iii. **FTEF (Full-time Equivalent Faculty):** Members asked what it means and how it is calculated. Daylene will add explanation to handbook with narrative and examples on how to calculate FTEF.

   iv. **A question was raised about “Resources” tab and Daylene suggested the possibility of adding a screen shot.**

   v. **Paul asked if changes to Add/Review Program were included in handbook?**

   vi. **An error was noted on “Number of Sections Requested by Department,” which should be changed to “… by Academic Affairs.”**

   vii. **Members suggested adding a link to “Avoiding Common Pitfalls” as well as making a clearer distinction between “Department Objectives” and SLO/Learning Objectives.**

Daylene plans to incorporate suggested changes to APR Handbook in time to share with Department Chairs for November FLEX sessions.
B. There was also discussion of creating a Guidebook for Completing PR which deals with broader content issues of the PR process as opposed to the nuts and bolts addressed by the Handbook. The following suggestions were made:
   i. Consult Crafton Hills document as an example for addressing broader concerns of PR process.
   ii. Create a more user-friendly document with tabs or FAQs (Crafton Hills documents is overwhelming at 700 pages).
   iii. Create an index with five to ten questions and “go to” links for easier navigation.
   iv. Nicole asked how to assess and enter degree and certificate programs that are similar or identical. Paul suggested consulting ACCJC to see what they suggest and/or sending out on listserve.

C. **FLEX training sessions update:**
   Two flex sessions are scheduled for this year: one in December and one in November. Paul suggested another more thorough flex session for January of 2013.

D. **Review Committee Procedures:**
   Note – goal is to present these to Academic Senate at 11/8 meeting for discussion. Academic Senate vote for approval on 11/22 meeting.
   i. The subject of standing members and faculty members was discussed.
   ii. Paul pointed out that stricken item B.3.iii was left in operating agreement just to see how others do it.
   iii. PR cycles of other schools that use three and six year models were discussed.
   iv. Member suggested need to discussing pros and cons of all departments doing PR at once.
   v. Section 4B Membership Structure was added to Operating Agreement by Paul.
   vi. Need for clarifying “the goal” in section IV.ii was brought up.
   vii. Members suggested professional development based on themes of department PR.
   viii. Daylene will provide a link to PAC B within the APR site.

Paul will revise document with suggestions from committee.

4. **NEW BUSINESS:** The items below were tabled for November’s meeting.
   A. Budget Module
B. “Validation” process (see pages 39-41 of “Program Review – Setting The Standard” and sample RUBRICS in intranet APR committee area)

1) **Self Analysis** – last step of APR process. Online form?

2) Initiate and maintain a **peer review process** (pilot 2013-2014 with volunteer departments/programs)

Develop a procedure to evaluate the Program Review Process

Next meeting will be 11/16 @ 10:30 AM.

Meeting adjourned at 12 noon.
Program Review Committee Minutes

11/16/2012

Members present: Paul Wickline (chair), Cindy Stephens, Nicole Faudree, Edel Alonso, Andy McCutheon, Daylene Meuschke, Lee Hilliard

1. Minutes approved with spelling correction made.

2. Paul provided an overview of goals of the meeting.

3. Daylene provided update on the FAQ’s/Technical Manual. Goal is to prepare this and have available for training in the spring FLEX. She is coordinating with Cathy Grandgeorge to get budget information for document.

4. Paul reminded about upcoming APR workshops planned. Three APR workshops are planned this fall and one during spring FLEX week. Clarifications provided concerning when and where workshops are being held.

5. Questions raised about elements of the committee procedures and operating agreement. Discussion about voting and responsibilities of the members concerning non-academic programs. Recommendation made to change voting language as follows:

   a. Only division representatives will have voting rights concerning academic program review processes and functions.

   b. Only administrative representatives will have voting rights concerning administrative program review processes and functions.

6. Emphasis made that the task of the program review committee when reviewing reviews is not to approve or disapprove, but to jointly cooperate to discuss processes and examine for strengths or weaknesses and completion of the program review. Language changes suggested to remove “approve” to reflect the following:

   a. All changes to procedures and forms will be submitted to constituencies for review before implementation.

7. Discussion about standing members on the committee raised. Decision to revise to allow a representative of “Professional Development Committee” and to modify “CIO or academic dean.” Changes made below:

   iii. Standing members

   1. CIO or academic dean
   2. Assistant Superintendent–Vice President, institutional development & technology or designee
   3. Academic Senate President or designee
   4. Professional Development Committee representative
   5. SLO coordinator

8. Daylene provided update on Budget Module. Updates and changes are underway to allow for submitters of program review to see the budget after it was submitted. Paul asked if a WORD report would be available for budget module output, or even
the entire program review. Edel asked for clarification about the process of how information is pulled from the budget module and how Cindy Grandgeorge formats these reports for PAC B. Edel suggested we invite Cindy to a future meeting to discuss.

9. Paul noted that there should be a clear connection between at least some of the budget requests and assessment results. This is something that needs further investigation and consideration. Concern made about the need to connect the PAC-B parameters and priorities to the APR process. Suggestion made that this topic be revisited for spring.

10. Paul referred Committee to pages 6-7 of Program Review: Setting a Standard to discuss “Role of Local Academic Senates (in Program Review Process)”

   The program review process shall promote professionalism, enhance performance, and be effective in yielding a genuinely useful and substantive process for determining program effectiveness,

   the program review process shall provide 1) an articulation of clear, relevant criteria upon which reviews will be based; 2) the establishment of reasonable and timely intervals; 3) the establishment of the specific purposes for which program reviews are conducted and articulation of those purposes to everyone involved,

   the principal purposes of the review process are to recognize and acknowledge good performance, to enhance satisfactory performance and help programs which are performing satisfactorily further their own growth, and to identify weak performance and assist programs in achieving needed improvement,

   one of the purposes of the program review process is not that of providing a mechanism or justification for program elimination;

   a program’s students, administrators, faculty and their colleagues shall all contribute to the program review, but the program’s faculty shall play a central role in the program review process and, together with appropriate administrators, assume principal responsibility for the effectiveness of the process;

   the procedures of the program review process shall foster a joint and cooperative exercise of responsibility by the faculty, administration, and governing board and shall reflect faculty and administrator expertise and authority in evaluating professional work as well as the governing board’s legal and public responsibility for the process;

   the program review process shall provide an ongoing and thorough review of the relevance and responsiveness of vocational education programs, consideration of the relationship between other similar programs
throughout the state, and the appropriate balance between vocational and general educational programs. (Scroggins and Locke, 1994, p.1)

Discussion ensued about need to involve students and/or student responses in the APR process through surveys, priority of program goals, creation of rubrics for summative assessments, student experiences in the program, courses offered, etc. Paul shared a theatre survey he uses to get student feedback concerning scheduling of courses, course offerings, etc. Paul shared concerns with response rate from students if using MY CANYONS email. Daylene suggested that the survey could be embedded in a BLACKBOARD shell/site.

11. Discussion of need for a question in the program review about student input, etc. Might consider adding.
12. Daylene suggested a FLEX session in spring to discuss how faculty are using survey results.
13. Paul referred members to pages 39-41 of Program Review Setting a Standard and Self-Evaluation/Peer Review Process for first meeting in spring. Paul suggested a 2-3 year “validation process” spreading the review of programs out over 2 to 3 year period.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM.

Next meeting: February 8 @ 10:30 AM in Mentry 246
Program Review Committee

Minutes from 2/8/13 Meeting

Present: Tammy Bathke, Miriam Golbert (co-chair), Nicole Faudree, Andy McCutheon, Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline (co-chair)

1. Minutes from last meeting were approved with correction for Cindy Grandgeorge’s name.

2. Old Business:

   a. Daylene provided an update for the on-line handbook. It is almost ready, need some input by Monday at the latest so it can be posted for faculty to use before the APR deadline of March 1st. Needs to add examples on data interpretation. Still some issues with # of students with declared majors. Need faculty input on criteria. It is a “messy” field right now, may not give departments accurate information. There is a separate screen shot for academic and administration Budget directions from Cindy. “Number of sections requested” item is still blank on Data Table. Still waiting from Academic Affairs. Committee will find out at Department Retreat if this is still necessary information. Members present agreed on the fact that the Budget module is not complicated and easy to use.

3. Flex workshops were well-attended. The committee had three in the Fall and one during Flex week. Paul mentioned he added to the last one the importance of faculty in APR decisions as per State Academic Senate.

4. “Operating Agreement” has been changed to APR Committee Procedures. It is on the Academic Senate meeting’s agenda on 2/14/13 for approval after corrections were made.

5. Committee is now looking for suggestions to APR from 3rd year update. Department chairs will be encouraged to send suggestions to the committee via their Division reps.

6. Committee still wants to have a “user friendly” web site.

7. New Business:

   a. Validation: the purpose is to give guidance, suggestions, sharing of ideas and finding interdisciplinary collaboration. Committee will like to inform departments that it will not be a “judging” process.

   b. The committee will like to start with an on-line self-evaluation of the process and then move onto Peer Review procedures. The committee will solicit input from department chairs and faculty on what worked, what didn’t, etc. in the form of a survey.

   c. An Evaluation of the PR process is also needed. The committee is revising other college’s procedures already in place.
d. Another suggestion is to place a self-reflection on the SLOs process/table/assessment to be placed on APR site.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM.

Next meeting: March 8 at 10:30 AM in Mentry Hall 246.
Program review Committee

Minutes from 3/8/13 Meeting

Present: Tammy Bathke, Miriam Golbert (co-chair), Lee Hilliard, Nicole Faudree, Ann Lowe, Andy McCutheon, Cindy Stephens, Paul Wickline (co-chair)

1. Minutes from last meeting were approved.

2. Old Business:
   a. Handbook: We need to revise the existing handbook (Thanks Daylene). A suggestion was to create it on a PDF file with scrolling pages so we can click on the separate pages as needed. Maybe include a FAQs section as well. The committee will continue discussions once Daylene returns next meeting.
   b. Validation
      1. Self-Analysis: Rubric (from the SLO’s committee) was introduced to the committee as an example. OR a “checklist” that chairs will go through making sure is completed. Other examples are posted on Dropbox. Need to encourage use of FEEDBACK on the left side of PR main menu. Many chairs don’t fill this out. Maybe add these questions at the end of program review so more chairs answer the questions.

      2. Peer review: Desire to do it before is due, but it may not be feasible because of deadlines. Certificates are programs as well. The committee needs to figure out when to do this. It will be impossible to review all programs in one semester. Peer evaluators may be pursued outside the committee, maybe with the offer of Flex credit. Maybe for the first time around chairs can individually ask other colleagues to trade and read each other’s PRs, this will be less intimidating and a true collaboration among departments. Maybe start with the members of the PR committee? Paul suggested that a post-submission revision may be useful among colleagues as well and a way of connecting the college’s strategic goals to PR. Most likely it will be a read-only password for the peer reviewers. Tammy Bathke suggested that maybe the chair and a full time faculty cam share the PR responsibilities to start mentoring others into becoming a chair in the future.

3. New Business:
   A. Problems:
      1. A Button for SLO table immediately above to group courses that are not being offered, or archived, with a text box; and the reason why they are not being assessed. It will be easier for Daylene to obtain the data and the courses that will be used.
2. Time of data collection for the Data Table needs to be revised. Some departments had incorrect number of courses that needed to be revised. There is the need to have a better communication between curicUnet and PR.

3. Increase the text box size on Department Strengths and Challenges.

4. Remember Control Z which is the “UNDO” button since we don’t have one on PR.

5. Access to the file attachments from previous year updates? Many files roll over to the PR for the current year, but may not for future years.

4. Other

   • There was an extensive discussion on timelines, deadlines, and a master calendar for chairs. Cindy S. suggested we get this calendar as a benchmark of dates and what is due at specific times. Some examples that should be included on this timeline are: Curriculum revision deadlines, Schedules, Adjunct scheduling and evaluations, APR, etc.)

   • Some changes to the Committee Procedures regarding the Division names. Need to make sure the college and Academic Senate website are the same. Paul will contact Edel to make sure we have the accurate listing and names.

   • Learning Resources has been added to the representatives needed, Peter Hepburn will be invited to join the PR committee.

   • Leslie Carr or a representative from the professional development committee is also needed.

   • Omar Torres and Cindy Dorroh are the CIO representatives on the committee.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM.

Next meeting: March 22, at 10:30 AM in Mentry Hall 246.
Program Review Committee Minutes_3-22-13

In attendance:

| Program Review Committee - Paul Wickline, Program Review Committee Procedures |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Lee Hilliard  - CTE            | Edel Alonso  - Counseling       |
| Paul Wickline  - FAPA          | Omar Torres                      |
| Daylene Meuschke                | John Wissmath  - PE/Athletics   |

Meeting began at 10:30AM.

Ann Lowe raised question about program review requirement for both Certificates of Specialization and Programs. Edel clarified that Certificates of Achievement and Degrees are tracked by Chancellor’s Office, but Certificates of Specialization are not. Question is why would we put faculty through work required

Daylene noted that ACCJC appears silent on this issue.

Question to address – Are Certificates of Specialization a program or not? If so, they will need a program review.

Paul noted that Title 5 §55000(g) defines an educational program as “an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education”

Daylene clarified that in ARCC 2.0 certificates that are more than 12 or more units are now counted in completers. Need to figure out how to submit these if they are not Chancellor’s office approved.

Paul raised question if the Certificates of Specialization are a CTE issue or General Ed. Predominantly CTE, but not all CTE are in same division.

Paul referenced information about the CTE program review process on page 10 of Program Review: Setting a Standard

“It should be noted that program review and accountability reporting for Career Technical Education programs receiving Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (VTEA) funding is much more prescribed. The data required is mandated by federal regulations and funding can be jeopardized if accountability measures are not met. The California Community College Chancellor’s Office has prepared a guide, The Instructional Program Improvement Resource Guide, to assist in meeting these mandates.”

Program Review Committee Minutes_3-22-13

ACTION ITEM: Lee and Omar said they would look into this document and see if we are following guidelines.

Paul asked if we have LOCALLY defined “what a program.” Ann noted that at Academic Senate Jennifer Brezina had offered guidance with language “in this instance and this instance only, a program is defined as...”

ACTION ITEM: Need to check with Jennifer Brezina and Lita to identify past Senate discussion. However, no action item was made.

ACTION ITEM: Need to consider DEFINING program locally for purposes of Program Review. Add to agenda for next meeting.

Minutes approved with minor punctuation corrections.

Old Business – Paul reminded that DROPBOX invite has been sent to all committee members.

Handbook for 13-14. Goal is to have something similar to SLO committee’s website. Work with Daylene to create this.

What specifically needs to be in this manual?

Edel asked if we are duplicating efforts with what is already available on SLO website. Or if we are creating tools that might not be used by faculty and wasting time.

Paul asked if it would be more useful to just create an ONLINE tool rather than a manual. Ann suggested that a manual would be useful for record keeping and documentation of decisions, definitions, etc. Edel urged caution to make sure that annual updates are done and made available to faculty. John noted importance of including contact information for topics and issues that might come up. Paul suggested a request for help form might be added to the website.

ACTION ITEM: for next meeting come back with particular items that might be useful to have in the manual. Paul needs to send this out to those not in attendance.

VALIDATION PROCESS

Paul provided overview of the Peer Review/Validation process as discussed in Program Review: Setting a Standard. Paul shared a confidential draft of a POSSIBLE schedule for both a peer review effort and a 2 year post-sharing (validation) effort which would all begin in the year 1 update in 14-15. He noted that this schedule only provides time for ACADEMIC programs.

Omar asked for clarification about timeline and the concerns about our 3 year process with annual updates and the inability to do a peer review as well as the post-review/sharing effort in a 3 year process. Faculty workload a concern. One idea – year one is peer review. Year two is doing the review and year three is sharing results with peers/committee.
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Paul expressed concerns that even a yearly update is still too comprehensive and for chairs not to feel overburdened with the addition of a validation process that something needs to change. He shared that some colleges are on a 6 year cycle with annual updates.

Ann noted Nursing’s additional 10 objectives in year 2 update. Question raised about the purpose and intent of annual update in terms of identifying objectives. Daylene and Edel noted the budget is often the driver for new objectives.

Omar asked of the program review piece has to be done every year. Can’t just the sections impacting the budget request process be done each year?

Edel asked if a process whereby a faculty in year 1 is working on the program review, year 2 it is shared with peers, and year 3 it is submitted would be a possibility.

Clarification provided that budget request is tied to both strategic goal and the program review objective.

Daylene noted that some colleges have been cited in accreditation visits for not having clear data driven budget decisions. COC has attempted to insure this doesn’t happen. The yearly updates are required to insure this occurs. Individuals still need to note the data driven decisions and budget requests on an annual basis. She noted that both budget requests and the need to identify objectives or decisions that are being made based on data. We run the risk of recommendations or sanctions if we do not maintain this practice.

**ACTION ITEM:** Daylene needs to talk with Barry about feasibility of adjusting the schedule?

Ann and Edel noted that what we make AVAILABLE to people in the update tab is under consideration by the committee, not formatting or changes to online template. Edel noted that a simple area about BUDGET and UPDATE BASED ON DATA – “Has there been any significant new data that has altered your objectives” or something like this might be considered. Then state that new objective? Include the data?

Ann noted that the peer review and validation processes might occupy faculty time rather than desire to update areas that are “optional.”

Omar noted how valuable the peer review process was for the deans when they did this one year ago. A revised, simplified version that includes only BUDGET and OBJECTIVES may be sufficient in the UPDATE years.

Edel noted that we have a 5 year window for curriculum which allows long-term planning rather than year to year planning.

Paul noted differences between peer review and post-sharing (themes, ideas, summative report). Peer review would be a more informal peer-review, buddy process, whereas the post-review sharing and report might be a more formal, “come to the program review committee and share your review with the
The post-review sharing process is really important to improve institution wide dialogue and identification of themes. Ann noted that we can identify commonalities.

Edel noted problems with how this will all work. Paul referenced to DRAFT of the timeline.

Discussion over possible timeline and problems of adding additional steps for department chairs to go through before submission is a concern.

Paul noted that a program review coordinator may be needed to assist with this process much like an SLO coordinator currently assists. This has been added to the program review committee program review.

Edel noted that it might be wise to consider an umbrella of curriculum, SLOs and programs (program evaluation – program review, curriculum and SLOs) – a joint meeting between all three on a regular basis might be helpful should this occur.

Paul noted that the validation process may hinge on having a coordinator in this position who assists with monitoring, coordinating, etc. the process. Others noted how much progress has been made because of the SLO coordinators.

Paul noted that the program review coordinator would be useful in the last step of the process to help with those department chairs and program reviews needing additional help before final submission of program review.

Paul noted that 2-3 years might be sufficient to hear from all academic programs and pull together annual summary reports and a cumulative report at the end of the 2-3 year sharing process.

Daylene summarized – Year one – all do program review, except for new programs coming on line – they start with a full review, wherever they are in the 3 year process – Year two and three split out groups to do post-review discussions. Paul noted that this is really a 6 year discussion we are having.

Omar suggested that we might consider this – ½ groups do FULL program review with the other ½ are doing peer review… then in year 2, ½ that did full review, do peer review. Then all culminates in year 3.

Daylene noted importance of looking at the strategic plan timeline if we were to entertain any changes to program review timeline. Whenever the clock starts for this new process, need to look at the timeline and alignment with strategic plan to make sure that EVERY department has completed a program review. Last strategic plan was 2012-15.

Discussion ensued about the number of ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS and the ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM REVIEWS and the feasibility of reviewing/post-discussing ALL of these in a 2 year period.

Paul clarified that the committee’s purpose was originally ACADEMIC, but we need to discuss the ADMINISTRATIVE side as well.
ACTION TASK: Omar asked if we had knowledge of other colleges who have received successful commendations from ACCJC and is going to look into this before next meeting.

General consensus that the goal is to look at the schedule of the program review process and see what is feasible to allow for both peer review and post-review in addition to the actual completion of the review.

Daylene suggested that it is very important to allow departments to add an objective every year so they can complete a budget augmentation request as they desire. Ann suggested that these new requests be DATA DRIVEN. Daylene noted that this would be very clear to faculty and others that this box is asking for the data to support the budget augmentation request.

Paul reminded that we had also discussed the goal of a SELF-ANALYSIS/RUBRIC for department chairs/faculty to use. Suggestion made that we provide this for next year’s program review update. Edel suggested that we look at the criteria on the rubric and reference TITLE V, REGULATIONS, ACCJC, etc. to demonstrate why this is part of the criterion. Identify WHY this is needed based on accreditation and best practices. "This need to be included because (Title V, Ed Code, ACCJC, etc.) Give the rationale and reason.

Omar suggested that we need to talk about the peer review process next year due to accreditation. Paul suggested pilot program process of peer review for next year.

Paul suggested calendar and timeline for program review process.

ACTION ITEM: When are due dates? Check with Barry. When is the latest possible STAGE 1 deadline.

Edel suggested streamlining of calendar would be helpful. Provide deadlines that faculty only need to know.

Omar and Edel noted that they would each talk to Joe Gerda about need for a program review coordinator for the future.

Ann and Edel noted the growth of complexity of requirements in curriculum, SLOs, etc and how this creates fatigue on the part of the faculty.

ACTION ITEM – reminder that we need to collect suggestions for changes to PROGRAM REVIEW year 3 update.

Paul reviewed changes to template.

ACTION ITEM – we need to see if Barry and Noris have made changes to APR SLO tables. Edel asked about budget prioritization communication back to department chairs after prioritization has been completed. Also – additional column in budget area about whether augmentation was funded?

Paul noted and provided examples of SURVEY QUESTIONS for the last step of the program review process. Discussion about the need and usefulness of a survey after faculty have complete program
Program Review Committee Minutes_3-22-13

review. Suggestion made that we send this out separately through SURVEY MONKEY. Embed LINK to the survey as it would be confidential that way. Daylene noted that the questions would need to be completed AFTER the level 3 budget process. This speaks to the Program Review rubric and an institution’s assessment of the APR process.

Paul reviewed the Program Review for the Program Review Committee and entertained questions.

ACTION ITEM -- Daylene requested clarification about MAJORS DATA and how to go forward with this in 2013. Add to AGENDA for next meeting.

Meeting concluded at 12:00PM
Program review Committee

Minutes from 4/19/13 Meeting

Present: Cindy Dorroh, Miriam Golbert (co-chair), Peter Hepburn, Lee Hilliard, Nicole Faudree, Ann Lowe, Renee Marshall (for Cindy Stephens), Paul Wickline (co-chair)

1. Minutes from last meeting were approved with corrections on typos and instead of “risk of sanctions” (page 3) “recommendations and sanctions”.

2. Old Business:
   a. Still deciding on what is a “Program.” Request for additional information was sent to Jennifer Brezina and Barry Gribbons. Item tabled until committee hears back from them.
   b. Discussion on which PR to complete; Admin versus Academic. It depends on the program/department/area. Counseling completes both because if the number of courses they teach. SLOs assessment/faculty involvement/objectives related to instruction need to be reported on the Academic side. For other programs such as DSPS, EOPS, Library, TLC, the committee recommends the Academic Senate to instruct these departments/areas to complete the Administrative with the inclusion of their single courses SLOs and assessment. Unless, there is a desire to complete both. For orphan courses and/or degrees (i.e. Social Sciences degrees) should be under their respective Divisions.
   c. Handbook: getting suggestions from questions Daylene usually gets from chairs working on APR. Majors Data Table: Daylene will add the number of active students that took 3 or more classes on the discipline along with the declared majors. A recommendation was made to also add how to interpret the data on the table and the connection with college-wide data. A suggestion was made on what is needed in each year and how to tie anything new to the year’s revisions. Also, the importance of relating SLOs data to new objectives and budget planning.
   d. Validation
      1. Self-Analysis: Rubric (from the SLO’s committee) posted on Dropbox. Committee members were asked to review it and a draft will be completed during next meeting on 5/3/13.
      2. Peer review: Pre and post submission sharing
         A comment was made that this is a very productive and efficient way of sharing and finding connection between areas. Deans shared their program reviews last time and they found ways of maximizing resources. The timeline for Program Review may need to be adjusted to accomplish this without increase of work load for faculty and reviewers. Nicole suggested the committee should rename the “Validation Peer Review” process to “Committee Sharing”. The main issue is not to overburden the faculty.
      3. Adjustment to APR schedule: Daylene shared that it will be difficult to have half the departments doing it one year and half the next (during year 1) because of the connection to Strategic Plan and Budget. Daylene suggested streamlining the year 2 and 3 updates taking out the narrative of three questions and leaving objectives, SLOs update, and budget. Data table should be left in but the committee should communicate to the faculty that there is no need to justify changes every year. A suggestion was made to have the program review in a 4-year cycle instead of 3 to allow for the pre and post sharing
submissions to occur. The 4th year can be used to address the SMART goals, sharing, or closing the loop. Daylene will consult with Barry on this. The conversation will continue. The handout (from the task force committee three years ago) provides some suggestions and questions and it will be reviewed at the next meeting about ways to start the peer review process. Compensation of reviewers was addressed, maybe Flex credit can be offered. There are many positives that come out of the peer review and it should be conveyed to the faculty that it is not a judgment on their program review, but a very helpful process.

4. New Business:

A. Daylene went over changes to APR template for Noris to start working on for the year 3 update along with the Budget component. Addition of an example of SMART goals will be incorporated on the SLO. Addition of text box above the SLOs table for archived/not offered courses. Budget prioritization to be posted on the APR budget link (along with the already posted “funded-non funded”). Deans budget augmentations rankings should also be posted on PR site. Strength and challenges section needs to increase word count. Program review deadline: right now is extended as far back as possible. It is set at March 1st. A suggestion was made that this deadline should be a part of the calendar committee.

B. Omar is still checking on ACCJC recommendations made to other colleges in regards to program review.

Other Issues:

A conversation on the need to have a Program Review coordinator with release time similar to the SLOs coordinators took place. Next year there will be just two SLOs coordinators instead of three, maybe some of the release time can be re-allocated to this new position. The committee has invested a large amount of time with recommendations for Validation (pre and post submissions review) and changes to the on-line program review template. To implement the committee’s recommendations a point person needs to be assigned. Paul has included this need in the “Program Review” program review. Conversations with Academic Affairs (Audrey Green) need to take place to request this position.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM. Next meeting: May 3, 2013, at 10:30 AM in Mentry Hall 246.
1. Minutes approved with edits.

2. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Definition of Program (see attached)

Information from Academic Senate was not found other than Jennifer Brezina’s presentation. Ann mentioned that we should look into the SLOs implications/discussions on this topic. Many departments have multiple programs/certificates. Committee should provide guidelines to AS on what a program is. Middle ground is where basic skills for example are considered a pathway, or departments that don’t have a specific degree (Econ, Chemistry). Because of budget reasons and how it is tied to program review we need to consider those instances. Needs to have a definition of objectives. Title 5 is broad to include everything (program, degree, certificate, or pathway). We can have the definition from the SLOs committee. The committee may suggest to those departments without a definite degree or certificate to define their “objective” for their program, even if they don’t assess their program. Although, many of them are still obtaining data on their programs. Committee will come up with a definition to send to Academic Senate.

Education Code from Ann Lowe in regards to CTE; need to review these programs every TWO years. Currently, it is not on our program review. If a CTE program has funding from Perkins, they need to review every two years. Not all CTE programs have Perkins, so we need to include all of them. Extra requirements forced upon the CTE programs. To be in compliance “the Governing Board of the District” needs this verification every TWO years. Same with co-requisites and pre-requisites need to be reviewed every TWO years (all curricula). Supplemental form checking boxes that we are reviewing every two years? From the CTE
addendum we can create a checklist to make it easier for departments and keep the narrative as part of program review. Ann Lowe will send the Ed Code requirements to Daylene to add the checklist to the on-line program review. Committee proposes we do this every year to make it less complicated. CTE representative questions how to measure success/completion/employment. It is hard to get job placement. Very difficult to track employment, especially when students take it as a supplement NOT to find employment but to get the skills. Nursing makes individual calls to follow up on employment putting an enormous amount of time. How can chairs do this?

B. Program Review deadlines TABLED
Paul shared the conversation he had with Barry. There are concerns with the 4-year cycle the committee proposed because of the Strategic Plan data. Pre and post sharing will be difficult in the current cycle. Are other colleges doing this? And what kind of cycles are other colleges using? We want to create a system to have a good experience especially at the pre-sharing, otherwise what is the purpose of the process? Many goals roll over anyway from year 1 and 2 onto year 3.
Committee will impress the need to follow ACCJC guidelines on the importance of the sharing aspect which is required by accreditation standards.

C. Handbook for 13-14: Suggestions for items?
Survey to department chairs on suggestions. Reach out to new chairs that may have used Daylene’s current handbook (such as Lisa Malley, Tina Rorick, Jia-Yi, Diana Stanich, and others).

D. “Validation”
1) Self Analysis – last step of APR process. Online form?
Rubrics in DROPBOX from many colleges were reviewed. Maybe a simple checklist is better to assess our own program review. Maybe pull samples from our program review to address our issues. Check with James GG or Omar that have served in Accreditation committees so the self-assessment follows what is required by accreditation. ACCJC rubric is not that explanatory. Page 46 from the Academic senate program review standards handbook explains what the self-assessment should be. Program review needs to be assessed on efficiency and SLOs in terms of student success. It also refers to how program review is being shared college-wide.
Ann was asked by the accreditation committee last time on how her PR had helped her department obtain something. This is an awkward question; maybe we can collect that kind of information on the post-sharing (?)
Fresno City college self-evaluation rubric: it can also be the peer review rubric as well. This is a good example. CTE program comments from Dean seem generic enough that can be addressed on this rubric, provided we tailor it to our own program review. Maybe start this process in year 3 (?). Page 14 of handout also has good items to consider. Check Coastline, Southwest colleges (one-pager forms).
University of La Verne’s is a bit more extensive. Some elements are good from this example. Some of the examples deal with termination of program procedures. By the end of Fall semester the committee should put something together for the chairs to use in February 2014. Committee will focus primarily on academic program review, maybe later including administrative ones. We can then establish a timeline, presentations every week. Orphan
courses are now with the Deans, so committee needs to figure it out what to do with those. Flex week can be used to do the peer review? Meeting with the committee is a more informal way. During Flex we can model what a peer review session may look like so faculty understands what it is (Spring 2014?).

2) Initiate and maintain a peer review process (pilot 2013-2014 with volunteer departments/programs)
Perhaps initiate this as well along with the self-evaluation rubric.

3) Post-submission sharing
Purpose to determine what happens to PR after submission and how PAC-B relates to that. Transparency is important.

4) Adjustment to APR schedule
Waiting for Barry’s input.

E. Changes to PR process for year 3 update (13-14)
Timeline for suggestions to Barry:
Right now is set at March 1st as the latest possible one. Need to check with Barry on this again.

Prioritization and feasibility of proposed changes
Proposed Changes:
Email from Daylene with proposed changes about the elimination of some final 3 questions at the end in years 1 and 2 (strengths, challenges, enrollment management. Should we survey the chairs before the change? Most chairs will be in agreement with the change, as they will still have a text box to address any of the changes they feel they need to add to the program review. It will be presented as a condensed version of the last three.

F. Evaluating the Program Review Process
Simple survey from Daylene to ask more useful questions to chairs. Paul and Daylene will have a draft possibly for next meeting.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. Outcome/Performance Indicators in PR (PAUL)
Paul attended a CPT meeting where Performance Indicators were discussed. Brainstorming session at CPT on how to improve performance indicators. Next step is to create a matrix on how to match indicators and activities (student success, etc.). How is this affecting PR? What is department doing in regards to these performance indicators? This is another issue that chairs need to address. Suggestion was made to do this “brainstorming” at the chair’s retreat. It can be a good conversation. If we add it to PR, will be an imposition on chairs to come up with something else. Paul’s proposal was to include it on PR because it is easily accessible. Chairs don’t need one more issue to address. Institutional Research office should be able extract what they need from PR. Maybe in the future, chairs will be more apt to addressing this issue on PR.

B. Department Website UPDATE in PR (PAUL)
LEAP project to include this on PR to make sure departments are updating their website. Updating websites is work; this is another issue that cannot be imposed on chairs because we
don’t have the support. This is not an academic issue, it is institutional. College’s website needs updating first.

C. Other issues?

Leslie Carr has asked to step down from this committee.

Tammy Bathke will not be returning to the committee next year, she will be starting a PhD program.

**COC DEFINITION OF “PROGRAM”**

I did some looking and I can’t seem to find the document we all were thinking of that went to the Senate. But I did find this in the SLO handbook:

**Step 1: Decide how many programs your department has.**

Title 5 defines a program as “an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education”

- Programs can also be defined as “student pathways”
- Programs are often organized by academic disciplines and departments, but not always
- Many departments may have multiple programs – the number will vary by the number of degrees and certificates and also by student pathways through the department’s offerings
- Your department may have a course or two that is part of another department’s program
- Some departments may not have a program solely contained within the department – they may, instead, be part of the GE program and/or one of the General Arts and Sciences degrees

Clear as mud, right? ☑

Jennifer Brezina

Division Dean, Humanities

**From:** Gribbons, Barry  
**Sent:** Friday, April 19, 2013 4:41 PM  
**To:** Wickline, Paul; Brezina, Jennifer  
**Cc:** Alonso, Edel  
**Subject:** RE: Definition of a PROGRAM

I recall a couple discussions over the past 8 years or so. There was some discussion about limiting it to just those on the approved list from CCCCO. Other discussions that any group of
courses commonly taken could be considered a program. At the time, we decided to allow flexibility at the department level in deciding what was a program. My guess is that the last discussion was about four years ago, though that’s a very rough guess. Jennifer, does that bring back any memories?
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In attendance:
Miriam Golbert, Paul Wickline, Tammy Bathke, Daylene Meuschke, Nicole Faudree, Andy McCutcheon, Cindy Dorroh

Old Business:

- Need to identify a representative from Student Services
- Reviewed the “Is General Education A ‘Program’ in the Senate’s Program Review: Setting a Standard
- Reviewed handout from Paul summarizing information on defining a program from ACCJC and other colleges (see attached)
- Develop a definition of a program for the Administrative Program Reviews (Daylene and Barry by end of Fall 2013)
- Confirmed changes to PR process for Year 3 update (see attached)
- Announced that Program Review would open on May 24 for 2013-14 AY
- Changes made to Levels 2 & 3 in the budget module will be made between May and October
- Evaluating Program Review Process:
  - Identified changes to Program Review Survey questions from handout provided by Paul (see attached). Daylene to program draft survey and send to committee for review in early fall 2013.
  - Obtain feedback submitted through the Program Review process in 2012-13 (Daylene)

New Business:

- CTE Addendum Checklist – Identified changes needed to CTE Addendum in program review which included:
  - Add question that reads “What similar training programs exist in the surrounding area or nearby colleges in the South Central Regional Consortium?”. This question should follow the question that asks them “What sources of information do you have to support your conclusions?”
  - Add question that reads “Please comment on how the program’s industry advisory committee has been involved in the preparation or review of the program’s annual program review.”
- Curriculum Review Question (prereq/coreq check) on APR Year 1 – will be part of the curriculum process
1. Minutes approved with amends. Thanks to Daylene.

2. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Definition of Program

1) Program discontinuance policy, broader but follows Title 5. Self-assessment is important no matter if academic or administrative. Program review should be a way of improving departments, programs, courses, to benefit our students and not just a validation for budget requests (although they should be connected). Emphasize program improvement. Once again the benefit of the peer review process is important to demonstrate the benefits to the department, not just obtaining funding.

Definition: Handout discussing ACCJC, Title 5, Board policy. Good definition from Skyline college. Transfer included in GE? Expectation of Title 5 to have a District definition of GE. Academic Senate review of the minutes shows GE definition on the Associate degree policy. Programs that don’t lead to a degree (i.e. Economics) Definition needs to match the matrix from Academic Affairs list of programs and certificates. Paul will contact Patrick for a revised list. GE language forwarded to Policy Council on Senate website under minutes on February 2012, (5920.4). It also reflects the college’s philosophy about GE. First reading should be in October/November. ISLOs if LEAP is considered, we need to address this definition as well (SLOs committee will address this). Use the same as the one on Program Discontinuance policy. Better to use a loose definition (collection of courses with a common objective/goal). Maybe revising mission, vision, and operating APR operation procedures to include the definition already approved by Senate and the Board. Stand-alone courses cannot be a program (not associated with any degree or certificate), but what about the EMT course that leads to a certificate (then it is a program because it leads to a certificate even if it is only a
course). Same as CAN course that leads to an unofficial certificate. They are included on the program review. Cannot change Title 5 language; but technically, a single course could be a sequence of just one. CNA and EMT are single courses, not a department, but part of one included in program review. Academic Senate is proposing a revision to the Program Discontinuance policy to address creating of new programs (more of a viability policy). Maybe have a clarifying sentence that a single course could be a program if it leads to a specific outcome. Discussion is worthwhile to make sure the definition is clear to all. It may be more difficult to determine the initiation of a program.

B. Program Review deadlines
   Last year the deadline was pushed up a week (March 1st) and created a lot of problems with Level 2 and 3 that got behind. Due on **February 24, 2014 for Level**

   1. Will be presented to Department Chairs during retreat. Departments should start the discussion with their colleagues early October. Paul will send out a timeline for chairs, especially new ones would appreciate benchmarks.

C. Handbook for 13-14
   1. Working on it, as well as a web site with resources (Daylene & Paul).
   2. Reach out to new chairs from 12-13, Paul got lots of voice mails, will keep trying to make contact with them.

D. “Validation” (More discussion during our next meeting)
   2) Initiate and maintain a peer review process: expectations and setting standards (from Academic Senate handbook). Where does the program review go after submission? Sharing of ideas, desire to have peer evaluation before submission. Make it effective and efficient. Post-submission sharing as well.
   3) Timeline, schedule on APR will also be discussed.
   4) Review Rubrics on Dropbox before next meeting.

E. Evaluating the Program Review Process
   1. Survey will be presented at the department chairs retreat using a presentation with clickers (Miriam). Use data for the write up of the evaluation process. Include questions on Strategic plan and Educational & Master Plan.

3. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Request for goals from the committee (Dr. Buckley).
   B. Deal with Year 1 changes coming up next year.
   C. Sharing ideas about APR, invite Jerry to attend a specific meeting.
   D. Other issues: Review other schools processes (look at some model processes:}
Crafton Hills has a nice web site, Palomar, Chaffey, & San Diego Mesa colleges.

4. Meeting adjourned at 12:15 PM
1. Minutes approved with amendments

2. OLD BUSINESS:

- The committee approved adding “Dean, Instructional Support & Student Success” to the procedures as a committee member. That position is currently held by Denee Pescarmona.
- The definition of an academic program is still pending. The committee briefly discussed the definition of an administrative program. The following definition was submitted: *Administrative programs for the purpose of Administrative Program Review can be areas, offices, departments, divisions, or even committees that are not an educational program. Not all committees, areas, offices, departments, or divisions must complete a program review. However, if the areas, offices, departments, divisions, or committees which to request a budget, they must complete an Administrative Program Review.* There was concern that “…not an educational program” might not define the issue well enough. This will be revisited.
- The 13-14 Handbook is still pending
- Program Review Website – no update
- Data coaches: a meeting was held to discuss who would make a good 1:1 data coaches for faculty desiring to learn how to use data better in program review. Groups of people experienced with data were suggested. One issue is the fact that there is no compensation for coaches. Also these people tend to be involved with multiple projects already. Rooms for the group sessions on using data were requested for October 30 (3-5 pm) and November 2 (10-12). Paul and Miriam will send out invitations to all faculty to attend. Dr. Buckley may also want to encourage attendance.
- Program review training sessions for later in the fall semester were also discussed, but no dates were established.

3. New Business:
• Dr. Buckley will be invited to the 11-15-13 meeting to discuss the peer validation process.
• An extensive discussion followed around the form of the peer validation process. Key points:
  o This a 2 part process: 1. Before the program review is turned in to help with the writing process and using data, and 2. After the program review is turned in to focus on recurrent themes.
  o The committee considered adopting a 6 year cycle for reviewing program reviews despite the fact that the actual cycle will probably remain a 3 year cycle.
  o How to incorporate Administrative Program Reviews into this process was briefly addressed. A steering committee like that used in the SLO Committee was suggested.
  o Rubrics and summary forms were examined. The relative merits of different styles were briefly discussed.
  o *Program Review: Setting A Standard* page 39 was read to help inform the whole committee of the purpose of having a post review of all program reviews. Additionally the connection to the accreditation process was addressed.
  o Various methods of getting faculty to engage in this change were also discussed, but no plan was adopted. This is an area for further discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 pm
1. Minutes approved with amendments

2. OLD BUSINESS:

- The committee approved adding “Dean, Instructional Support & Student Success” to the procedures as a committee member. That position is currently held by Denee Pescarmona.
- The definition of an academic program is still pending. The committee briefly discussed the definition of an administrative program. The following definition was submitted: *Administrative programs for the purpose of Administrative Program Review can be areas, offices, departments, divisions, or even committees that are not an educational program. Not all committees, areas, offices, departments, or divisions must complete a program review. However, if the areas, offices, departments, divisions, or committees which request a budget, they must complete an Administrative Program Review.* There was concern that “…not an educational program” might not define the issue well enough. This will be revisited.
- The 13-14 Handbook is still pending
- Program Review Website – no update
- Data coaches: a meeting was held to discuss who would make a good 1:1 data coaches for faculty desiring to learn how to use data better in program review. Groups of people experienced with data were suggested. One issue is the fact that there is no compensation for coaches. Also these people tend to be involved with multiple projects already. Rooms for the group sessions on using data were requested for October 30 (3-5 pm) and November 2 (10-12). Paul and Miriam will send out invitations to all faculty to attend. Dr. Buckley may also want to encourage attendance.
- Program review training sessions for later in the fall semester were also discussed, but no dates were established.

3. New Business:
• Dr. Buckley will be invited to the 11-15-13 meeting to discuss the peer validation process.
• An extensive discussion followed around the form of the peer validation process. Key points:
  o This a 2 part process: 1. Before the program review is turned in to help with the writing process and using data, and 2. After the program review is turned in to focus on recurrent themes.
  o The committee considered adopting a 6 year cycle for reviewing program reviews despite the fact that the actual cycle will probably remain a 3 year cycle.
  o How to incorporate Administrative Program Reviews into this process was briefly addressed. A steering committee like that used in the SLO Committee was suggested.
  o Rubrics and summary forms were examined. The relative merits of different styles were briefly discussed.
  o Program Review: Setting A Standard page 39 was read to help inform the whole committee of the purpose of having a post review of all program reviews. Additionally the connection to the accreditation process was addressed.
  o Various methods of getting faculty to engage in this change were also discussed, but no plan was adopted. This is an area for further discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 pm