

Program Review Committee
Friday, September 4, 2009
10am – 12:00pm
Boardroom

Minutes

Present: Zach DeLoach, Rachel Anderson, Cindy Hooper, Steve Brown, Hillary Reed, Dave Banducci, Nikiya McWilliams, Marjorie Carson, Keith Snow-Flamer, Brady Reed, Vinnie Peloso, Lynn Thiesen, Michelle Hancock, Karen Nelson, Maggie Lynch, Melody Pope, Toby Green, Todd Olsen Crislyn Parker, Recorder

1. Program Review Calendar

- All subject areas are required to do an annual program review. We are looking at instruction and student services.
- The list of programs and disciplines annual and comprehensive program review due dates are posted on the Program Review site, accessed by going to www.inside.redwoods.edu and follow the Program Review link.
- Marjorie will check to see how often to re-do comprehensive program reviews on programs with flags: Three additional programs were tentatively put on the comprehensive review list: Marine Technology, Culinary and HPRT.
- It is established that Comprehensive Program Reviews for technical programs are to be completed every two years.
- Vice President Marjorie Carson will check with Chancellor's office to determine if the College needs to complete another Marine Technology program review, since a detailed comprehensive review was completed in the 2008-2009, which contains a strong body of information documenting compliance with process.
- Those Programs that have comprehensive program reviews due will *pull and include* the pieces from the annual form that inform various sub-committees, (to be included in the integrated planning process); they do not have to complete an annual program review.
- A request was made to double-check the Program Review calendar dates for all annuals and comprehensive program reviews, as there seem to be some errors. (Dental Assisting was listed as a completed comprehensive in 08-09 and was actually an annual; Medical Assisting did not complete one at all.) *Note: The correction was made to the program review website. Dental Assisting is now listed as having a completed annual program review in 08-09. The Program Review Committee needs to determine when the Dental Assisting Comprehensive review comes due and try to align it with the Program accreditation.*

Revised Calendar

- It was suggested that more explanatory detail be included:
 - The exact roles of the authors.
 - How authors are to circulate their documents district-wide to reach consensus prior to being submitted to PR. (For example, the Distance Ed Dean should see program reviews from disciplines that offer online courses).
 - Where authors will post the completed reviews (back to the IR site?).
 - Include that Program Review authors need to identify themselves, co-authors and collaborators.

- Concerns were voice over the two day midweek turnaround for faculty to make revisions (see * on lower right of the calendar). It would help if faculty could have the weekend.
- It was noted at this point that the follow-up report has to be received by the ACCJC committee on October 15 and it must include Program Review. Prior to this, the report must be ratified by Board.
- The Academic Senate will receive and approve the best rough draft of the follow-up report on September 14. They must sign the ratification page of the report, prior to October 12 final report.
- Maggie created immediate access (MyCr) to all members of the program review committee. The rest of the campus has a (join) read-only access right now. Maggie needs the names of those who will post.
- There was discussion as to what happens if author(s) decide not to do their program review or refuse or are unable to make their revisions in the timeline. In the Program Committee debrief from last year, it was determined there must be a process in place for those not doing program review; there must be a stick not a carrot. It was determined this is a discussion for another meeting.
- A suggestion was made that *all* program reviews be submitted later, as an addendum. A non-official vote was begun, but it was decided that all completed reviews will be included in the report, either as a sample of evidence or as partial evidence with the remaining submitted as an addendum.
- Discussion then revolved around rushing the process versus establishing a quality process; compliance versus non-compliance. There is supposed to be collaboration, but in rushing, collaboration and quality might not be possible.
- In summary, is it the mandate (of ACCJC) that we develop a reasonable, logical and sustainable process that everyone can do or do we rush and in the future make it a reasonable, logical, sustainable process? Will the Commission want to see that we are developing a good sustainable system that we are implementing now and can't complete within the timeline or should we rush the process?
- It is believed the Accreditation Commission does not want to see planning the plan, they want evidence that we have sufficiently demonstrated that we are living the plan and are finished or near enough finished to include what is completed as evidence.
- Student Services and probably Athletics will complete by September 18 and Keith will build in milestones for others to participate in the calendar.
- ***After a general discussion, it was agreed that the calendar timeline will remain as is listed, with the exception of extending the revision due date to one week.***
- It is noted that the last group will not have extra time for revisions.
- It was discussed that good information, up front, on how to complete the program review forms will simplify the process for all faculty and how this can be accomplished.
- A suggestion that the Program Review Committee form an assistance team for faculty who are overwhelmed with this process was made. Program Review Committee members in the discipline can be a mentor for the faculty doing the review.
- Another suggestion is to send an email to all faculty and associate faculty, asking do you who need help and the committee will schedule time(s) for some training. This can be a flex activity, repeated annually as part of the Program Review process. (Kevin Yokoyama was nominated as being very experienced person in writing program reviews.)

2. Program Review Committee Process (mirroring Curriculum)

- The PRC will assign subcommittees to review a section or sections of each of the program reviews (for consistency).
 - a. Instruction review forms include 14 sections plus forms in 30-40 annual and five or six comprehensive program reviews.
 - b. Instruction sections:
 - 1) Enrollment, 2) Success, 3) Retention, 4) Basic skills,
 - 5) Labor market, 6) Budget resources, 7) Library resources,
 - 8) Faculty & Staff, 9) Facilities & Tech, 10) Learning Outcomes,
 - 11) Curriculum Updates, 12) Action plans, 13) Goals & plans,
 - 14) Other
 - c. Student Services will have 13 or 14 departments completed by 9/18, consisting of 3 sections each:
 - 1) Listing or a brief paragraph of the accomplishments for this year and the goals for coming year.
 - 2) Learning outcomes - SLO, PLO; to identify what they had in place and assessed last year or if in place last year, to be sure they are identified for fiscal year 2010.
 - 3) Wish list and/or needed resources, including staffing, equipment, technology, facilities, professional development and any other not covered by budget.
- Student Services and Instructional forms have the following same resource forms: staffing, technology, equipment, facilities, professional development and other needs.
- ***It is agreed the subcommittees will include both faculty and staff for both Instruction and Student Services reviews. It is agreed that Maggie, Cindy, Lynn, Hillary, Dave and Vinnie will create a draft of sub-committee members to be finalized and approved in the September 11 meeting.***

3. Assessment Analysis Forms

- *Assessment analysis documents clarification:* The documents submitted by the Assessment Committee included two forms, two samples and one set of instructions.
- The *Assessment Analysis of Course Sections* is a worksheet. It is the student learning outcomes for individual courses with the caveat that everyone involved in assessment would use this form to work out their assessment and it was agreed that faculty would download, fill in and return this form to the area coordinator who would then compile and put all data into the second form – the *Discipline Analysis Form*.
- The *Discipline Analysis Form* is the one posted by IR on the website.
- It was suggested that the only revisions needed are to label the assessment analysis for course sections as a worksheet and the Discipline Analysis Form as the one to be posted on the IR website.

4. FT Faculty Request Form

- There were two separate faculty request forms – one generated by the administration and one included in the program review forms. The administration form is not included in the program review document.
- The administrative form which is data driven was problematic requiring projected enrollments, for (5) years. The data that was provided for the “enrollment projection” chart on last year’s administratively authored FT faculty request form was difficult to interpret”.

- Of the two forms, one more “narratively” oriented and the second was more data orientated (projected enrollments).
- It was agreed that Rachel will look at both forms and put together a form that might meet common ground and approval, and bring to next September 11 meeting. These will take into consideration non-teaching faculty as well. Form is for hiring faculty not staffing; both non teaching faculty and teaching faculty. The committee agreed that this form will be due at a later program review calendar date, because of the lateness of new form and the shared governance process.

Other

- *Review of 8/38/09 revised Minutes:* Marjorie and Crislyn reviewed the original August 28th minutes sent out to members on 9/3/09. The intent was to have clear minutes if we post this as evidence for the ACCJC follow-up report and future reference
- A suggestion was made to re-include some language that was removed (highest level of shared governance) in the fifth paragraph, beginning, “Program review is the blueprint...”
- A suggestion was made to include the date the Academic Senate Program Review Committee members are approved.
- It was decided that the Committee review both sets of minutes and submit any corrections to Crislyn via email and for approval at the September 11 meeting.
- *Dates:* It is confirmation that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges/Community College League of CA is sending a group for role clarification and a workshop on 9/28 at 4pm and 9/29 all day. (The workshop will be on what are all staff responsibilities in shared governance)
- Accreditation Self-Study, October 9: ACCJC is only allowing 20 previously-identified members to attend the training. Academic Senate will name a group of people to co chair the various pieces of self-study. CR needs and overarching team with two co-chairs and co-chairs for each of the four accreditation standards.
- The next program review meeting is September 11, 2009, 10am to 12pm. The location has yet to be determined.
- Meeting Adjourned.

Program Review Committee
Friday, September 11, 2009
10am – 12:00pm
LRC 103 (Multipurpose Room)

Minutes

Present: Rachel Anderson, Dave Banducci, Marjorie Carson, Zach DeLoach, Toby Green, Michelle Hancock, Bill Honsal, Cindy Hooper, Maggie Lynch, Nikiya McWilliams, Karen Nelson, Todd Olsen, Vinnie Peloso, Mike Peterson, Melody Pope, Brady Reed, Hillary Reed, Keith Snow-Flamer, Martha Davis, ad-hoc, Crislyn Parker, recorder

Absent: Steve Brown, Anita Janis, Geisce Ly, Lynn Thiesen

Approval of Minutes

The September 4, 2009 Minutes will be approved on the basis of the following changes:

- After general discussion it was agreed to change bullet point two wording from “programs” to “subject and service areas,” to accommodate both instructional and student services.
- (Keith and Marjorie will provide clarifying language for bullet point eight.)
- Bullet five under the topic of the *Revised Calendar* is corrected to show the committee agreed to extend the revision deadline to one week for all program reviews.
- Bullet two under Item 4, Full Time Faculty Request Form has been corrected to read
- It was agreed that committee members both present and absent are to be noted in the minutes.

Agenda Items

1. Role of staff Program Review Committee (PRC) members in evaluating the Instructional forms, and the role of faculty PRC members in evaluating the Student Services forms.
 - Concern was expressed that there would be an imbalance between staff and faculty on the program review section sub-committees. After a general discussion it was decided that balance between faculty and staff has been achieved by the distribution of program review committee members for each sub-committee assignment.
 - There was general discussion on how to inform the college at large and it was determined that the tools are already in place: the program review website and MyCr. It was discussed and agreed that another email inviting/reminding the campus they can join and review.
 - A request was made to post minutes, post calendar and current committee membership on the current Program Review Website.
 - There was discussion about the rubrics for evaluating program reviews and it was agreed the committee will start with last year’s summary rubrics, have each subgroup look at the rubric and make modifications for their section and bring drafts to the September 18 meeting. It was also agreed the rubric should be made public for comment and future suggestions.
 - After general discussion it was agreed a mission statement needs to be formulated and should be included on the rubric.

2. Discuss the potential problem of having staff PRC members working over the weekends in order to evaluate Instructional and Student Services forms.
 - Discussion brought resolution that all committee members are salaried Managers and structurally able to work over weekends with the exception of one classified person who will confirm with her supervisor to doing PRC work on Mondays and Tuesdays until noon.

3. The next step: What role will IT, Maintenance, and other functional groups have in processing these forms once they are completed and publically posted? For example: will IT have veto power over a program's request for technology.
 - It was discussed and agreed that Agenda item three and nine can be combined except for the IT question.
9. An update from the co-chairs of the PRC describing how Program Review forms are going to be integrated into the larger planning and budget functions of the college.
 - The broader answer to all these questions, is that the various forms, including technology, becomes a function of Integrated Planning.
 - Following more in depth discussion on how Program Review becomes part of Integrated Planning and budget raised more questions on how it will be accomplished this year. Last year, it seemed, the Integrated Planning loop was incomplete and the only structural link was instructional equipment block grants and action plans.
 - The concern is that the College has not integrated Program Review adequately into the planning process. How is all the work PRC does substantively benefit the college. We need to provide evidence to ACCJC that we have made progress on the issue of integrated planning and the impact of program review and budget. A suggestion was made that Senior staff provide a brief synopsis of how program review is going to be integrated and how presented to ACCJC committee.
 - A flow chart of Integrated Planning will be provided for review at the September 18 meeting to see if the language takes care of the Committee's collective concerns.
 - Once the flow chart has been vetted, it was agreed this should also be posted on the Program Review site.
 - It was suggested that the follow-up report should include last years program reviews and how we have addressed the recommendations.
 - It was suggested that ACCJC will be looking for a Program Review mission statement, objectives and protocols.
 - There was emphasis that ACCJC Recommendation 1 must be addressed by the program review authors and if this has not been done, the subcommittees should recommend they to go directly to IR for information.
 - It was discussed that the Coordinated Planning Committee (CPC) is charged with the planning model and the flow chart will detail the function of each planning.
 - IT was discussed that the model has been revised so that Program Review becomes the central planning function to create flow to all other areas; Program Review is the hub and the rest of planning processes, the spokes.
 - There was concern, based on the results of programs reviewed in last two years and which the PRC moved forward, that resulted in no funding and no staffing. This brings forward that the integrity of the PRC relates directly to funding the basics of various programs. It is believed that this year, if everyone goes through the process and if basics aren't covered, there will be a huge frustration factor. It is felt that there needs to be areal effort above the PRC to meet basics and we need to convince ACCJC that we are moving ahead in a positive way to resolve these issues.
 - Another concern regards whether we are we keeping the curricular integrity of our courses. In some cases we are not meeting some curricular needs and at some point we could lose the curricular integrity. All planning groups agree everything hinges on what is in program review. It is hoped that because of the substantial changes the college has made in moving forward and the commitment of the college as a community will move us forward with ACCJC.
 - Another area of concern focused on a lack of communication loop-back. The PRC discussed the need to communication back to the college at large, what action was taken or not taken and why or why not.

- It was discussed that if an item is a basic requirement of curricular integrity, it needs to be in the basic budget which needs to be tied to specific student outcomes for more effective planning at the program review level.
4. Discuss who will be in charge of information dissemination about Program Review activities and decisions, and will there be broadly distributed informational emails in addition to those penned by individual PRC members for their own constituents?
 - After general discussion it was concluded that each Program Review member will commit to keeping their constituents updated about what happens in the meetings. All information will be posted to the Program Review website including the member list, flow chart and minutes. Keith and Marjorie will send an email reminding everyone where Program Review information can be found. It was decided that a summary of the new process should be posted on the web and in MyCr for the benefit of the program review authors.
 5. Accuracy of some of data pre-populated on Program Review forms, especially the Faculty Load Table in Item 6.
 - Regarding Table 6 (annual program review document) and Table 4.01a (comprehensive program review document), datatel is not designed for faculty to be paid thru TLU's. A manual step is required between datatel and payroll. Faculty is being paid correctly, but it takes extraordinary effort on the part of student services (see attachment). IR will be happy to go through this with anyone needing further clarification.
 - IR who will create tables based on that information and send to all program review authors.
 - Tables 2.04 in the annual program review document and 1.1I in the comprehensive program review document are Basic Skills Success Tables which show the success rate of students who tested into a level of English and/or Math or have passed the classes, which place them in that level of English or Math. Once a student has either tested into the Transfer Level of English and/or Math or passed the highest level of basic skills, they would be included in the Transfer Level of the table. Program review is addressing the overall success of a program of study.
 - It was mentioned that an addendum can be attached to any program review document for clarification purposes, if deemed necessary.
 - IR will sort FTES by subject area and send to all program review authors.
 6. Discussion and approval of the "FT Faculty Request Form" (draft created by Rachel Anderson).
 - A draft of general questions was generated (but not included in today's handout) and sent to IR to see if it could be put in a data format. It then needs to be determined how to get it out to the faculty, as this new form will be an attachment to this year's program reviews.
 - It is a series of questions on 2 levels:
 - a. Brand new hire/position
 - b. New replacement – lost faculty, but want/need to replace
 1. What is full time/part time ratio of position – (data would be included by IR)
 2. What is the FTES generated by that area (for example: a 3 year span)
 3. The rate of growth experience – what is the # of sections offered over a period of years– (available from IR)
 4. What is the per cent of fill rate
 5. What is the significant change to enrollment that has occurred to justify the new position; (some example are an increase in student demand, job demand [technical course with huge demand], new and developing programs, accreditation needs for technical programs, lack of existing full time support)
 6. Provide supporting documentation – write in any and all justifications as evidence to support the request

- Rachel will send the draft to committee, for review, completion and approval of a draft to submit to the Senate by Tuesday.
 - A concern was expressed, regarding program review faculty requests, that when faculty leave a site, they are automatically replaced, but the numbers do not support the replacements. Historically enrollments have been very low at the sites (for example) in Math, where the Eureka campus has high enrollments and is short on staff.
 - This was cited as good reason for documenting fill rates, enrollments, etc. Tracking is important.
 - A suggestion was made that there should be interpretive narrative to tie in hiring in conflicting areas.
 - The reverse has been true for some of the sites; for example, Mendocino has had the numbers for a full time English position for years, but haven't received a full time English position.
 - It was noted that CR will begin developing education master plans for Del Norte and Mendocino. This should be helpful in looking at the unique differences, how to address having viable centers and whether to elevate a site to campus status, for example. It can provide the ability to address differences, in areas.
 - A suggestion was made for the narrative section of the form to take into consideration not only interpretive narrative, but a pedagogical aspect of the request for faculty.
 - It was suggested that clarification be made on what is "the program." If the centers are part of the program, clarification has to be made in faculty requests for centers. Historically centers were more autonomous, now more integrated. Need to discuss the systemic change in description of programs.
 - Today, CR has one curriculum overall, but there is concern that various areas don't transfer between campuses or colleges. There is a commitment not let that happen here. Historically, when one faculty member wanted to move between campuses, even though on tenure track, had to re-apply and go through the whole hiring process.
 - Probably should be a topic for future program review meetings.
7. Discussion and approval of the "Staff Request Form" (created by Keith Snow-Flamer and Mike Wells).
- The staff request form will be sent to the PRC for comments via email and online approval and submitted to the Senate, as a draft, by Tuesday.
- 8 Discussion and approval of the proposed on-line evaluation subcommittee assignments (draft created by a PRC subcommittee).
- It was agreed that sub-committee lists stands (see attachment)
9. (Revisited) It was agreed this will be a standing item.
10. Discussion on whether both program review authors and the committee should be comparing what is written this year to what was done last year, in order for the process to be meaningful, effective and ongoing.
- It was suggested that program review authors, by default, include the previous year program review.
 - It was agreed that this issue is covered in the current form.
 - There was discussion of what to do when if a goal is not achieved; it becomes part of the current year review assessment. The authors address and explain why the goal was not/could not be met, what actions are currently being done to achieve the goal and move forward, and create a plan on how you plan to continue trying to achieve that goal.

- It was discussed and determined that the Assessment subcommittee does not have to pull previous year's reviews to compare. The charge is to do the best with this year's data and if the group thinks need more is needed, the issue will move forward in the future.
11. Discussion whether IR should make last year's reports available to both the authors and the committee. Decision on whether to make this task part of each subcommittee's duties, or ask one or two committee members to look at both this year's and last year's reports.
 - It was agreed that IR reports are available and data are available on the web and the committee will not be tasked with looking up last year's reviews.
 12. Comprehensive Program Review requirements and CR's five year rotation.
 - VP Marjorie Carson clarified her reason for putting Historic Preservation Restoration Technology (HPRT), Culinary Program and Marine Science Technology (MST) back on the list for comprehensive program review. It has been her past experience that the VP of Instruction would look at programs with ongoing concerns, review their comprehensive program reviews and determine if they should be put back in the cycle. She did this. She then checked externally with an old colleague who informed her that technical program comprehensive reviews are due every two years. She then confirmed with Stephanie Low whether we have a duty to go back and re-do a comprehensive program if the program has challenges. The determination was made, that a full review need not be done, but only the quality improvement portion. She noted that at CR, any deviation from the program discipline calendar would come from the Program Review Committee.
 - It was noted that regarding IR and hard data, that HPRT was subsumed under Construction Tech, so as an annual, it wasn't looked at as a subject area, but as a program of study, as was MST, which was subsumed under biology. Now, data will more accurately cover these three program.
 13. Program Review QIP's for two disciplines.
 - Marjorie feels that MST did a good QIP step-down last year and are meeting their QIP's, but that HPRT and Culinary could use more clarity and specificity, especially being able to look at the hard data being supplied this year. Her recommendation is the two programs do their annual review and add updated QIPs instead of doing a comprehensive
 - The committee agreed to look into this issue and revisit it in the September 18, 2009 meeting.
 - It was questioned why Medical Assisting was not on the list to do their comprehensive and the program head will be notified.

Suggested Agenda Items for 9/18/09

1. Program Review Evaluation Rubrics
2. Mission statement and objectives
3. Review, for final approval, the Staff and Faculty request form drafts approved electronically by Tuesday, and which will be put on the 9/18/09 Academic Senate agenda

Program Review Committee
Friday, September 18, 2009
10am – 12:00pm
Boardroom

Minutes

Present: Rachel Anderson, Dave Banducci, Steve Brown, Marjorie Carson, Martha Davis, Zach DeLoach, Toby Green, Bill Honsal, Cindy Hooper, Anita Janis, Geisce Ly, Maggie Lynch, Nikiya McWilliams, Karen Nelson, Todd Olsen, Vinnie Peloso, Mike Peterson, Melody Pope, Brady Reed, Hillary Reed, Amber Smith, Keith Snow-Flamer, Lynn Thiesen, Cheryl Tucker, Crislyn Parker, recorder

Introductions were made of two new members of the committee: Cheryl Tucker is replacing Michelle Hancock, who is unable to continue being a member, and Amber Smith is a Student Representative.

The minutes for September 4, 2009 were voted upon and unanimously approved.
The minutes for September 11, 2009 were approved as corrected.

There was discussion on determining a policy for any programs or disciplines out of compliance of the program review schedule. It is agreed that this is a discussion that will be settled in future meetings.

Agenda Items:

1. Clarify: do we need to update the Program Review calendar to reflect the additional week for revisions:
 - It was agreed the calendar remains as posted.
 - It was requested that all form drafts are dated and initialed and spread sheets Include headers and numbered pages.
2. Request for concise introductions of Program Review Committee members; name and area of the college:
 - The committee members each stated their name and area of affiliation.
 -
3. Questions, comments, and concerns from the Business and Technology Division. This includes the addendum to the HPRT Annual report:
 - The two year career technical comprehensive review cycle was questioned. In response, Education code, Section 7.8016 was researched cited:
CEC §78016 specifically requires that colleges review the effectiveness of CTE programs every two years. The minimum requirements for this periodic review must demonstrate that the program:
 1. *Continues to meet a documented labor market demand.*
 2. *Does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the college's service area.*
 3. *Is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students.**Review of instructional programs on a regular basis and according to a regular procedure is also mandated by the standards of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.*

- The conclusion reached by the Career and Technical Education Dean is that their annual & comprehensive reviews cover the three areas. To be fully in compliance they would need to add something about unnecessary duplication of programs. This seems unlikely to ever be an issue for CR due to our remoteness.
- A recommendation was made to refine this process in the next few years, and keep this information handy for the self-study; to be sure CR is clear on this issue.
- IR does not have produce annual forms for HPRT and Culinary, because they are already included in the annual program review courses under Construction Technology and Hospitality, Restaurant & Culinary.
- The pieces that rose to the level of concern in these two programs, from that past and today, will be particularly addressed in the form of past QIPs and current plans. It is the intent of faculty to address these issues as noted.
- Mendocino oversees Marine Science Technology.

4. Program Review Evaluation Rubrics

- Prior to evaluating the rubrics it was noted that many of the 2008-2009 Summaries are missing.
- There was a request to see a return to the executive summary analysis. An executive summary draft form was submitted to the committee and it was decided to revisit after the subcommittees have had a chance to go through one evaluation cycle
- *Budget Rubric:* Vote to approve the budget rubric was unanimous, pending changes to the mission statement.
- *Trends Rubric:* It was agreed to change the language in Criteria #1, from “programs” to “disciplines/programs/services.” It was agreed to the language in the Objective statement, to read “Enrollment, Access, Success, Retention.” It was agreed to amend the language in Criteria #3, to read “Access/Success.”
- *Assessments Rubric:* Criteria #7 and 8: It was agreed and approved to change the language from “relevant” to “clear and measureable.” The grading criteria were taken out of this rubric, in favor a more evaluative approach to assessment. The committee agreed to amend the assessment rubric to include the grading criteria.
- *Informational note:* With regards to Accreditation, CR is where it needs to be on Student Learning Objectives. A review of all active courses in the district disclosed there are a total of 834 courses, of which 769 have SLO’s included and one does not; 64 were not determined because they are independent study.

5. Review and discuss Integrated Planning Model:

- Model links who is responsible and for what actions. PRC is in the middle of the planning process and shows what the committee was tasked to do on monthly basis from September to May. Model shows the Dean and VP level and what happens to program reviews, tear out sheets, and what where and when program review comes into the budget process
- Instead of arrows, the model is divided by month. (EMC is the Enrollment Management Committee which reports to CPC and is part of the Educational Master Plan).
- A suggestion was made to put the model on the PRC/myCR site for future review.
- A question arose as to why program reviews are done in August and September; can the process be changed to the spring semester instead. It was agreed that a two-year plan be drafted and put on the PRC site
- A brief summary of the process following completion of program reviews by the Program Review Committee: Tear off sheets (resource requests) go to IR who collates them into one document. The collated document then goes the VPs, Cabinet, budget planning committees and then CPC. The process is not linear; simultaneous processes occur at one time. The function and a clarification of this process will be on the next agenda.
- The process of the subcommittees was discussed. Agreed to break down to subcommittees and subgroups will decide their next steps. It was suggested each subgroup have a chair who oversees the functions of the subcommittees and be sure all rubrics have

been submitted. It was agreed one summary should be brought to the Program Review Committee. Maggie can set up conference calls, tape and post a link on the myCR site.

5. Mission statement and objectives:

- It was agreed to put this on the September 25 agenda.

6. Review, for final approval, the Staff and Faculty request form drafts approved electronically by Tuesday, and which will be put on the 9/18/09 Academic Senate agenda:

- The forms need to be approved by the PRC and sent to authors as soon as possible with due dates.
- The suggested goal for fill rates is 90, but 80 is acceptable (access = how many sections available, how many open/closed, etc.)
- There need to be a future discussion and clarification for faculty on fill rates.
- It was unanimously agreed to accept the New/Replacement Form for Full-Time Faculty as the draft document.

Meeting was adjourned to subcommittees.

The next meeting is Friday, September 25, 10am in the Boardroom.

Program Review Committee
Friday, September 25, 2009
10am – 12:00pm
Boardroom

Present: Rachel Anderson, Dave Banducci, Steve Brown, Zachary DeLoach, Toby Green, Bill Honsal, Cindy Hooper, Anita Janis, Geisce Ly, Maggie Lynch, Nikiya McWilliams, Karen Nelson, Todd Olsen, Vinnie Peloso, Mike Peterson, Melody Pope, Brady Reed, Hillary Reed, Amber Smith, Keith Snow-Flamer, Lynn Thiesen, Cheryl Tucker, Crislyn Parker – recorder
Marjorie Carson

Absent:

1. Approve Minutes from September 18, 2009: approved as corrected
2. Mission Statement and Objectives
 - 2.1 Revised Program Review Mission Statement and Objectives:
 - Internal Program Review web site has a mission and charge. Discussion about what the mission/charge should include ensued. It was agreed that the Committee would look the Program Review Charge and draft language, changing the charge slightly, to include communicating and the best use to infuse data in planning processes.
 - There was some discussion Board Policy and Program Review. It is believed Board Policy primarily refers to the makeup of the Program Review Committee. Crislyn will send a link and the committee will familiarize themselves for the next meeting.
 - There was discussion on the exact language and function of comprehensive and annual reviews: Comprehensive Program review and Annual Planning Updates. Both require quantitative data.

It was agreed to combine and address Items 10, 11 and 6.

10. Overall management and oversight of the documents and deadlines for this committee—who is in charge?
 - Marjorie, Keith, Crislyn & Keith's new Assistant
11. Who is in charge of PRC-wide (and district-wide) communication about our committee activities?
 - Discussion addressed a need for more guidance on how to accomplish the program review process for authors, committee and subcommittee members.
 - Rachel sent out detailed steps of what to do-include where calendar with deadlines, where to review and where to post and will re-send these instructions.
 - All (subcommittee) requests for program review revisions should be located in one place and include deadlines.
 - Keith and Marjorie will clean up how we communicate and send out to all, including instructions on how to request access to myCR
6. Reaching consensus in subcommittees when there is no time to do so. (I) took the tact of summarizing all reviewers feedback. However, that is not really reflective of everything as in many cases no scores or comments were put on several items.
 - There was discussion on how sub-committees post feedback to authors regarding their recommendations: post all sub-committee feedback; each member post their findings or post just one consensual summary for authors, per subcommittee.

- It noted that the “scores” are not rankings, but a determination of what, if anything, needs to be done to improve the program review document and/or the program.
 - It was agreed there should be one common process (authors need consistency for all sections).
The subcommittees will:
 - Read program review documents
 - Meet physically or online as a group with their individually completed rubric
 - Evaluate each program review one by one, discuss and reach consensus
 - Post a final summary based on consensus for the program review authors
 - It was discussed that authors need to be informed revisions are due one week from dates subcommittee comments are posted. Maybe include the calendar.
 - For the current group, it was agreed that authors had one week from today (9/25/09) to submit their updated/revised program review documents.
 - It was agreed that Maggie will clarify where program reviews and revisions need to be posted, since many authors thought they were to be posted to the IR website.
 - The staff and faculty form issue will be added to the 10/2/09 agenda.
 - Discussion turned to the difficulty of using the same rubrics for both Instructional program reviews (easily followed), and student services reviews (not easily followed because student services reviews didn't include data, or enough data, for evaluative purposes). It was difficult understanding why a goal was included and therefore was difficult defending. One suggestion was for student services to add a line as to why this is a goal.
 - A bit of history: last spring, it was decided that student services program annuals would be separated from instructional program reviews. Student Services decided to use Fred Trapp's suggestion to use annuals as a planning document, so they aren't doing comprehensives every year. It was agreed at that time that services would simplify and just look at goals, objective and at resources.
 - The committee needs to decide how to use the rubric for this year. Services will look at how to revise the planning document so it is a better document in the future. At the end of the year, as the Committee evaluates the program review process, it should discuss how to make improve the instructional, student services and administrative services process. This is especially important as there will be notable differences in administrative services reviews.
 - Keith will have Student Services go back to comprehensives from last year, pull and use data pertinent to inform the annual and to add goals that should be included based on best practices.
5. Providing feedback to authors, summary or otherwise. (This relates to Item #6) Does it matter that we are consistent?
- Discussed in Item #6.
3. Integrated Planning Model
- 3.1 Clarification of the model; 3.2 Clarification of the role of the CPC; 3.3 Draft of a revised two-year model
- Keith will post an updated Integrated planning model and this item is moved to the 10/2/09 agenda.
4. Discussion of an Executive Summary Form
- Moved to the next Program Review Committee meeting.
7. Clarification of expectations regarding SLOs and PLOs. (ex: some programs provide SLOs for every course, other programs provide for only one or two courses; do Student Services areas providing courses like Guidance need to provide SLOs and assessment in their reviews?)

8. Expectation of direct tie between assessment and planning, or other areas and planning: i.e. assign a “3” because they have an assessment plan whether it’s been implemented or not?
 - Discussion that for subcommittee evaluation purposes, (all) program reviews should have a tie between assessment and planning. In using the rubric, committee members should ask the question, was there enough data present to make the tie? If there is not enough data (in either instructional or student services reviews) they should be sent back to authors requesting they make the tie or explain why it can’t be made.
9. At what point does the PRC request/require rewrite: Is it a subcommittee function or an entire PRC function?
 - Moved to next Program Review Committee Meeting

Note: Due to the convening of an Academic Senate Special Meeting, the agenda items as noted above will be added to the 10/2/09 program review committee meeting

Next meeting: Friday, October 2, 2009 in the Boardroom.