I. Meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.

II. Minutes of September 19, 2006 were approved.

III. Reports by members of interviews of Division Chairs re. program review and data, using the agreed-upon set of questions.

A. Lloyd reported to the committee that he had conducted three interviews:

1. Math 9/19 – Dr. McMasters, chair, would like additional, specific data to verify “what our gut feelings are telling us,” that concurrent enrollment in the math lab helps more students succeed, that students coming here from SMC cannot make it through our Math 125 class. Other specific needs were mentioned which would help the math division determine, for example, that the new program of Math 127 and 128 are not only needed but also cost efficient and which students were in Math 112 and PD5 and their progress compared to students in Math 112 who did not also take PD5.

2. Language Arts 9/26 – Betty Jacobs, chair, says that program Review forces her to address specific issues, leading to discoveries that go into the unit plan. This process gave her needed data to request two full-time English positions from the FPIP committee. Her appointment with the researcher helped her understand how to interpret class size, averages and enrollment trends. She would like to see actual pass/fail data for each semester. The form seems a bit repetitious and must be quite intimidating for new chairs. It takes a solid weekend alone with a computer to go through it the first time. The two faculty who run the process are helpful.

3. P.E. 9/28, 9/29 – J. Witucki, chair, noted that while the program review process allows her to review any changes that have or have not occurred during the year and identify any changes, she stated that the data provided was not useful in her analysis, giving enrollment and section numbers but not what may or may not be working in her division. This chair did not schedule an appt. with the researcher and feels that prog. review does not help create change in the division or college.

B. Clyde reported that he is rescheduling a time to meet with Ara Aguiar, chair of Dental Hygiene and Allied Health, that Murray, chair of computer science, did not see much value to program review and that Craig Wilder, chair of aviation, had not responded.

C. Fran reported that she has met with Sherron Rouzan of counseling; however, the purpose was to jump start the program review process with counseling. She has since emailed the questions to Sherron. In addition, she has emailed the questions to Phyllis Morrison, chair of science, who will look them over in advance of a scheduled meeting.

IV. The committee then discussed a number of issues relating to students and helping to grow enrollment, including but not limited to: Does West offer prospective students pre-registration/enrollment advising to see whether West is the right place for them with the right programs and services? What about academic advising in addition to academic counseling? Importance of gathering data over time, creating mechanisms to do so. Helpful suggestions on how to request services from plant facilities or from IT, for example, could be put in the President’s Bulletin.
V. Fran reported she had met with the Senate Exec. at their meeting that morning about additions to the timeline for the progress report, notably adding Nov. 14th as the day the draft progress report goes to the Academic Senate as well as other bodies. This allows for two more Senate meetings for consideration, discussion, question-and-answer and action.

A. To prepare for the writing of the draft progress report, Fran requested that members of this committee e-mail her any actions taken toward the specific recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Upcoming meetings: 10/17, 11/7, 12/5