Program Review Committee Meeting
Minutes of
Monday, October 16, 2006
3 pm-4 pm, PCR

Guests: Ara Aguiar, Nikki Jacobson

I. The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.
II. Minutes of September 13, 2006 were approved.

III. Fran Leonard welcomed new members, Aimee Preziosi and Marlene Shepherd, both of whom were appointed by the Academic Senate at its meeting of October 10, 2006. Other members introduced themselves.

IV. Improvements to current process; use of data and its analysis
   A. This agenda item was moved up at Ed Pai’s request. In response to the Accrediting Commission’s recommendation for evidence of data-driven decision-making, the college researcher provided a data packet at a presentation to Division Chairs at the workshop in August. Both the chair and the Recommendation #5 & #4/2000 Committee members are soliciting feedback from Academic Division Chairs as to the data’s utility. What data should be provided? While data this cycle focused on enrollment, chairs have said they would also like retention data in a form that is readily accessible and understandable.

   B. Re: Student Services. Suggested key performance indicators were suggested in order to jumpstart the process of data analysis. The committee and the researcher will garner evaluations and feedback to feed into the online version.

   C. Action – compare our program review process and instrument to LA Southwest’s online version. Does that version address the concerns voiced by some chairs of redundancy, “too long a form,” and the need to see tangible outcomes.

   D. Aimee observed that data she looked at suggests that Class Tracks is problematical. Sections that are cancelled for lack of enrollment are not accounted for.

   E. Recommendations also include
      1. Division chairs continue to meet individually with the college researcher, a process that worked well this p.r. cycle.
      2. Paul Stansbury says that deans should also be included in the data analysis.
      3. Budget worksheet training is also needed.
      4. To address the concerns voiced by Division Chairs that program review is tedious and repetitive, reconsider the current program review cycle of annual program reviews for all divisions and a once-in-six-year comprehensive program review for each division.
      5. Ensure that tangible outcomes result and are communicated to the college. Having both the program review website and the instruments online should help.

V. Accomplishments
   A. Division chairs are looking at data, something not really done before.
   B. AB 1417 will be presented at the November 3, 2006 Fall College Retreat. This legislation will require colleges to have clear definitions: year-to-year persistence, transfer preparedness, retention.
VI. Other points
A. Program Review Committee, in addition to holding the workshops in August and September, check that reports are submitted in a timely manner, read the reports and summarize their findings, including areas needing improvement and those plans that qualify for allocation of resources. Ed suggests posting all program reviews, consolidating the unit plans and the VPs come up with a prioritized list that is forwarded to the College Planning Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm