Program Review/Recommendation #5 Committee Meeting
Draft MINUTES, Revised
Thursday, October 11, 2007
HLRC-316, 1 p.m.

Participants: Isabella Chung, Cathy Froloff, Fran Leonard, Phyllis Morrison, Aimee Preziosi

Handouts: 2007-08 Academic Program Review Introduction & Instructions, Program Review instrument and Summary, LA Southwest’s Senator Assessment Form for their college’s 2004-05 Program Review, the ACCJC’s rubric for program review.

I. Fran mentioned that the Academic Senate at its meeting of Tuesday, October 9, 2007, unanimously approved of forming an ad hoc Senate committee to develop an evaluation process/rubric for evaluating academic program review reports. She suggested that current faculty who are members of the Program Review Committee work with her and Cathy on this project. We should include representatives of the Senate and the CPC in this effort.

II. Fran and Cathy are scheduled to meet with Dr. Rocha this Monday, October 15, 2007, at 3:30 p.m. to discuss research needs, putting the program review online (with the help of a software developer) and next steps.

III. The committee then talked about aligning program review/unit planning with the budget timeline.
   A. If possible, we hope to have program reviews completed by the end of the fall semester in December. Evaluation/prioritizing will occur in January in time for budget requests to be submitted in February. This would align with the submission of the preliminary budget in March 2008 for the next academic year, 2008-09.
   B. Isabella mentioned the draft proposal that had been discussed, which now needs to be revisited in light of the new Educational Master Plan and the new timeline for program review.

IV. Cathy and Fran will soon schedule a meeting with Betsy Regalado and John Oester to go over with them the program reviews for Student Services and Administrative Services.

V. The committee also discussed the advisability of a District template and timeline for program reviews/unit planning that links with resource allocation that standardize these processes for all colleges. As Isabella pointed out, administrators move among colleges within the District, thus having a standardized instrument/process makes sense and may increase efficiency and effectiveness.

VI. Next steps. Since the researcher has transferred to the District Office, at this point, Phyllis suggests that we ask divisions to review their programs in light of the 2008-2011 Educational Master Plan (EMP). In addition, we could
   A. Distribute to each division a copy of the EMP and remind them that one of the goals of the EMP is Academic Excellence.
B. Distribute to each division a copy of their 2007-2008 Unit Plan.
C. Instruct chairs to examine “critical actions needed” columns in the 2007-2008 Unit Plan.
D. Instruct the chairs to cull from these columns actions that could implement one or more of the EMP strategies
E. Instruct the chairs to propose an action in their division which could result in implementation of one or more of the EMP strategies
F. Announce that funds are available to support proposals to improve academic excellence and that Dr. Rocha has set aside a total of $250,000. Emphasize that the proposals must be within the parameters of the EMP strategies.
G. Develop a set of criteria to evaluate the merits of the proposals.
H. Develop a timeline.

VII. The meeting adjourned at 3 p.m. The next meeting of this committee is next Thursday, October 18, 2007, at 2 p.m. in the PCR.