

## The Program Review Committee Agenda

### September 19, 2011 at 3:30 in A141

The committee will have two areas of focus this year:

Updating program review procedures

Reviewing annual reports (due Oct 31)

Sept 19 Agenda:

Discuss ACCJC expectations for accreditation

Discuss program review procedures

### Program Review Committee Minutes – September 19, 2011

**Members present:** Fredy Aviles, Stacey Adams, Vickie Beatty, Ty Mettler, Melanie Parker, Carol Eastin

Goals for today:

- Communicate ACCJC expectations for Accreditation
- Begin discussion of program review procedures

Handouts:

- Instructional Unit Validation and Recommendation Form (from COC workshop)
- Language from 1/31/11 letter from Barbara Beno and 2/11 ACCJC News regarding program review and institutional self-improvement

Business:

- We will become an “official” committee under CCC
- We will need to write a committee mission statement and consider the make-up of the committee
- Action item for next meeting: Write a mission statement
- We will examine avenues for streamlining the process of program review
  - 1- Need to ensure comprehensive use of data in decision making
  - 2- Need to incorporate data meaningfully into annual reviews/How do we keep this brief?

Discussion:

- ACCJC does not dictate exactly how we do program review, expects we will continually improve the process to meet new expectations, yet needs to see consistency- How do we achieve that?
  - 1- Clearer guidelines and expectations communicated
    - a. idea for peer “coaches” or mentors

- 2- Rubric for evaluation would provide expectations for writers and provide more standardization for reviewers
- 3- Who should review?
  - a. Do we keep peer review teams as is?
  - b. Could we have divisions “trade” reports for peer review?
  - c. Should the Program Review Committee do all the review?
- 4- Significant data from SLOs, PLOs, action plans must be incorporated
- 5- Significance of data will vary from program to program; what is significant for nursing may not be for another program.
- Idea from another college (Diablo?): Accumulate 3 years of annual data analysis that feeds into a comprehensive 4<sup>th</sup> year report.
- Where/how does prioritization of budget requests occur?
  - 1- Need to incorporate action plans
  - 2- Faculty needs to be aware of budgeting process and how it works- transparency and visibility
  - 3- Faculty need to see the critical connection of action plans to program review to budget and planning
  - 4- If reports do not meet standards, shouldn’t there be a connection to budget and planning? (“No plans, no problem, no money”, as expressed at COC workshop.)
- When we revise procedures we need to take a “big picture” perspective due to the differing nature of divisions and departments.
- Emphasize the program perspective. Even though an academic area does not award a degree or certificate, mission and outcomes need to be clear.
  - 1- Maybe we need to see SLOs/PLOs more from a discipline perspective?
- Carol suggesting “tweaking” rubric from another college and using it on a pilot basis for peer team review this semester. Committee agreed.
- We would like to see program review use an electronic format that would simplify writing and submission process; using check boxes, drop-downs, etc.
- When we evaluate data we need to get used to saying, “Now what?”

**For Next Meeting:**

- **Work on mission statement ideas/we will begin writing. Mission statement needs to keep spotlight on data and the value we place on using data-driven decision-making**
- **Think about where we are heading as a committee and what will facilitate an improved process**