

Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes  
(A213)

March 2, 2017  
3:15pm – 4:45pm

Present: Judith Bell, Linda Meyer, Joe Lugo, Dorothy Pucay, Michael Berke, Christopher March, Gina Del Rosario, Robert Gutierrez, Guillermo Castilla

Absent: Duncan Graham (communicated), Joyce Lui (communicated) Scott Miller, Lisa Vasquez

1. Approval of Agenda – motion by Linda Meyer, seconded by Guillermo Castilla. Passed unanimously
2. Approval of 2/9/17 minutes, motion to approve (with addition of Dorothy Pucay's name to the list of faculty serving on the Ad Hoc Committee for Program Review Redesign) by Linda Meyer, seconded by Dorothy Pucay. Passed unanimously
3. Public Comments - none
  - a. Sean Abel visited the group and participated in the discussion.
4. Discussion/Action
  - a. Discussion of the migration of Program Review to CurricUNET and the formation of an ad hoc committee for redesigning the Program Review process.
    - i. Guillermo mentioned that there is a white paper from the State Academic Senate called Program Review: Setting a Standard, published in 2009.
    - ii. Judith passed out 2 documents:
      1. The Data Worksheet developed by Joyce Lui, with comments containing the Accreditation standards relevant to the sections of data
      2. The Academic Affairs Program Review Sections for CurricUNET.
        - a. This is an outline Judith developed to get the discussion about the redesign started.
        - b. Members were asked to suggestions on the Program Review Sections for Curricunet document.
    - iii. The committee discussed the following topics
      1. Data
        - a. Discussion of the importance of data to Accreditation
        - b. The importance of Senate approval of the data form
      2. SLOs
        - a. Celia Cruz and SLOAC are the experts in this area and their involvement in the development of this section is crucial.
        - b. We need to find out how much we can bring in from the SLO portion of CurricUNET.
        - c. Some programs have already input their SLOs in CurricUNET, so we should have some data to work with.

3. Budget
  - a. Addition of sections regarding non-fund 10 monies, such as Student Success, Basic Skills, Professional Development, and CTE funds such as Perkins, Strong Workforce, etc.
    - i. This is to help the Finance Committee determine how money is being allocated and spent by the college.
  - b. Budget form
    - i. Need for alignment with Business Office – Marilyn Morikang.
    - ii. Possibility of having 3 levels of validation:
      1. Maintenance – for programs not submitting a budget or not asking for an increase in funding.
      2. Growth – for programs wanting to improve existing areas, for example with new equipment, staff, etc. They would need to support their request with data, which could be positive or negative.
      3. Innovation – for programs that want to try some new approaches. This would require a plan with a timeline, measurable outcomes and accountability.
      4. The committee will discuss this idea further; Judith will bring it to the Finance Committee for their input before the next meeting.
- iv. Discussion of progress of Program Review validations
  1. Subgroup 1 is almost done
  2. Subgroup 2 is done; Assessment (comprehensive) and Business (annual) are still in process.
  3. Subgroup 3 is done except for Cosmetology. Judith will send that PR to them.
  4. Subgroup 4 is almost done; need to double-check files.
- v. There was a discussion of what to do about programs whose PRs are not validated.
  1. Such programs can't ask for funding or faculty/staff positions
  2. Should the Academic Senate take a role in this? If so, what should their role be?
- vi. Meeting adjourned at 4:35