

Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes  
(A213)

November 2, 2017

3:15pm – 4:45pm

Present: Judith Bell, Joyce Lui, Dorothy Pucay, Jagrup Kahlon, Yelena Lipilina, Edna Dolatre, Takeo Kubo, Kristen Ruano, Gina Del Rosario-Fontela, Valentin Garcia, Doug Robb, Graciela Cochran, Joe Lugo, Barry Del Buono, Lena Tran, Edina Rutland

Absent: none

1. Approval of today's agenda - passed
2. Approval of Minutes from 10/19/17 - passed
3. Public Comments:
4. Discussion/Action
  - a. Review of charge and goals
    - i. Question: do changes need to go to CAC, Academic Senate?
      1. Yes – Judith will take any changes to Senate, Joyce will take changes to CAC
    - ii. Discussion of why the Program Review Committee is an Academic Senate Committee, since we represent the entire campus (Academic, Student Services, Administrative Services).
      1. AS wants faculty to run the committee and wants to monitor its activity
      2. We need to have more discussion with the AS about membership and constituency representation
      3. Discussion of the “re-up” process and how it impacts the PRvC – the timeline is difficult for us because we need to hit the ground running.
      4. Committee decided we don't need to have anything in the charge about adjusting the membership as needed.
      5. Suggestion to have representatives from all divisions
        - a. Value would be for accreditation and cross-campus dialog
        - b. Concern is too many boundaries – this could be a goal rather than part of the charge.
    - iii. Judith commented that she has been unable to upload last year's PR forms, as she doesn't have access and doesn't know how to batch upload.
      1. Suggestions – IT, Jose Luis Pacheco at DO.
      2. We need a web master!
    - iv. Review of goals
      1. Judith suggested that all validation teams be in contact with the people writing program reviews.
      2. Judith has asked to have Program Review migration to CurricUNET put on the AS agenda.

3. All goals have been addressed on an ongoing basis.
- b. Go over a couple of Program Review forms (in progress) – what do we expect?
  - i. Comprehensive Program Review form – Music (written by Judith as Humanities Coordinator)
  - ii. Use college catalog description –possibly take up with IPCC that all programs should have a description in the College Catalog, whether or not they are a degree program.
  - iii. It's OK if the PR form is short – not all programs have lots to report.
1. Validation form
  - a. If you don't think something is complete, check the In Progress box and explain why in the right hand column.
  - b. You can use the validation form for comp. drafts.
  - c. Question – do we work as teams on validation or separately and share the information?
    - i. There is no specific way to work – the point is to have 2 sets of eyes on each form.
    - ii. The form is more specific, so hopefully it will be easier to evaluate.
    - iii. Suggestion – use Google docs.
    - iv. Deadline for first draft validation is Dec. 15
    - v. Proposal to have the second draft mandatory
    - vi. We need to let writers know who to turn to when they need help
    - vii. Workshops – often people don't come
    - viii. Working one-on-one may be better.
    - ix. "Division buddy" – help coming from a peer – might work better
2. Annual Program Review form – English
  - a. Because we are transitioning, the annual PR form is longer, which is difficult for some writers.
  - b. Mission and Vision – maybe we could put the mission and vision right in the question.
    - i. Writers could highlight the relevant terms in the mission and vision.
  - c. Limits on how much people can write
  - d. Data sheet will be an area of major revision because it is very long
    - i. We may be able to do autofill in CurricUNET
    - ii. The packet that Joyce gives us could be much different
  - e. The big question: is the content relevant? How would we know?
  - f. We are not "grading a test"
  - g. Too much information is hard to gauge
  - h. In terms of coaching, what is sufficient? Elegant – not too much, just enough
  - i. Joyce – summer data throws off some of the graphs, but not program awards
  - j. Character limits on narrative parts level the playing field. Limits should be specified

- k. How about things like incomplete sentences?
  - i. These are going to be public documents – this is the face of your program. Should we make sure they are grammatically correct?
  - ii. We should let people know what's OK to use.
  - iii. It should be consistent – whatever style you are using
  - iv. Basic question – what is Program Review for?
    - v. For the public, for the program
- l. Goal setting – important
  - i. Train the Trainer – coaching in strategic planning for programs
  - ii. Planning will not be optional for innovation money
- m. Professional Development section
  - i. Is it for talking about what faculty are doing or for how they are using Professional Development funding?
  - ii. It might not be necessary to talk about your faculty activities every year – maybe just for comprehensive
- n. Academic Senate form for applying for new faculty – should it replace this section of the form?
  - i. The problem is it's a year out. PR is a year ahead; AS form is for that semester.
  - ii. Suggestion: when you request a new faculty through the Academic Senate form, copy the narrative into the Resources section of the PR form for that year.
- o. Are program coordinators writing program reviews? Probably.
- p. Idea – PDD poster session highlighting programs
- q. Other methods of doing program review – video, Canvas, e-portfolios.
- r. Validations – send them directly to the writers and cc Judith

b. Adjourned at 4:45