

## Program Review Committee

3-27-14

### Members present:

Amber McCall, Marc Sola, Heidi Hoffman, Linda Meyers, Duncan Graham, Lisa Vasquez, Judy Bell, Doug Robb, ex officio Ronald Lopez Ramirez.

### Call to Order:

Add to agenda I. e. validation form and handbook.

Motion HH, 2<sup>nd</sup> LM. Approved 7-0.

12-12-13 minutes.

Motion to approve LM, 2<sup>nd</sup> HH, approved 7-0

MS added spelling change from and to an.

2-13-14 minutes

MS IIb asked to have worded "remove Chemistry and Music" as submitted late. Changes the percentages.

Motion to approve HH, 2<sup>nd</sup> MS, approved 7-0

3-6-14 minutes.

Divide and conquer.

LM motion, JB 2<sup>nd</sup>, assed 7-0

### Discussion and Action Items:

1. AM presented the XL spreadsheet that documents and presents the reviews that were submitted and the dates, contacts, authors and color coded feedback dates.
2. AM reported all but one annual submitted and proficient. Am reported all but one Comprehensive submitted and proficient.
3. AM asked what to do when comprehensives aren't proficient what to do?
  - a. JB – stay in progress
  - b. AM- how long? Stay on schedule doesn't reset the cycle. Lack of proficiency or lateness must be submitted as completed.

- c. DG and JB – no reward for non-submittal.
  - d. AM – keep in cycle and have asterisk. The committee is held hostage with these late or non-submittals, must release by respecting timelines. Program needs to get drafts and finals in on time to be able to get suggestions.
  - e. JB – informative meeting with writers and readers to go over the process.
4. Motion to have in progress or submitted comprehensive reviews after deadline maintain position in cycle, while having late review written and completed in following academic year.  
DG called to vote, HH 2<sup>nd</sup>, passed 7-0
5. Validation forms
- a. Annual calendar – AM will send out next year’s comprehensives as the 2014-15 schedule.
  - b. Discussion about earlier 1<sup>st</sup> draft, more time in between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> drafts, allowing all of January for authors to rewrite, and have separate deadlines for annuals and comprehensives.
  - c. HH system worked well, felt better about reading reports
  - d. MS Finance committee needs time to review. Asked if next year is the last of first time submittals of comprehensives.
  - e. LM – keep due dates the same
  - f. DG will adjust his schedule to keep times together
  - g. AM – mid February and keep both dates together. Answered MS that yes it’s the last year of first time submittals.
  - h. Motion for schedule as follows:
 

10-8-14	1 <sup>st</sup> draft
10-22-14	Feedback from subcommittees
11-26-14	2 <sup>nd</sup> draft
12-10-14	feedback from subcommittees
2-11-15	Final versions due

Motion HH, 2<sup>nd</sup> LM, passed 7-0

6. Discussion on feedback from writers of reviews.
- a. Data changed in middle of review complicated the process.
  - b. Had to recalculate data and percentages often.
  - c. Not accessible data or not meaningful for the division.
  - d. Questions to RLR concerning data and timelines and access.
  - e. RLR explained different program will be up and running before fall semester hopefully without any hitches.
  - f. AM needs for a more friendlier portal, username password.
  - g. RLR stated generic name/password for generic account.
7. AM presented reflections from divisions
- a. Campus Tech – needed edits for non-academic divisions and having subcommittee contact before process about support and how to use information.

- b. Chemistry expressed process worked well, received timely feedback, but had data problems. Also there was good communication with PRvC chair, as well as alignment of the committees.
  - c. Counseling had two responses. First expressed it did not work well for the division, data issues presented problems and usefulness was adequate. Second response felt review process worked well, but again had data problems, and that it did work well for counseling.
  - d. Dorothy Pucay(DP) through email suggested that narratives of annuals should present what has and has not changed from previous reviews. Also the discussion of data needs to be more evident in annuals.
  - e. DG agreed with DP email and suggestions.
  - f. AM more clarity in annuals about trends of enrollment as well as part-time and fulltime instructors.
  - g. DP expressed about comprehensive review had overall rubric problem should not be a summarization of program but of the document.
  - h. Discussion of comprehensive reporting and how it is used by departments. Look to change language demonstrating how things are different because of the review.
  - i. Discussion among committee about members that did not contribute to committee asked not to return next year.
8. Evaluation form
- a. Added to goal #2 ( Finance committee, academic senate for new fulltime faculty hire and website administrators)
  - b. Added to goal #3 writers workshop subcommittee
  - c. Added to goal #4 evaluate submissions from writers incorporate relevant feedback
  - d. Motion MS, 2<sup>nd</sup> DG, passed 7-0
9. Discussion of 2014-15 committee
- a. Recruitment of next year's chair and committee
  - b. Talk about re-assigned time
  - c. Form revisions subcommittee McCall, Meyer, Graham, Dean Montemayor, Pucay, Breheny, Bell
  - d. 4-10-14 1:45 PM to 3:30 PM form revision scheduled meeting
  - e. Handbook revision HH
  - f. 4-24-14 1:45 PM to 3:30 PM handbook revision scheduled meeting.

Meeting ended at 4:30 PM