Program Review Committee Agenda – October 17, 2011
3-4:30pm in A141

Review draft of Program Review CCC Information Sheet
Review checklist/rubric for peer review reports
Discuss ACCJC findings from Oct 2010 team visit pertaining to program review

Program Review Committee Minutes – October 17, 2011

Members present: Fredy Aviles, Stacey Adams, Ty Mettler, Melanie Parker, Yvette Petrin, Carol Eastin

Goals for today:
- Review Program Review CCC Information Sheet
- Review checklist for peer review reports

Handouts:
- Proposed Program Review Committee CCC Information Sheet
- Peer Review Report Evaluation Checklist
- Highlights of Program Review Findings (from October 2010 Accreditation team Visit)
- 2011-2012 Program Review Fact Sheet (goes to Senate November 2011)

Business:
- Feedback was solicited on the committee membership and purpose. Suggested additions are the V.P of Academic Affairs or designee and either Dean of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness or a designee from that department.
- Peer Review Report Evaluation Checklist was been distributed to a current peer team for use in reviewing their assigned report. Committee members expressed enthusiasm for this idea, stating that having clearer guidelines for what reports reflect is essential. Also expressed was the viewpoint that electronic automation of this process would make a tremendous difference. One committee member expressed that if Curricunet and WEAVE could "talk" to each other, there would be great benefit. Also, being able to drop SLO-related data from WEAVE directly into Program Review documents would facilitate the process.
- Current progress on Program Review Reports was reviewed and members were reminded that several areas have reports due October 31st.
- The committee reviewed findings from the October 2010 Accreditation visit and were reminded that program review is a continually evolving process. The template used for review must change to reflect that.

Discussion:

- How do we create interest and ownership in this process? Frustration was expressed that it is generally the same people who serve on campus committees, write reports, etc. How do we encourage more participation? It was suggested that greater transparency and understanding of the process, so that staff and faculty know who reads the reports and how the reports are integrated into budget and planning, might make a difference in this area. Some members expressed frustration that there are few "teeth" when people do not get reports completed according to schedule or expected guidelines. One member stated we are supposed to work "as a well-oiled machine", but does not believe we can say that is true. The committee was reminded that reports reflect the investment we have made in our programs and that we must use data-based discussion to reflect a program's priorities. Program Review represents our "voice" but we are not confident anyone really hears our voices.
- What needs to happen to ensure all areas are using consistent data and how do we know what data is relevant? This is a topic for further exploration and discussion.

Next Meeting: November 7, 2011 from 3 to 4:30 p.m.