**Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes**

October 1, 2019 L160

Note taker: Mindy Wilmot

Attendance:

Chairs: Stephen Waller - Administrative Co-Chair; Kimberly Nickell - Faculty Co-Chair; Kristin   
 Rabe - Classified Co-Chair

Members: Mindy Wilmot, Library; Anna Poetker-Collins, Philosophy; Anna Melby, FACE; Andrea Tumblin, Mathematics; LeAnn Riley, Agriculture; Brent Burton, Fire Technology/EMS; Neeley Hatridge, Communication; Keri Wolf, English; Casey Goodman, Health & PE; Jason Dixon, Industrial Technology; Katie Ganster, Biology; Linda McLaughlin, Foreign Language; Aneesha Awrey, Counseling; F. Javier Llamas, Social Sciences; Maurice Muller, Physical Science/ Chemistry; Kalina Hill, Testing Center; Connor Harris, SGA; Meg Stidham, CSEA representative: Faculty co-chair Assessment Committee and Liaison

Call to Order: Kimberly Nickell called meeting to order at 3:31 pm.

Note taker: Mindy volunteered to be note taker.

Approval of Minutes: Brent Burton motioned for approval; Meg Stidham seconded; motion carried.

Agenda Items:

1. Initiative Reviewer role in eLumen
   1. A preliminary Read List with teams of two reviewers has been completed. This list will probably change because we welcomed a new member today, and PRC asked Academic Senate for an additional 5-6 additional members. Teams can decide how they would like to approach reading and making comments, if together or apart. Once list is finalized, each reviewer will get commenting privileges to the reviews assigned.
   2. There are two types of Reviews: NIAU = non-instructional Annual Update; AU = Annual Update (Instructional)
   3. Timeline – all Program Reviews are to be submitted no later than October 14 so that Kristin can pull and forward resource requests. Feedback from reviewers will be due sometime in mid-November.
2. Norming the Reading of Program Review
   1. Reviewers should not be assessing or grading. Reviewers are merely looking for coherency. Remember that the Program Goals are “where the rubber meets the road.” Does the update identify a goal? Do they have a reason for identifying the goal? How do they plan to accomplish the goal? And does it all correspond with the Strategic Directions of the college?
   2. Each reviewer can make comments that will not be identified. DO NOT press “Publish”!! “Save as Draft” instead. Kristin and Kimberly will publish.
   3. A resource request is not a goal (it can be part of the action plan, but it is not a goal in and of itself).
   4. Goals should link to Strategic Directions which link to the Mission
   5. The Assessment Report section of the review will be completed by the Assessment Committee. You can, however, make a brief comment such as that it has or has not been completed.
   6. Remember that this process is new and no one really knows what things will look like. Be Patient! Helpful Hint: write down suggestions/issues as you read so PRC can make improvements to the process next year.
3. New(ish) Business
   1. Possibly do a PR Spotlight and mail out to all throughout the school year. Items to include:
      1. Make a PR file in SharePoint to include items that can be added to review when time comes
      2. Periodically remind FCDC about items needed items so that they can be collected throughout the year.
      3. Lesley Bonds will probably provide PRC with a pullout section in regards to equity for future reviews.