**Program Review Committee**

**Tuesday, September 23, 2014**

**3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Library 149**

**Minutes**

**In attendance:**

Anna Agenjo, Sue Vaughn, Meg Stidham, Diane Allen, Janet Fulks, Kate Pluta, Billie Joe Rice, Kim Nickell, Michael Carley, Laura Lorigo, Kristen Rabe, Jennifer Johnson, John Carpenter, Manny Mourtzanos, Michael Self, Michele Bresso

**Today’s Note Taker--**Michele Bresso

**Note Taker for 10/7/14--**Michael Carley

**Review and Approval of 9/9/14 Meeting minutes will take place at the October meeting.**

<https://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview>

**Program Review and the 2015 Midterm Report—Standard I.B**

Dialog about evidence:

What we have to do for the mid-term report: address the 2014 standards adopted in June. Our AIPs have to be tied to a standard that may have been renumbered. We must meet the standards 24/7. Language in the far left column represents the new language. There are 14 teams and 14 sections of the standards. We’re using Mt. SAC’s report as a model. The college president has led 19 visiting accreditation teams, so it’s a proven model. When our report is written, we’ll shrink it down to the most important things. It will be relatively short. We also have to deal with the eligibility requirements.

Looking at 1B1:

The goal is to sustain collegial dialog about student outcomes. We’re talking about this in all committees and in student success initiatives.

Institutional effectiveness—sustained dialog:

We are sustaining the dialog in various places but there’s no person assigned to this task. However, it is in the Accreditation and Institutional Quality (AIQ) committee’s charge. New interim positions in the next phase of BCATT suggest this emphasis. The program reviews dealing with student learning and administrative outcomes would address this. We know that this sustained dialog links to our current GE pattern, but we need to document the dialog with evidence.

The Education Master Plan would be evidence for Standard IIA instruction. We want to include links to existing documents, but we don’t want to link to documents in progress. Doing so might result in incomplete documents offered as evidence.

Regarding reviews, Kristin will send the table we use for review. Teams of two have an identified primary and secondary reader. They talk to each other, combine their comments, and then the primary reviewer is charged with sending the results to the PRC. Complete the document, submit the form to Kristin through the program review email URL. She will upload the review to SharePoint.

The committee reviewed options for email language regarding consequences for late submittals. Documents submitted late to [bc\_programreview@bakersfieldcollege.edu](mailto:bc_programreview@bakersfieldcollege.edu) will be include (Late) in the document name. Kate will send an email alerting FCDC.

Since PRC makes up the majority of Standard IB, we will ask this group to create the narratives. Looking at areas of improvement, specifically IB6, there is a lot of evidence in the third column. What’s the commission’s consideration of disaggregation of data on SLOs? Some folks are attending ACCJC’s meeting at COS. This will be a place we can ask questions. Are there additional ways we can disaggregate data? Cull out foster youth, for example? Michael Carley will write a paragraph about this issue.

Section 1B7:

In College Council, we talked about the need to link the decision making document to the committee charges. We want to show they are linked to one another. It is being addressed now. Nick Strobel is working on it.

We need to identify potential problems and see what we can solve. We want to solve as soon as we find them. For example, the third bullet of areas for improvement on 1B1 indicates that data summits are not organized into a single webpage. We can do that now.

Section 1B2:

We need to mention AUOs. Last bullet in areas for improvement needs to add “AUOs.”

Next Steps:

An area for improvement we can identify: use of Curricunet to review data. We need to make sure people who include assessments in Curricunet send an email to us to let us know that the data are there. This is the only way we can keep track. We cannot move evidence and documentation forward without these assessments. We have to show that our work in Curricunet matters. If we can’t get reports, what is the point of doing the work? John will write a paragraph about this issue. Essentially, the assessment component is not functioning.

Action/Volunteers:

Manny asked for volunteers to identify one of the nine sections for which they will write a narrative/summative statement and develop action plan and action steps. The following committee members volunteered:

* John Carpenter -- 1B.2
* Kate Pluta/Diane Allen -- 1B.3
* Meg Stidham -- 1B.5
* Sue Vaughn -- 1B.7
* Michele Bresso/Jennifer Johnson -- 1B.8
* Michael Carley -- 1B.9

Kate will assign sections 1B.4 and 6 to other committee members and request that AIQ address section 1B.1.

Each person should provide a draft to Kate Pluta by 12 noon, Monday, October 6. Look at the Mt. SAC report for examples.