**Program Review Committee**

 **Tuesday, September 22, 2015**

**3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Levinson 40**

**Meeting Notes**

1. **Today’s Note Taker**
	1. 9.8.15- Anna Agenjo, Minutes of 9.8.15 approved
	2. 9.22.15—Kate Pluta
	3. 10.6.15—Liz Rozell
	4. Jennifer Johnson will do late October meeting minutes

**Committee Members in attendance**:

Kim Nickell (co-chair), Kristin Rabe (co-chair), Manny Mourtzanos (co-chair), Kate Pluta, Anna Agenjo, Jessica Wojtysiak, Mark Staller, Sue Vaughn, Jennifer Johnson, David Neville, Liz Rozell, Diane Allen, Andrew Baker, Michael Carly, Hal Mendoza, Meg Stidham, Andrea Tumblin, Laura Lorigo

**Committee Members absent** (Are these people still members?): Diane Baeza, Bernadette Towns, Bernadette Martinez, Maritza Salgueiro-Carlisle, SGA rep.

1. **Review and approve agenda items.**
2. **PRC reading list**—reviewed layout and discussed assignments
	1. Michael Carley notes that DSPS does not have revised data.
	2. We are reading Dean of Instruction offices. They participated in pilot program in summer 2014.
	3. Under Ag Liz is listed as dean—change to Corny Rodriguez
	4. Liberal arts—Bernadette Town is lead
3. **Early AU and Comprehensive submittals. Any trends, issues?**
	1. Issue with using correct forms.
	2. Kristin will send information for logging in to SharePoint.
	3. Need for setting timeframe for new goals—question from last week’s workshop—is there a timeline requirement or deadline? Kim Nickell will check. Manny raises issue of defining reasonable timeframe might be 3 years.
4. **Development of 3-year comprehensive cycle for Student Affairs and administrative programs/departments**—Manny raises issue of whether these units should do 3-year Comprehensive PR as well.
5. **Should we reduce complexity of Annual Updates?—**Are we asking too much? What would we delete? Must keep requirements of integrated planning in mind.
6. **Issue of college calendar—**when one due date changes, it can affect other processes, like program review.
7. **Explanation of how we read program reviews and use the checklist—**This time it is not formative feedback so they can improve their final submission. The comments can be helpful to develop next year’s review. Committee agreed that “atta boys” go to the bottom of the checklist to note strong examples. No need for “atta boys” for every category unless one is especially strong. All the forms are organized in SharePoint.

Forms (e.g. technology) supplement the main program review. Kristin notifies committee when they come in and will try to post them in SharePoint September 29. Checklists go back to areas October 26. We have a meeting October 20.

1. **Classifying stand alone and special programs (ACDV, EMLS, future GEN ED)—***did not discuss.*
2. **Report on Tuesday, Sept. 15th workshop--**Manny and Kim.Workshops are very helpful.
3. **Budget Form**—Laura Lorigo—new process, would appreciate feedback on how it fits in program review process. Much earlier timeline. Manny recommends adding column for current year allocation. New Budget form has a line for each program on form. How do we move from past practice to current practice? For example, Industrial Technology has 15 programs and 1 budget.

**12.Committee Charge/Goals for 2015-16 –** Table for next time.

**Meeting adjourned at 4: 52 p.m.**

**Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 6, 2015**

**Note taker:** Liz Rozell