Program Review

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

Minutes

September 19, 2017

**Charge: In support of the College's mission, the Program Review Committee (PRC) facilitates an annual, systematic self-assessment of institutional effectiveness for instructional, student services, administrative and operational areas.  PRC provides training, feedback, commendations, and recommendations related to the program review process.  The committee contributes to "Closing of the Loop" by disseminating resource allocation requests to responsible committees.  The committee reports to College Council annually at its last meeting of the calendar year.**

Indicates this topic needs follow-up

 Note taker: Nicole Hernandez

1. We will be having a visit from the Accreditation Leads, Liz Rozell and/or Jason Stratton; *Neeley Hatridge will be presenting for AIQ*
	1. ACCJC stand for accrediting commission for community and junior colleges, President Christian is a commissioner for the board.
	2. Four major accreditation standards with all subsections needing to be evaluated. Total subsections = 14.
	3. ACCJC member institutions are expected to meet all accreditation standards at all times.
	4. The document that guides BC decisions-making planning and resource allocation and BC goals for student learning and achievement is *the mission*
	5. BC has received zero sanctions
	6. There four phases of the ACCJC accreditation process
		1. Internal or self-evaluation
		2. External evaluation by a visiting team
		3. Evaluation by a commission
		4. Institutional self-improvement and follow-up and mid-term report
	7. Assessment drives our college planning to improve student learning and achievement
	8. 2012 was the last accreditation visit and 2018 will be the next visit.
	9. Program review forms resources and growth needs for the campus and used for accreditation
	10. Accreditation and institutional qualities committee is the standing governance committee.
	11. AIQ helps to produce the yearly report of strategic directions in addition to the self-evaluation report
	12. The 2012 Bakersfield college self-evaluation report is posted to the accreditation website under “about BC”
	13. QFE stands for quality focus essay
	14. The program review is the basis for the allocation of college’s resources.
	15. The accreditation visiting team can meet with anyone during visits
	16. The accreditation visiting team is made up of peers form other institutions
	17. The college demonstrates the regular review and assessment of institutional effectiveness process, including the evaluation cycle, integrated planning, resource allocation via program review assesses process, program review distributes the data and then it is reassessed
	18. Institutional planning
		1. Must happen on a regular basis
		2. Use valid data for course
		3. And follow consistent processes
	19. Can search for these terms on Bakersfield website or speak with someone in AIQ who may know terms
2. Minutes were unanimously approved for meeting from 09.05.17
3. Review the Program Review Feedback Form (the form formerly known as the Checklist)
	1. Changing “Yes/No” to “satisfactory/needs improvement” to allow for recommendations if answer needs further clarification
		1. Reviewers need to ensure they are providing helpful feedback and not criticism/ demeaning comments
	2. Kim to change form with end column to indicate that section has been reviewed
	3. Questions are formatted to be closed ended, not allowing for open-ended response – possibly in future change to make questions open-ended to allow for better feedback
	4. “College Mission” section
		1. no comments from PRC members
	5. Section of forms “E. Budget” has been changed to “F” and “E” now “Other”
	6. Forms for budget may be delayed due to Laura Ligo (SP) moving to district
	7. Sue wanting to add general question about future budgetary needs
		1. Possibly place questions in program analysis
		2. Budgeting is currently assessed through what they used for the previous years resource request
		3. This could be revisited in the spring
	8. “Progress of Goals” section
		1. change the word from “discussion” to “action plan”
	9. Question - Should program review re-assess program review documents if the document they submit has sections that do not appropriately answer questions being answered
		1. Feedback is typically encouragement for next year; to make changes for the following year
		2. Historically, reviewers sought guidance from committee co-chairs on what actions to take
	10. “Best Practices” section
		1. no comments from PRC members
	11. “Program Analysis” section
		1. Added “Did the program’s analysis of trend data address the following:” above bullets.
		2. Bullet “A” re-worded
		3. Bullet “B” re-worded
		4. Bullet “C” re-worded
		5. Bullet “D” re-worded
	12. “Resources Request and Analysis” section
		1. Added “for each applicable section”
		2. In future should possibly add description to make it clear for programs to understand how to answer section
	13. “Conclusions and Snapshot” section
		1. Added “does”
		2. Changed question to “does the conclusion provide a clear…”
		3. Changed section name to “Conclusion”
		4. “Conclusion & Snapshot” is used in the AU form
		5. Should possibly put in the section prompt that Dr. Christian reads the section to emphasize the importance of completing section adequately
	14. “Have all the appropriate forms been completed”
		1. no comments from PRC members
	15. “Assessment”
		1. Possibly do more campus training of how to complete PLOs, AUOs, SLOs
		2. Once eLumen goes live, this section may not be on the program review form
4. Norm the reading and response process for feedback to programs
	1. See notes from above

Future meetings…

Strategic Directions Report (Due November 9)

Review Committee Charge