Program Review
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Notes

October 31, 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.**

**Notes…**

1. Trends, issues, things that bubbled up in the reads…
2. Missing mission statements
3. Programs didn’t understand that they had program learning outcomes or administrative outcomes.
4. Feedback question…describe the students served…type of student? What is the focus, CTE, transfer, etc. Student and admin. services serve all students.
5. Equity question…most people didn’t say anything about it. Assessment is having questions about this. Maybe take that off the assessment piece and pull that back into the AU and Comp. forms.
6. Trend data not used. Trend data not broken out for individual programs, i.e. Business Administration
7. Requests…one form to include previous requests, new requests
8. Goals: lack of action plans. Too many ongoing goals. Not making staff or faculty request a goal. It can be part of the action plan to request. Goals student or campus centered, not resource centered.
9. Sue Vaughn gave an example of keeping the goals and needed resources ongoing, even if it is 15 years.
10. Relate the program or administrative outcomes to the institutional outcomes.
11. Give programs that are not instructional some training…spring training should help them develop a better program review.
12. Can we speak to a program that is less than two years old…is there a way to identify that it is a new program early in the review.
13. Training for instruction and non-instructional
14. Who makes the call on space allocation? How would two areas wanting one space be resolved? Look at the Education Masterplan along with the Facilities Masterplan
15. Budget form issues. Only deans received them, and it seemed to cause confusion with some chairs. This may be resolved next year if we keep the format that they will go to the deans again. This is to spark conversations between deans and dept. chairs.
16. Equity piece is still a conundrum. Maybe meet with Equity and Inclusion and figure out what we need to ask and what we are looking for in the answers. Do we include it as a box within the goal section? Still need to speak to it in the trend data. Be sensitive to the issues of disproportionate impact.
17. Put the conclusion at the beginning as an abstract.
18. Welcome to your Program Review Packet letter with hard and fast deadlines. Some may think forms are optional.
19. The Handbook may be too much information
20. Bullets in the assessment piece.
21. How did some people not have unexpected things crop up in Program Analysis?
22. Encourage to answer NA when it isn’t relevant.
23. Categorical budget programs don’t have to submit HR form for staffing
24. Standout Program Reviews to use as examples
    1. Bill Moseley Computer
    2. Manny Mourtzanos
    3. Institutional Effectives
    4. MESA
    5. English
25. Kristin will be posting all feedback forms on Sharepoint. All committee members can take the opportunity to read and give feedback to the chairs.
26. How did it work for those who are new to the committee?
    1. Partnering new with veteran
    2. Feedback process and having a norming session gave new members the opportunity to see things with a critical eye.

Future meeting…

Strategic Directions Report (Due November 9) this may be tabled for spring 2018

Review Committee Charge

Discuss forms, CTE and CoA identification