PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES for March 17, 2010

Attending: Celena Alcala, Mary-Jo Apigo, Judith Ann Friedman, Fran Leonard, Betsy Regalado, Aimee Preziosi, Marlene Shepherd, Rebecca Tillberg

Noticed absence: Lloyd Thomas

I. The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.

II. The minutes of February 27, 2010 were approved.

III. Proposed Program Review Process

Fran passed out copies of the draft Proposed program Review Process developed by the Senate’s Educational Policies and Standards Committee. The committee reviewed the draft and reworked a few sections, changing the title, for example, from “Proposed Program Review Process for Academic Divisions” to “Proposed Institutional Effectiveness Process...” In addition, members noted that

A. the process needs to begin with discipline faculty who prepare a comprehensive evaluation of the discipline every 6 years, followed by a comprehensive evaluation of the division by the Division Chair, “in consultation with the members of the Division.”

B. Rebecca also noted that another step needed in the process is a planning one. Added to the draft is this step, “Based on the comprehensive self-evaluation, the division will develop division goals and actions plans to guide the division activities over the following 6 years.

C. Discussion included questions, such as the implication of basic or foundational skills in the second bullet point under definitions. And, the evaluation of programs such as UMOJA and FACE.

III. Update on Program Review instrument development.

Rebecca reported to the committee that the District has a programmer and work proceeds on the District Collaborative online program review instrument. She handed out the Library of Program Review Modules and Questions, many of which the committee had vetted in previous committee meetings. **TASK:** Fran agreed to go through the questions to indicate which ones respond to specific accreditation standards/recommendations. Rebecca will provide Fran with a new template of questions to work with.

A meeting with the District programmer will be scheduled for the committee. Items to be fine-tuned include adjustments for the 6-year comprehensive cycle with updates every 2 years. The Report Settings need to account for divisions, disciplines and distance education, for example. West’s administrators for the online program review are Mary-Jo Apigo, Celena Alcala and Rebecca Tillberg.
Rebecca also went over the chart of Phases 1, 2 and 3 of this project, indicating that a Technical Work Group will focus on Phase 2, Goals and Objectives and the Prioritization/Budget Process with relevant BW Reports. Judith Ann agreed to work with this group.

The committee noted that reports generated should be available across disciplines and divisions for grants, for example, to respond to requests for software or other identified needs.

The work is slated to be completed in August in time for Phase 1 to be implemented in Fall 2010.

IV. Program Review & Institutional Effectiveness, Standard I.B
Fran reported to the committee about the 1st meeting held Monday, March 15th of the Standard I committee.

A. The mission statement continues to be reviewed with all input due to Fran, chair of the College Council, by Monday, March 22, 2010. All input then goes to the Accreditation Steering Committee meeting of March 25, 2010 for final work on the recommendation to go to the College Council, April 8th.

B. Fran shared copies of the team evaluation report from West's 2006 Comprehensive self study, specifically on Standard I. This provides a context for the upcoming report and a reminder of where West was in 2006, how much progress we've made since then to report on, including to Recommendation 5.

C. Fran shared with the committee the updated Accreditation Standards Committee membership and meeting schedule. Each committee is looking for more members from faculty as well as staff, administration and the ASO.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.