MARK FRONKE (MF) opens meeting by welcoming committee members to the first Program Review Committee Meeting of the year and discusses his four ideas on the meeting’s protocol. The first one being that everyone be prompt to scheduled meetings, second for members to come prepared with notebook. The committee voted to bring their own printed copies to the meetings. The third idea was on protocol, which is that there are no bad ideas. The whole idea of this committee is to come up with a refreshed plan of attack on how a Program Committee should work. His fourth and last idea on protocol is, come with a good attitude.

Mark informed the committee that he was approached by the Curriculum Committee on campus about having a joint meeting with Program Review as a centralistic way of diffusing ideas. He asks committee to consider how they’d like to organize one of these meetings. The intent is for both committees to get a better understanding on how to help each other, with it’s primary focus being the Student Learning Outcomes (S.L.O.).

DAVID YOUNG (DY) noted that in doing research during the summer he came across a school, a seemingly nice model, that requires as part of the sub-study, that all curriculum materials be current and approved by the Curriculum Committee. This is a topic of conversation this Program Review Committee should have with the Curriculum committee as far as how to integrate this process into our own. At this particular school
the committee chair also sits on the program review committee, making integration a lot easier.

Ed Heckerman (EH) voiced concern that requiring curriculum to be current could be problematic. He goes on to use his own department as an example, a two person department with a dozen and plus courses to review and rewrite within a six year cycle.

DY clarifies that he understands the concern but that the Program Review committee’s job is to overlook whether departments are current on their curriculum or not. There is a mandate that S.L.O.s be in all classes. This committee’s job is to say whether given department is in compliance with that mandate, not say, are you having trouble getting current. It’s that simple. The big issue on challenges the small faculty departments on campus are having is an institutional issue, a committee issue, something the whole school should be looking and if Program Review begins making exceptions on an individualistic level, then nothing will get done because everyone can make that argument.

Linda Rose (LR) speaks on behalf of both arguments having merits. Going back to accreditation, one of the recommendations made was on communication at the leadership level but it also needs to happen on a more fundamental level among the committees on campus. Having a joint meeting with the Curriculum Committee would be a great opportunity to show that faculty are making the effort to communicate with each other and the minutes of those meetings would be very beneficial and could become a model for other committees on campus that should be doing the same thing. It is important to voice to other people on campus the challenges that, as a two person department, for example, have in terms of updating course outlines in contrast to a fifty person department. We need to get people asking what we, as an institution, can do to be sure that you have all the resources you need to get your Program Review done in a timely manner. The college should be reviewing its programs more often than on a six year cycle because accreditation cycle is every six year as well. We want to be able to include all of our complete course work without having to be scrambling during the year prior to accreditation, to get it all done. I see the merits on both sides of the argument.

EH would like to rephrase his previous comments. His department has rewritten all of their department courses but the problem is that some courses have changed so much that they’ve had to be rewritten and there’s also been new classes to be added and that all takes a while.

DY thinks that this discussion might be addressing two different things. There’s a curriculum standard that says program and curriculum need to be reviewed in a timely manner. That process should be the only one used by the committee, to make sure that all classes are in compliance with that standard. If you are writing new classes more frequently and are unable to keep up with that, that’s not a failure to meet up to the standard of the Program Review. It’s more of not meeting the standard set by the institution. So there are two different issues here. He doesn’t think there’s the conflict that initially we may have heard.
Farid Wissa (FW) mentioned that he was told as a chairman by his dean that the annual unit plan would be kind of a smaller version of a program review done annually. He believes his dean obtained this information from his superior and was wondering if the committee could elaborate more on that.

MF went on to explain that the two do have to be consistent. He adds that right now the committee isn’t too involved in the unit planning process, but maybe should be. In his opinion, the committee reports might be longer than they should be. Matter will be discussed at a later time.

MF will speak with Rich Cameron and Mary Jean Piorkowski from the Curriculum Committee, inform them about the committees discussion on having a joint meeting and see what their thoughts are on it. It will further be discussed in next meeting.

DY adds that they way he conceptualizes curriculum is that he sees that a lot of what they do meets the concept of Program Review. A lot of what they do implicitly is in the concept institutionally of Program Review. He wants to make the argument that this committee should have a larger role in what happens on campus wide than what it currently has.

MF acknowledges that he’s heard that same thing said in a lot of other venues. It’s been said that it should be stronger for the review process and should include administrator’s function. The problem is, how does the committee accomplish all this? In effect, Program Review is the internal audit department of the college.

DY responds to issue at hand by stating that all these things cannot be accomplished with the 8 committee members present. When observing other colleges, many of them structured this process a lot differently. They have different kind of administrative support, and the chairs have more time, and there are models where you get institutions where research and planning has a stronger commitment to the process and is written right in. He adds that to his understanding, when looking at the recommendations made my WASC seven years ago, the committee still isn’t doing what WASC wants it to do. This is not an integrated, across the system program review process. This is a silo function, not intergraded, committee is on its own, looking at just one aspect and that’s a flaw in the model.

FW doesn’t believe that the committee should get involved with the campus over all.

MF partly disagrees in saying that committee can’t be that rigid but needs to be more flexible in figuring out what the model is. Looking at other institutions makes sense because there are other places where this is not an issue for accreditation. It works in the sense that the accreditation people are happy with the process and so we need to look at those models that work and implement that. We should not disregard any ideas at this point.
FW clarifies that what his idea was for there to be two program review committees, one for instructional and one for non-instructional.

MF responds by saying that again, he doesn’t believe that that’s the kind of model that WASC is looking for. We have to do what they dictate as the model. That doesn’t mean that we can’t have a sub-committee that’s focused on instruction and a sub-committee that’s focused on administrative functions but overall program review will basically be the same.

EH mentions that it was his understanding from the recommendations from the accreditation committee that integration was a big issue, so that that needs to be pressed and people need to be brought in to the discussions.

DY adds that there was also an admonition that the other areas should mirror the instructional program review process and they aren’t doing that.

MF further adds that it’s not so much that they’re not doing what the committee is doing but they aren’t doing anything.

DY’s concern is that Student Services is going in a direction that’s creating a silo, it’s not integrated. There are models in the state where all the programs submit themselves into the same committee. His understanding is that that’s the WASC standard, that’s what they’re looking for.

MF brought up the Reading Department Report and recruits two volunteers to take a look at it. DY and Cynthia Lavariere (CL) volunteered to read the report and follow through with the validation

5. Summer Research Reports

DY began by sharing his research made in Santa Monica because they really have a remarkable model. He spoke with Janet Hackorobe which is the co-chair at Santa Monica on two different occasions. Their model is a little more than a shared government. They have a chair that is appointed by the Senate, and there’s a vice chair that’s appointed out of the president’s office and those people have equal importance in that committee. They currently also have two faculty co-chairs, so there’s two faculty serving chair from the Senate side and then there’s a vice-chair that is a dean, appointed by the President in to the committee. Then there are faculty and managers that sit in relatively equal proportions. There are students and other staff members that serve on the committee as well. It’s not a large committee but he points out the aspect that he really liked about it is that all six domains on the campus submit their self-studies into the program review. They assume competence in each department, there’s extensive guidelines provided to each area from the Senate on the process. They have listed all that data and all the institutional resources that are available to complete that in a document. They also include instruction on when you have to go through curriculum and in how to make sure they have all their paper work in line. And what
they do is that everyone’s report is due to the Program Review committee two weeks before the Accreditation Committee is scheduled to meet with that particular area and it undergoes a check list. The Review Committee doesn’t challenge whether the data is accurate, they just make sure they’ve cited the sources they were suppose to cite. It’s an assumption of competence. It changes how much work the committee has to do. It’s a six year rotation but some disciplines could be accelerated if they are audited internally.

**Action Item:** MF asks DY if it's possible for him to find out when was the last time that Santa Monica went through accreditation and if anything came up as far as recommendations to change anything in their process. It sounds like it's a system that is more mature.

DY agrees to find out more information on Santa Monica. He mentions that he's taken the liberty of discussing this with MF, faculty and the Senate President. The Senate President is open to us having a discussion and recommending out of this committee and going forward to the Senate and allowing them to discuss whether or not a new organizational model in terms of the committee’s role and things are done here. He's willing to support that.

Jeff Rigby (JR) brings to the discussion his impression of programs at other colleges he researched such as Long Beach City which seems to have a pretty good program. He presented print outs of some of their forms he downloaded from their website. L.A. Community College seemed to have a very comprehensive program as well. Attached to the L.A. Community College was this Accreditng Commission for Community and Junior Colleges Western Association of Schools and Colleges Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. The document bullets a lot of the things that the committee has mentioned should be done. He will further research these and other colleges more thoroughly and get back to the committee with further details.

FW looked at colleges, some of which had never done a program review. Others had made program review packets dated five years ago while in process for verification but never did the evaluations for their departments. Some colleges are joining each other for the same booklet. Santa Clarita does it's Program Review through the chairman of each department. They don't have a Program Review Committee. The chairman does it and shows it to the dean, their deans approve it and it is done. Faculty is not included in their process. San Luis Obispo just started their Program Review in April of this year and has never done previously. Miramar College just started their program too. Both Miramar College and San Diego Community College in San Diego share a booklet and have agreed to mail us a copy. Their process doesn't look very good but they do have a process and procedure to follow through. The San Diego Centers for Education and Technology, they belong to the San Diego City Colleges, and they have on their website a very brief program review questionnaire that they use. The San Diego Community College District all use the same process and they are as previously mentioned on a five year cycle, and they began their Program Review in 2003 and have been revising it and fortifying it since then. San Diego City College and San Diego Center both use the same
evaluation process and the timing of their process is each year. It is somewhat of a yearly unit plan. San Diego Miramar Program Review and SLOs are one committee which they call Program Review and SLO Committee. They evaluate every three years with annual updates. Their annual updates are like unit plans submitted by every department and every department is evaluated by the committee every three years. Somehow they combine program review and push for SLOs to be integrated in curriculum in the same committee.

LR discusses Rio Hondo, San Bernardino and Riverside. Rio Hondo has as step-by-step on how to use the Program Review Model online. They will be going through accreditation this fall. Their Program Review Process is integrated with a committee they have called Planning a Fiscal Counsel. Their Program Review takes place at their meetings, where departments attend and present. Linda presented a print out of Rio Hondo's Planning a Fiscal Counsel Meeting minutes so the committee can get a better idea of their process. In their meetings they have addressed everything that needs to be addressed as far as their Program Review process in four easy discussion topics. Linda will obtain a copy of their report to present at the next committee meeting. Rio Hondo also has scoring criteria for their Program Review Process and its in a three point scale: Does, Does Not Meet, or Exceeds. They've also included within their process Administrative Services, Student Services, Technology and Learning Services, and those answering to the President's office. At the time that they were doing this Marilyn Brock was acting VP or President at Rio Hondo and she might be a resource in developing a review process on campus. Maybe she can be invited to a meeting so she can share with us her first hand knowledge on what was done. It might be useful. Linda went on to talk about the second college she reviewed, Crafton Hills. They have included in their model how to interpret the data. The person who developed their process is part of their Research and Planning Department. The instructions are very helpful and only a few pages long. They have another section that talks about how to interpret Program Review data in terms of program efficiency.

**Action Item:** MF makes an overall comment asking committee members to get copies of their research done at these different colleges so that the information can be gathered in a master binder. Models at Santa Monica College, Rio Hondo College and San Diego Mesa College are some that the committee should further look at.

EH looked into "Name" College. Couldn't get much information on their model but managed to speak with someone who agreed to mail him some information. They did mention that they were modeling their plan on Riverside's. "Name" College was another college he looked at and managed to get a lot more information on. They seem to have a real streamline process. They're like Santa Monica College in that they include services specified in a document titled Guidelines for Programs and Services Review Report. Their evaluation process is data driven but the word "evidence" is not found in their literature. Their validation process is called a Review Report. Their evaluation report is done by a manager of the program, a staff member, a student enrolled in the program and others. He presented committee a printout of their Report mechanisms which specifies their time line which is a three year cycle and their programs goals
within those three years. It sounds like a simpler version of what would be a unit plan, including only the goal, timeline, and estimated costs. In this particular college is seems like the Unit Plan is more important than their Program Review.

EH mentioned that he found the most information on Peralta Community College District. It has a big thick booklet that is available as a pdf document online. What's neat about their process is that they have a very specific format laid out for every individual department, with very specific questions. They're also on a six year cycle. Their process seems very easy to do because there are specific questions and the answers are data driven but they also fail to mention the incorporation of evidence in their reports.

San Francisco Community College District does not mention anything regarding Program Review on their website. Ed emailed their Chancellor of Academic Affair who responded that their currently undergoing revision. Lastly, San Jose Community College District did not have anything concerning Program Review.

Ed states that after reviewing these colleges and their programs, he likes the "streamline" version best. He really supports the idea of making this Program Review Committee largely about helping departments on getting theirs written and going towards more of a checklist validation process and also, tying it in with budgeting process as well. Ed believes it would be beneficial for them to write a Program Review booklet that everyone gets.

**Action Item:** MF asks Ed if he can find out when Peralta went through accreditation last and whether they had any recommendations? Ed consented to find out and also obtain some of their reports.

LR wanted to add that the ACCJC website allow you to see what colleges are under warning. We shouldn’t be trying to model colleges that didn’t pass a clean bill of health.

MF volunteers to look up all the colleges and get back to the committee with that information. Also asked Ed to please email him the pdf file of Peralta’s Program Review.

Angela Beck (AB) started out by saying that she also had trouble getting some colleges to respond. "Lassen" Community College was the strongest model that she found. They go through their Program Review every four years, vocational programs every two years. They also provide a lot of support. They offer a faculty orientation in the spring before going into Program Review where everyone is given a handbook explaining exactly what's needed to be done. They get to choose a mentor off a list of people that went through it the previous year and the mentor guides them through the process. Their self study is seven sections similar to the one on campus. It includes: Program Goal, Curriculum, Student Learning Outcomes, Personal Support, Facilities, Budget, and then their overall Program Recommendation and it requires a lot of documentation and evidence. The reports are submitted to the Dean of Academic Affairs and then the Academic Senate where their committee reviews it off a checklist. Budgets are frozen of those departments that are non-compliant, an action that needs to be approved by the Senate and Governing Board before being implemented.
**Action Item:** In response to a question concerning what exactly a budget freeze consisted off, AB agreed to email the college and ask them for further details.

LR mentioned that budget freezing might be a problem for departments that are integrated and share a budget.

AB went on to talk about Mendocino College which she found a lot of information on through their website. They also provide a lot for support. Their Program Review Reports are collected, compiled and summarized by the Instruction office and completed electronically. Those were her two stronger college models.

MF points out that after committees report on their summer research, they have six committees they can focus on. He restated that he would look on the accreditation website to make sure they all have a clean bill of health because that is very important.

Lola Rizkallah spoke of Santiago Community College District because she was impressed by their model. They developed a Resource Development Department and it was really well done, very extensive. Some of the other colleges had just plain data such as fde's, number of courses, and thinks like that, which wasn't very impressive. Some, like North Orange County Community College District, mixed program and curriculum development and kind of threw Program Review into it. Palos Verdes College Library, which is non-instructional but was also very good. This appealed to her in particular because in between now and March 1st all department's on campus have to do their own Program Review so the college can clear their warning status. She has begun working on payroll but will eventually shift over to accounting and budgeting. Mount Sack's was ok, but was not very impressive. The two colleges that she spoke positively on where the ones that mostly impressed her. There wasn't a lot of information on the websites.

She was asked a question on whether she gained any useful information during her research that could help her on her March 1st Program Review report. She answered that she has learned a little but it was very different. She had started on the payroll report two years ago and there just doesn't seem to be a template or guidelines like the instructional programs have. She added that for the moment being the instructions that her department is receiving is for everyone to do their own thing and then eventually compile all those individual reports into one. Lee Krichmar is working on a program called Planning Plus that will take unit plans and add a component for Program Review. Through her research of different models, she has learned the component of validation which she shared with the Planning Plus committee and is something they will now implement into their process. She thanks the committee as well because she's also learned a lot through their in-put.

MF concludes meeting by mentioning that in next meeting the committee will discuss standards for evaluating departments. He also asks everyone to please send him whatever information they have so he can organize everything together. He will look at the accreditation website to check on the list of colleges and he will send out an email
with all the action items. He might even start a TalonNet site so the committee can more readily share information.
He thanked everyone for coming and reminded them that next meeting will be October 7th. The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 pm.