<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Representative (Vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classified Staff Representative (Vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Librarian (Vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Beck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Cain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Durdella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Edson-Perone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Fronke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Heckerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Kremer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Lavariere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Rigby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Lola</td>
<td>Rizkallah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Farid</td>
<td>Wissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests: Miriam Tolson
## Cerritos College
### Program Review

### Action Items

- Action Plan for Program Review
- Include Colleges that were not covered in the survey
- Provide a report to the Faculty Senate Office
- Develop a statement to share the views of the Program Review committee related to the process to address the recent accreditation recommendations
- Continue Francine and Albanese project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web search distributed as noted below for survey information on the various colleges selected distributed among the following: Mark Fronke – (Lorraine Gersitz)</th>
<th>Angela Beck – Shasta and Redwoods (Gary Cain and Nick Kremer)</th>
<th>Lorraine Edson-Perone (Patty George)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Everyone on the committee is to review the presentation by Nathan Durdella prior to the next Program Review meeting in two weeks
- Mark Fronke to draft up and submit college model information for the committee - committee to respond with comments
- Check to see if there is a district policy on Program Review so that the committee can operate within the guidelines (Linda Rose)
- Look at colleges that didn’t get covered and see if there are any gems in the pile (Mark Fronke)
- Process is what is structured (online) if any findings any bring them in if they look reasonable
- Email to Fran and Albanese and copy to Bryan Reece regarding email submitted to Dr. Stephen Johnson
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The meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m.

Mark Fronke welcomed the committee and proceeded to discuss the agenda items as follows:

1. The committee reviewed the minutes from the September 16, 2008 meeting and amendments were made. The minutes were approved by the committee as amended.

Amendments included college name adjustments as well as information from Farid Wissa, Chair of Technology division indicating the information he received from his dean regarding unit plans would need documentation such as that comparable to Program Review.

2. Update on joint meeting with Curriculum Committee
   a. Mark Fronke submitted an email to Marijean Piorkowski and Rich Cameron indicating that the committee discussed it and wanted to pursue it. The committee is willing to meet at some point with the focus on the topic of SLO's and how to accomplish it.
      i. Mark has not received a response and will continue to pursue the request.

Presentation Nathan Durdella, Director of Research and Planning

A presentation was made by Nathan Durdella, Director of Research and Planning regarding Program Review and evaluating institutions. The presentation included a media enhanced podcast and was discussed in detail regarding the purpose of the development of the podcast as follows: Nathan Durdella and Mark Fronke have met regarding it and wanted to present it to the Program Review committee. Due to time constraints, a broad overview of the podcast was shown and the committee was encouraged to view it in totality prior to the next Program Review meeting. The Research and Planning department has worked hard in developing this tool; they are pleased with the outcome, and are ready to launch it. The tool will be available as a faculty and staff development tool in the future, with the beginning of the development of the non-instructional process being a new creation.

There are three (3) separate podcasts which will be available in ITunes format and Windows Media file versions in audio and video (totaling approximately 35-40 minutes combined)

- Developed for the purposes of Program Review
  - Focus and illustrate with practical ways on how Faculty and Staff can collect, analyze distribute data in the Program Review process
    - Data and Analysis
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- Targeted for Instructional, non-instructional programs and business and support services programs
  - Have worked diligently with instructional and multimedia services
- Purposes of using data in Program Review, and roles of Research and Planning as well as awareness to the committee as to what services are available through the department to facilitate stakeholder participation in the Program Review process.
  - Types of data available (3 types)
    - institutional data (MIS), Program data (collected locally), Primary data (surveys)
    - Step by step guidelines as to what the data, and surveys look like

At the conclusion of the presentation, the committee’s questions were answered, and they discussed the presentation and media related to the Program Review process and their focus as follows:

- Pilot tested for a few individuals – received positive feedback
- The link will be forwarded to the committee for review

3. Validation of Reading Department from 2007-08
A copy of the report will be given to read by Rachel Moore in the absence of Cynthia Lavariere. David Young is also reading the report. Rachel will report findings to the committee at the next meeting. This report was due last year but has not been completed.

4. Additional summer research reports

Seven colleges had been identified during the last meeting for research on Program Review processes: Lassen Community College is on probation and will no longer be included on the list.

Mark Fronke opened the floor up for suggestions from the committee on the continuance of the research on additional colleges.

- The committee agreed not to include any colleges on probation in the research.
- Lorraine Gersitz resigned from the committee and a replacement is needed for the Library
- The committee will need to decide on what characteristics they are looking for in a model (Nathan Durdella)
- Mark Fronke will look at additional colleges that did not get included at add them if they look like good models.
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- Those assigned to searching for models were instructed to:
  - Look at their process and see how it was structured and present it to the committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reassignments on Research reports for additional colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Mark Fronke – (Lorraine Gersitz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Angela Beck – (Gary Cain and Nick Kremer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lorraine Edson-Perone (Patty George)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

November 4 will be the working session. The committee is required to bring in their findings to discuss during the next meeting on October 21, 2008.

The committee will decide which six (6) out of all presented. Santa Monica College was commended on their Program Review process.

5. Review of identified models: The committee was invited to attend the meeting with Nathan Durdella, Mark Fronke with Caroline Sheldon to review the information at Santa Monica College. The meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 14 at 2:30 p.m. SS 141.

Mark Fronke requested Rachel Mason to address the committee on the issue of accreditation recommendations related to the Program Review process.

Rachel noted, that although it was not one of the accreditation recommendations, in reading the report it was noted through the language of the report that one of the preferred requirements would be to develop a process of what is working and what is not working, and to eliminate course offerings that have not been offered in years and point out anything that relates to the process and how models related to this process and whatever points back to curriculum and program review.

Linda Rose noted that the lack of integration of the process on the campus is a major concern and problem that exists. Linda agreed that was an excellent idea to go back to the reports the committee received from the commission, and that the college is aware of what they said. Linda suggests that there should be a seamless integrated process across instructional and non-instructional programs. With Lola Rizkallah representing non-instructional this provides a voice; however the issue remains as to how all of this can be integrated.

Lola Rizkallah noted that during the Planning Plus project in regards to including Program Review, that they were very limited in their understanding of the Program Review process and needs. Lola recommended to them regarding reports and additional aspects to Program Review that they were unaware of, and informed them regarding the details of her, Linda Rose and Terry Price providing reports and recommendations. Due to the lack of understanding on the campus regarding the process, Lola recommended that the Program Review
committee get moving to get clear of any accreditation warning without soliciting help, and whatever assistance is provided outside of the committee would be additional and greatly appreciated; however, at this point the committee may not have enough knowledge of what the needs are for additional participants.

David Young discussed his great concerns about models, and distinguishing having a member of the non-instructional side on the Program Review committee as opposed to an entity such as a group or committee to report to. Since that is not Lola Rizkallah’s charge, and since there is not currently a task force to integrate and import all of the work that has been accomplished from all the Program Review committees from the past approximately seven years, this remains a great concern.

Nathan Durdella indicated that the integrated model would include orientations with instructional and no-instructional so there is a common format and shared expectations. Research and Planning would work with these groups across the board. Nathan indicated that there should be a charge from Program Review within a two month period to establish a process for an integrated model. Mark Fronke concluded the discussion with the agreement of the committee to proceed with the statement to Faculty Senate.

6. Items from the floor

Mark Fronke discussed Program Review with Bryan Reece, Faculty Senate President since Program Review is a subcommittee of Faculty Senate. It was agreed that the Program Review committee would investigate exactly what the status is with the unidentified non-instructional areas in Program Review, and what the various committees are, as this is of great concern to all stakeholders. Upon reviewing the accreditation recommendation report, the following information has been requested, in order to report back to Faculty Senate. This was followed up with a detailed email to Dr. Stephen Johnson, VP Student Services, requesting the information on Program Review. To-date there has not been a response. Mark Fronke read the email to the committee. The committee requested that the email be sent and copies submitted to Bryan Reece, and Jim Albanese, VP of Business Services, and Francine De France, noting that he had not received a response from Dr. Johnson. Dr. Johnson will be copied on the email. It was noted that Francine De France was charged with ensuring that this project is completed.

The email summary is as follows: Request the update for the Non-Instructional Program Review process for the Program Review committee to review the progress for the meeting agenda for this current meeting (October 7), and to provide the following information. (The email was submitted a week prior to the meeting date):

1. A list of all identified programs in the non-instructional areas.
2. A template of the methodology used to develop the specific procedures for determining the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for each area. If there are separate methodologies for each area, please send them as appropriate.

3. A timetable of each step in the process.

4. Establish a report on where we currently stand and any identified variances from the original timetable to meet the March 1, 2009 deadline.

- The committee agreed that collaboration and integration process be established to encourage involvement with the campus stakeholders, and those experienced with the Program Review process. A motion was made to involve administration to an active role in this process. The committee is making an effort to communicate with the campus in this process.
  - A Program Review policy is mandatory and cannot be established by the committee.
    - Linda Rose will investigate if a policy exists on “program discontinuance” in order that the committee can operate within the guidelines.
  - Lola Rizkallah recommended establishing the structure for Program Review and proceeds with non-instructional departments. She also inquired as to how the Program Review process would assist with non-instructional processes.
    - Mark Fronke responded re: Validation, self-study, and processes in the past.
    - Mark Fronke indicated that no one had inquired regarding this prior to now, and most of what he has seen does not have a validation process.
    - Santa Monica is an excellent model and does not have a validation process.

After a motion was made that Mark Fronke develops a statement to reflect the views of the instructional Program Review committee, the committee agreed to critique and include their input to the statement at the next meeting. Mark will develop a draft that reflects the recent recommendations of the accreditation, and review an integrated process for all stakeholders, collaboration encouragement.

Lorraine Edson-Perone indicated that she had not seen a template. She suggested contacting some of the people that Fran De France has worked with or has contacted and inviting them to a working meeting.

The committee was reminded to bring their information binders to every meeting.

Adjournment (12:20)