**Members Present:** Pat Flood, Sarah Master, Leslie Milke, Monica Moreno, D’Art Phares, Dennis Schroeder, Bob Smazenka

**Members Absent:** Michael Allen, Angela Echeverri, Mike Reynolds, Jan Silver, Hanh Tran

**Guest:** Dr. Matthew Lee

1. **Review of agenda**

2. **Introductions**

3. **Review status of items from prior meetings:**
   - **PROC** – S. Master reported that the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC) had its first meeting on Oct. 3rd, 2013. Sarah Master and Hanh Tran will be co-chairing the committee. The committee decided that the online program review system will be open from Mon., Oct. 21st to Fri., Nov. 22nd this year. The PROC will be determining a training schedule for using the online program review system and will be discussing each division’s program review and validation processes at the next PROC meeting.
   - **ACCJC Institution-Set Standards** – S. Master reported that she compiled the data to aid in the discussion of Institution-Set Standards for LAMC (as required by the ACCJC). The initial discussion will take place in the Chairs and Deans meeting on Oct. 16th, their recommendations will be taken to EPC, and final approval will be sought from the Academic Senate and College Council.

4. **Discussion of tasks this committee can take on to address research/evaluation-related accreditation recommendations**
   - Serve as “short-term shared-governance research advisory task force” recommended in Dr. Matthew Lee’s gap analysis report?
   - The group went over a handout that listed Dr. Lee’s suggestion for creating a short-term research advisory task force to accomplish four specific tasks related to accreditation recommendation 3 from the visiting team’s report. Briefly, these tasks are as follows:
     i. Develop a system for setting priorities among research projects (this system will then be approved, implemented, disseminated, and adhered to)
        a. Discussion focused on the fact that research demand will outstrip the supply of resources, and there needs to be a systematic approach to determining high-priority items
     ii. Determine campus training needs in the development, application, and interpretation of data, particularly for participants in the program review and outcomes assessment processes. Develop a calendar of training sessions, distribute calendar, facilitate the sessions, and provide an opportunity for evaluation of the sessions and suggestion of additional training.
a. Discussion focused on the need for trainings on how to use the tools that are available, how to approach data, how to determine what the data mean (based on trends, patterns, outliers, etc.), and on what conclusions can be drawn from the data. What are the training needs for the next 6 months? 12 months? Also discussed idea of “local leads” – training a couple people from each department who will be responsible for training others in their departments/disciplines.

iii. Evaluate and recommend specific improvements in the data the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) customarily collects and provides for program review and in other major planning and evaluation processes such as the outcomes cycle, in light of the increasing need for data disaggregated in multiple ways to illuminate diverse student needs.

iv. Evaluate and recommend concrete improvements in OIE support of ongoing, robust, pervasive, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

• The group discussed that it will put forth a proposal to be considered at the next College Council meeting that this group (the Research/Eval. Theme Team) serve as the “Research Advisory Task Force” to accomplish the above tasks.
• Dr. Lee noted that we need to include “review and revision as needed” in any priority system or training schedule (or any similar system or process) that is developed.
• Dr. Lee and S. Master will work on dates of completion for each of the four tasks and will report the proposed dates back to the group.
• The group discussed that as the units go through program review this fall, we should ask them to provide comments/feedback about what they need help with and what they would like to see in terms of data. Would they like to the data disaggregated in other ways? What additional data reports would be useful to them in evaluating their programs’ effectiveness?
• B. Smazenka agreed to draft up a question asking for this feedback and will send it to D. Phares by Wed., Oct. 9th.

• **Other areas/tasks committee can take on?**
  • This committee can help review the questions for the fall Faculty/Staff and Student surveys, and survey question recommendations will additionally be solicited from the Accreditation Steering Committee.
  • Discussed that roll-up of certain course SLOs to PLOs and certain PLOs to ILOs would be a topic for the newly-formed Students Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee rather than this group.

5. **Items from the floor**

• Discussed that the group’s regular meeting time will be the second Tuesday of each month, from 12pm – 1:30pm.

6. **Adjournment**