Call to Order by:
D’Art Phares (co-chair) @ 1:37pm
1) Approval of Minutes of 7-11-13, 2013 (10 min)
   a) MSC (Robert Smazenka/Mark Hobbs) to approve as amended.
2) Call for new items (3 min)
   a) Review of charter changes to ensure participation in budget prioritization:
      i) VPAA reports to EPC on prioritized budget; EPC responds; VPAA reports back on revisions
   b) Committee member update
      i) Robert Smazenka taking over for Carole Akl as Math rep. Donna Ayers is new AFT rep. Two Senate reps still pending. ASO representative still uncertain.
   c) Phares announced EPC’s charge to create objectives for LAMC’s revised Strategic Goals; this will appear on our next agenda.
3) Review of outstanding action items (3 min)
   a) Viability Process Task Force will report on their proposal next meeting.
4) PACE Viability Committee’s Report
   a) Brief discussion ensued. EPC’s role is to oversee the process. Formal approval is the prerogative of Senate and College Council who will consider this over the next month. A question arose over whether EPC should advocate for the actions suggested in the report. This question will be considered next meeting.
5) Mission Statement Review
   a) Only one issue arose: the line about “lifelong learners.” How to measure? Should the term be eliminated? Should it remain but be worded in a way that would better allow measurement?
   b) This recommendation will be finalized at our next meeting.
6) Program Review: planning this year’s cycle
   a) EPC must evaluate Program Review as a whole & issue formal report each year. The focus should be on improving education (per Dr. Lee). Improvements need to be incorporated
for this cycle (by end of September) to be included in the next Accreditation report.

There was discussion of sending changes out to select department heads for comment before incorporating them.

i) A general task force was formed (Bob Smazenka, D’Art Phares, Michael Allen, Said Pazirandeh, and Pat Flood) to plan the changes that would be included in the Fall Program Review.

(1) **Action Item:** Sarah Master will contact task force members to schedule this meeting by the end of September.

ii) EPC agreed to “customize” Program Review to better reflect the issues relevant to Library, LRC, & Distance Ed.

(1) **Action Item:** Sarah Master will contact Donna Ayers, David Jordan, and Marie Zaiens to schedule a discussion of this by the end of September.

b) Must coordinate with Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC) on the Program Review process.

c) Reviewed new schedule: PRs in Fall, and again in Spring (to shift in calendar so that AcAf can begin review earlier). Fall PR will cover fiscal year 2014-2015; Spring will cover 2015-2016. Perhaps treat Spring as annual updates only?

i) EPC agreed to retain the organization of last (3-year) cycle in terms of which departments do Comprehensives which year.

d) 3-year Comprehensive vs annual update?

i) Discussion focused on what should be included in each. One idea was for Comprehensives to require a 3-year plan for each department (based on the data in current Program Review and more), with annual updates reporting on progress made on that plan (to document continuous improvement).

ii) For Comprehensives, EPC/AcAf should review and, if questions, invite chairs to address those questions in person.

iii) Extra questions: what are your goals and how do they support improving education?

e) General observations

i) Accreditation report pointed to inadequacies in Learning Outcomes/Assessments/Improvements in current Program Review. Reports should focus on what has been learned. This will require new reporting screens incorporating data now held in SLO database.

ii) ILO’s: examine half in Fall and other half in Spring. Focus: “What does your department do to promote these outcomes?” Have chairs rank them with respect to their departments’/disciplines’ participation.

iii) Current system doesn’t allow for a dialog, can’t edit items

iv) It would be useful if it could incorporate a project management system, which can track progress on goals.

v) Chairs duties to submit goals as part of PR have not been enforced.

vi) Dr. Perez will submit two new fields/screens for PR

vii) Program Review should trigger detailed response from dept. chair or investigation by Academic Affairs if substantial change occurs (e.g. 10-15% decrease in dept. enrollment)
viii) Deeper analysis of the data is desirable. This will require training faculty, examples or rubrics for chairs’ responses, and involvement by Deans.
ix) Provide guiding/standardized questions/responses
x) Should there a way upload a Word document to help with project management?
xi) PR tends to focus on the past—shift the focus toward the future?
f) Should the CTE viability process be integrated into Program Review?
i) How does Advisory Committee feedback impact departmental programs? This could create “different” PR processes for CTE & non-CTE programs. What about transfer CTE programs?
ii) **Action Item**: Michael, Madeline, and Cathy will discuss and bring back to EPC

---

Adjournment: 3:30 pm
Minutes – M. Hobbs