Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Rod Austria, Sarah Master, Leslie Milke, D’Art Phares, Joe Ramirez, Janice Silver, and Daniel Villanueva

Guest(s) Present: Nick Minassian

Members Absent: Michael Allen, Walter Bortman, Niki Milani, Dennis Schroeder, and Tara Ward

1. Review of Agenda:
   A. The meeting was called to order and the agenda was reviewed and approved.
   B. It was discussed that PROC will need a replacement member for Monica Moreno – it should be whomever becomes the new co-chair of the Student Services Committee (once elected, which should occur by the next PROC meeting).

2. Approval of Minutes of October 7, 2014:
   A. MSP Milke/Phares (1 abstention: Ramirez)

3. Formalization of process for providing feedback on annual program review updates in Student Services and Administrative Services:
   A. For instructional program reviews, the appropriate Academic Affairs Dean reviews the yearly updates with their Department Chairs.
   B. Similarly, the Deans in Student Services will annually provide feedback to the different Student Services units.
   C. In Administrative Services, the Vice President of Admin. Services will annually provide feedback individually to each of the units within that division.
   D. As Administrative Services goes forward with comprehensive program reviews, it was discussed that the Facilities Planning Committee, Technology Committee, and Budget and Planning Committee will jointly convene, at least two times per year, to validate the comprehensive program reviews from the Administrative Services units up for review.

4. Finalize discussion of program review of administrative offices (i.e., the Office of the President, the Office of Academic Affairs, the Office of Student Services, and the Office of Administrative Services) and their validation:
   A. Potential models of comprehensive program review (CPR) and validation of administrative offices (the President’s Office and the VP’s office in each division) were discussed.
      i. For the President’s Office, it was agreed that the Chancellor’s review of the President may already be sufficient, but that we could ask that the entire President’s Office be included in that review as well.
      ii. Nick Minassian mentioned that at LA Valley College, they are creating their own program review model for the Vice Presidents’ offices, and that we can perhaps consider doing something similar to what they are doing. Nick will be demonstrating the LA Valley College program review system (that he developed) to PROC at the December meeting.
      iii. It was also proposed that each year, each of the VP’s offices could self-reflect as an office and complete an annual program review update (and make any budget requests), but then every three years, the other two VPs would do a CPR validation of the 3rd VP’s office (e.g., the VPs of Student Services and Admin. Services would review the Office of
the VP of Academic Affairs, etc.), the results of which would be reported out to College Council. Since this would be a three-year cycle, all three VP office CPRs could occur once every three years, or one office could be reviewed each year in each year of the three-year cycle. It was also suggested that the three VPs could jointly conduct a CPR of the President’s Office every three years.

iv. Also, what about the non-instructional units under Academic Affairs – what is the process for CPRs of those units?

5. Discussion of Program Review feedback/system:

A. Began discussion of feedback from the last round of program reviews and changes/enhancements that will be implemented for this Spring. In addition to the comments in the “Spring 2014 Online Program Review System Feedback” chart that was distributed, it was also discussed that:

i. The success and retention data should be disaggregated by student demographics. Also, while the enrollment data is already disaggregated by student demographics, it would be very helpful to have this information displayed as percentages and not just numbers of students.

ii. An issue was noted in that retained resource requests (i.e., that were created in a prior year and rolled over) keep the “year” indicator of the year that they were created (and not the current year) unless they are updated in the current year – Nick said that he can flag requests that haven’t been updated in the current year so that they can be updated (so the year of the request will update too).

iii. Leslie mentioned that the College’s average performance should be added to certain screens, but she needs to check which screens these should be and will get back to PROC.

B. There was also discussion of a prompt that should be added so that programs that received Student Equity funds and/or that have activities included in the Student Equity Plan will be able to report on the status and success of those activities each year in program review.

C. Sarah noted that the definition for institution-set standards in the new accreditation standards is: “Performance metrics and measures set by institutions for student achievement, both in individual programs and for institution-wide student achievement.” Currently each program compares itself to the institution-set standards in its annual program review update. PROC discussed that the institution-set standards at the program level are thus the same as those set for the institution level, but that individual programs may set their own standards if they so desire.

6. Items from the floor:

A. The Vice Presidents will be submitting their “SWOT” reports to PROC on Dec. 2nd, 2014 of the major themes of the planning objectives and resource requests in their divisions’ program reviews. These will then be shared with College Council.

B. From now on, PROC would like to meet in the Academic Senate Office (so as to avoid having to wait for the door to be unlocked at CAI). Leslie will reserve the Academic Senate Office.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm.

**Next meeting:** Tuesday, Dec. 2, 2014; 1:30pm – 3:00pm, Academic Senate Office

Minutes by S. Master