

Los Angeles Mission College
Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC)

October 7, 2014 – 1:30pm-3:00pm
CAI 2nd floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes – FINAL

Members Present: Michael Allen, Rod Austria, Sarah Master, Niki Milani, Leslie Milke, D’Art Phares, Dennis Schroeder, Janice Silver, and Daniel Villanueva

Members Absent: Walter Bortman, Monica Moreno, Joe Ramirez, and Tara Ward

The meeting was called to order at 1:36pm.

1. Review of Agenda: The agenda was reviewed and approved.
2. Approval of Minutes of March 27, 2014 and May 22, 2014
 - A. March 27 meeting: MSP Phares/Allen (2 abstentions: Austria and Milke)
 - B. May 22, 2014 meeting: MSP Silver/Phares (3 abstentions: Austria, Milke, and Silver)
3. Review of PROC Charter:

It was discussed that PROC may need more Student Services members in order to avoid being “top heavy” with Academic Affairs members. It was also decided that PROC will meet on the first Tuesday of each month from 1:30-3:00pm.
4. Program Review Structure:

The committee took one last look at the Program Review structure before it gets posted. Sarah also went over the PROC self-evaluation that was completed during the May 22nd PROC meeting and that will be submitted to SGOC. One of the four goals of PROC is to finalize the process for Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) for the President’s and Vice Presidents’ offices.
5. Program Review Status:
 - A. As scheduled, **Academic Affairs** completed all of the CPRs for one third of its programs in Spring 2014, with the exception of Professional Studies, which will complete its CPR by the end of October.
 - B. **Student Services** completed all CPRs for all of the units in its division by the end of August 2014, and one third of the units will be going through the CPR process again in 2015.
 - C. **Administrative Services** will be meeting soon to complete CPRs of all of the division’s units, and it was discussed that they could follow a similar format/process as the Student Services division and that it would be very helpful for Dr. Matthew Lee to come out and help Admin. Services with their program reviews and program review process the way he did for Student Services (see the first recommendation below). It was also discussed that it’s really important to come together with the shared governance committee for the division to get recommendations and commendations on the CPRs.

Possible additional elements for CPRs in Student Services and Admin. Services were also discussed, which, as in Academic Affairs, could involve additional screens, follow-up questions, projecting goals out further, etc.

There was much discussion regarding the mechanism used to assess/provide feedback on the Program Review yearly updates. Currently, this process has not been well-specified and little feedback is typically given to the department chairs. For Academic Affairs, it was agreed that there needs to be some systematic review by the appropriate Deans, and that they would provide feedback to each department chair during one of their regularly-scheduled meetings each year. These reviews will be reported to the VP who, in turn, will report a summary to PROC. The fact that Program Review yearly updates are now completed in the Spring will allow the Deans to review the yearly updates in the summer and then meet with the department chairs in early fall (see also the second recommendation below). The Student Services and Administrative Services divisions will follow up with their Managers as to how to proceed with evaluating the Program Review yearly updates and provide feedback to the managers. Student Services and Admin. Services will be making recommendations for how to formalize the process of feedback on their annual program reviews at the next PROC meeting. PROC will continue to work on standardizing and aligning what all divisions are doing in Program Review.

6. Based on the discussions above, PROC is making three recommendations:
 1. Recommending that Dr. Matthew Lee be retained to consult with the Administrative Services division on its program review process. (This recommendation will go to College Council for approval.)
 2. Recommending a standardized timeline for completion of CPR validations across the divisions, such that they should occur in the fall semester for the units up for CPRs – this way the CPR/validation can be based on the most recent information entered into the program review screens the preceding spring, and will give the validation teams the summer to review the CPRs so that the validation process can be completed in the fall.
 3. The Vice Presidents of each division will report the major themes of the planning objectives and resource requests from their respective divisions to PROC (in the form of a SWOT analysis) at the Dec 2nd, 2014 meeting. These reports will then be shared with College Council.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Nov. 4, 2014; 1:30pm – 3:00pm, CAI 2nd floor conference room

Minutes by L. Milke and S. Master

Los Angeles Mission College
Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC)

November 4, 2014 – 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm
CAI 2nd floor Conference Room

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

Los Angeles Mission College
Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC)
June 2, 2015, 1:30pm-3:00pm
Academic Senate Office

Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Michael Allen, Sarah Master, Leslie Milke, D'Art Phares, Janice Silver, Daniel Villanueva, and Tara Ward

Members Absent: Rod Austria, Walter Bortman, Niki Milani, Joe Ramirez, Steve Ruys, and Dennis Schroeder

1. Review of agenda:
 - A. The meeting was called to order at 1:40pm and the agenda was reviewed.
2. Review of Feb. 3rd, March 3rd, and May 5th, 2015 minutes:
 - A. Feb. 3rd, 2015: MSP Allen/Master to approve as read; Phares abstained
 - B. March 3rd, 2015: MSP Phares/Allen to approve as amended; Villanueva abstained
 - C. May 5th, 2015: MSP Phares/Master to approve as read; Allen/ Villanueva/Ward abstained
3. Initial program review feedback from spring 2015 program review annual updates:
 - A. Some of the non-instructional units had confusion about how to submit their program reviews because the system was asking for a "submit code." The submit code is entered by the VP of the division and is his sign-off that he has looked over what is being submitted. Upon completion of their program review, each program/unit should email its VP to let him know it's ready to be reviewed and submitted.
 - B. The Student Support Services Committee needs to finish posting all of its Comprehensive Program Reviews on its website.
4. Timing of Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPRs)/validations:
 - A. At the 10/7/2014 PROC meeting, the following recommendation was made:

"Recommending a standardized timeline for completion of CPR validations across the divisions, such that they should occur in the fall semester for the units up for CPRs – this way the CPR/validation can be based on the most recent information entered into the program review screens the preceding spring, and will give the validation teams the summer to review the CPRs so that the validation process can be completed in the fall."

 - a) The Admin. Services and Student Services divisions are okay with this timeline, as they plan to conduct their comprehensive reviews over the summer such that they would be complete by Fall.
 - b) EPC discussed this timeline and decided to finish out the current 3-year cycle with conducting the final third of academic CPRs in Spring 2016. It will then plan to conduct the next cycle in the fall semesters (starting Fall 2016).
5. Comprehensive program review of non-academic Academic Affairs units (e.g., Assessment, Learning Resource Center, etc.):

- A. It was discussed that certain programs do not need to undergo a CPR (e.g., CalWORKS, Foster Care/Kinship Care).
 - B. For the remaining units, it was decided that the comprehensive validations of these units would be performed by a team consisting of the overseeing Dean and the Vice President of Academic Affairs every three years.
 - C. The Assessment Office and the Honors Program will be assigned Deans to oversee them.
6. PROC annual self-evaluation:
- A. Although not required by the Shared Governance Oversight Committee (SGOC), PROC completed the SGOC's annual self-evaluation form to reflect on the past year and prioritize goals for the year ahead. The completed form is attached.
7. Meeting time for next year:
- A. The committee decided to keep the same meeting time for next academic year (1st Tuesday of the month from 1:30pm to 3pm).
8. Items from the floor:
- A. None.
9. Adjourn:
- A. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm.

Minutes by S. Master