



Program Review Committee

March 23, 2016 / 3-4:30 PM / Room 507

Meeting Minutes

LPC Mission Statement

Las Positas College is an inclusive learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals.

LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards.
- ❖ Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance.
- ❖ Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes.
- ❖ Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE, and Transfer courses.

Program Review Committee

Members Present (voting):

Karin Spirn
Christina Lee
Catherine Suarez
Michal Shuldman
Nadiyah Taylor
Robin Roy

Members Present (non-voting):

Members Absent:

Meeting Guests:

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 PM by Karin Spirn

2. Review and Approval of

Minutes

Motion to approve minutes of Feb 24, 2016 and March 10, 2016 by:
Michal Shuldman

Seconded by: Catherine Suarez

Minutes approved by consensus

Nadiyah Taylor abstained

The meeting of April 13th was cancelled due to a conflict with the Staff Appreciation Day. The Rawk Hawks will be performing at the event.

Karin Spirn announced that she will be working on a shared governance worksheet with the charge of the committee. Some things listed on the shared governance document were obsolete. She showed the committee the charge of the committee listed on the web site. She will send the corrections to Kelly Abad to put on the Shared Governance web page.

3. Recommendations from the

PRC

Karin Spirn spoke to the Deans in the morning. They were amenable to having a time set aside where for an optional meeting with faculty to go over the development of program reviews. The management said mid-September to October would be the best time frame for them. The advantage is that the Dean may help with ideas on how to implement ideas and the review will help the Dean know what is happening in the program.

Karin Spirn also spoke to the Academic Senate. She reported to them that PR is interested in moving to a larger meeting for centralized planning. The Senate may be interested in putting forth a resolution that recommends a centralized committee. The IEC could be in charge of evaluating whether procedures are done effectively and not a power grab.

A discussion was held on whether to move forward with the idea of creating a centralized planning meeting. It was suggested to have a large committee that is broken up into several subgroups meeting at

different times. Enrollment management should be its own committee but report to the central committee.

Karin Spirn talked to IPC about combining with PR but they did not want that. IPC did not want to read program reviews. IPC only reads the Deans reviews to compare the priorities.

Karin Spirn asked the members if they wanted to advocate for a committee on planning budgeting and program review. It was suggested to have one big reporting committee. It was suggested that the committees could remain the same but have a large centralized reporting meeting. The large reporting meeting could take place at the Town Hall meeting. The consensus was that there needs to be a better centralized planning process.

It was suggested to combine the budget allocating committee with the IPC. The committee allocates money but they do not set up the budget. That function is done at the District level. Each college has its own allocation model. The faculty make their presentation and the president puts together the budget. Resources are allocated using the budget allocation model.

It was noted that if the college had a centralized planning and budget committee it would be easier to report out. RAC was broken up because the Deans said it had gotten too big and unwieldy. There wasn't a planning committee until recently. A planning committee was needed for accreditation purposes.

Karin Spirn will look at different colleges to find out what other committee structures may work.

4. **Next Year's PRU Template**

Karin Spirn handed out a mockup of the new Program Review Update Template. She added a link to the office of institutional research. She put in a section for adding DE courses degrees and/or certificates. It was asked if there was any program that had a degree completely online. All general Ed courses are online. It was asked if Scott Vigallon meant everything online or just one course. Karin Spirn will ask for clarification on whether he mean all courses "could" be taken online or "must" be taken online.

Karin Spirn will send the draft to the committees that do allocations asking if the template meet their needs.

Karin Spirn showed the “Example Program Review SLO Section” document sent by John Ruys. He has added directions to the last page.

It was suggested that the draft be presented in April and May so everyone will have time think about it.

The April Town Hall will be focused on SLOs. It was suggested that it may be a good meeting to present the draft. This could be a first step in to helping people assess their SLOs.

There was a discussion on what to keep in the document and what to link to a web page. It was suggested to move items 1-6 of the directions to an online link.

This opening section gives the impression that faculty are going to write their program outcomes as opposed to just reflecting on them. It was suggested to put a hyperlink stating “More information can be found here”.

Karin Spirn will ask to meet with John to ask the following questions:

Concerning the section starting with the line “Using assessment data from last year...

- Can we add PLOs?
- DO you want this for SAOs?
- Provide a definition of institutional effectiveness.
- Could this section be clarified a bit?
- Maybe some examples posted on SLO site?
- We are confused about what IE means here.
- Give us an examples on SLO site.
- Maybe add planning priorities.

For the question on “Courses addressed last year” Does John Ruys mean the number of courses or title of courses? Ask John to clarify if he means specific course titles or just amounts of courses.

For data or changes it was noted that Faculty may forget they need to do a classified position request.

Karin Spirn will ask Scott what is meant by “DE degree/certificates”.

Some people were confused by section “G”. “B” is about what your program has achieved. “G” is a chance to brag about how the program impacted students. It was suggested to put “G” after “B” and add “If

you did not answer this in section B”....

It was suggested to reword section “G” to “Discuss at least one positive example of how students have been positively impacted by the work of your program since the last program review”.

The question about DE courses was moved under “D”. “If applicable” was replaced by “Instructional programs”.

The working draft was completed. Karin Spirn will make a mockup for the allocation committees. She will ask John Ruys and Scott Vigallon for clarification on the questions.

5. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4: 25 PM

6. Next Regular Meeting April 27, 2016

Spring 2016 PRC Meetings

(2nd and 4th Wednesdays, 3-4:30 PM Room 507)

April 27

May 11