

**Program Review Subcommittee
MEETING MINUTES
October 21, 2005**

PRESENT: Jim Bowsher, Cathy Hasson, Christine Roumbanis, Arthur Tayakama

ABSENT: Lori Adrian, Sherri Hancock, Ray Hernandez, Regina Stanback-Stroud

RECORDER: Christine Roumbanis

MEETING NOTES

Philosophy/Purpose of Program Review

We reviewed the philosophy of Program Review which is for program improvement. The primary objective of Program review is to assess on an ongoing basis the quality of programs as they relate to the mission and goals of the college. We want to encourage renewal and enhancement of our programs. The committee is reviewing the self-study questions for Student Services and Instructional programs and there seems to be a need to revise the existing documents to incorporate student learning outcomes which would enhance the quality and viability of programs. Evaluations are essential to enhance the quality and viability of programs and one consideration is to integrate the self-study into accreditation and its timelines.

For the first phase of the committee work we decided to concentrate on reviewing the current process and timelines of program review and try to determine their effectiveness. We reviewed Mission College, Saddleback College, Irving and San Diego Mesa Colleges existing processes. Most colleges are on a five to six year comprehensive program review cycle with an annual review. Programs and forms do not change drastically from semester to semester or year to year to make the process manageable. Many colleges either have changed or are currently reviewing their own process to meet with accreditation standards.

- 1) **Program Review Timelines.** The committee members are looking at the timelines of other colleges. Cathy Hasson went on a list serve to find out what other colleges are doing. Consensus is to have a streamlined, yet meaningful process which is faculty driven regardless of the Program Review Timeline.
 - a) Review and revise the formal program review timeline. The action plan has been implemented. One suggestion is to include a follow-up to the Action Plan. Another suggestion is to have programs come to the Curriculum Committee one year after the presentation and present a follow-up to their proposed action plan.

- i) We will develop a faculty survey which will be disseminated to all programs having gone through program review in the three years to help determine the effectiveness of our current timeline and process. The survey will be conducted over the telephone and through email to try and get as many responses from faculty as possible. We will design and implement the survey in spring.
- ii) We discussed the current program review process which culminates with a presentation. Discussion about the process was lively. Faculty in the committee have participated in the presentation process and felt the maximum ten minute time limit, with five additional minutes allotted for questions was a good process. The Curriculum Committee offers workshops to assist faculty through the program review process and we might want to add an additional workshop which would help faculty with their presentations. We could elicit the help of Phyllis Taylor, Speech Communications to help guide faculty with their oral presentation.

2) Action Plan

- a) Cathy Hasson will research different college program review cycles. Review Regina Stanback-Stroud's suggestions for incorporation of student learning outcomes into the self-study. Committee members continue to review other college models for more discussion at our next meeting.

NOTE: Many of the committee members are unable to attend the meetings because of other committee time schedules. We have been corresponding via email.

Our next meeting is February 9, 2006 at 1:30 pm in Room 8105.