



Program Review Committee Minutes for April 22, 2021

12:50pm-1:50pm
Zoom

Meeting Participants

Committee Members Present

Laura Adams, Greg Aycock (co-chair), Michael Collins, Araceli Covarrubias, Joseph Deguzman, Alexis Gray (co-chair), Ashlee Johnson, Starlene Justice, Samuel Lee, Christopher A. Lugo, Jason Parks, Tim Russell, Jose Sentmanat, Kaneesha Tarrant, Paul VanHulle, Jose Vela and Caitlin Welch.

Committee Members Not Present

Guests

Jason Caceres and Steven Marshall

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 12:51 pm

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda

Agenda amended to include 'Program Review Faculty Chair Nominations' as an action item.

- MSC (Laura Adams/ Starlene Justice)

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved

2.2 Approval of March 25, 2021 Minutes

- MSC (Laura Adams/ Joseph Deguzman)

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved

2.3 Program Review Faculty Chair Nominations

- Beneficial to nominate someone currently on the committee.
- No nominations brought forward.
 - If no nominations made chair position and will be forwarded and appointed by Academic Senate.

2.3 Follow-up Items	2.3 Task of	2.3 Due by
Email nominations to the chairs	Committee members	ASAP

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Program Review Scoring- Norming Session

The rubric was shared and committee participated in a scoring exercise. The committee worked through scoring a sample Program Review.

- Reviewers will be anonymous.
- In the review section- reviewers are able to add comments.
- Note- on the rubric only assign whole numbers.
- Assignments will be sent out to committee members.
- Usually takes about a half an hour to review a Program Review.
- Each Program Review will have two readers/reviewers.

3.1 Conclusion

- Reader/ reviewer assignments will be sent out soon.

3.1 Follow-up Items	3.1 Task of	3.1 Due by
Send out Reviewer assignments	Co-chairs	As soon as available

4. Information Items

4.1 Survey of Effectiveness

Greg Aycock shared the results of the Survey of Effectiveness for the Program Review Committee. The purpose of the survey is to help the committee evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the committee. The results will be summarized and presented to the Academic Senate.

- Highlights
 - Majority of the results of the survey are positive.
 - Suggestion to improve the committee 'More visibility and collaboration on PR structure and decisions among committee members.'
 - Suggestion to improve the survey 'A question about how long someone has been in the committee would be helpful. Surveys from newer members and older members may have different meanings.'
- Questions/Comments
 - What are some ways we can improve as a committee?
 - Meeting used to be 2 hours outside of college hour. Suggestion to consider changing the amount of time allotted to at least two hours per meeting.

4.1 Follow-up Items	4.1 Task of	4.1 Due by
Please send any suggestions to improve the committee to Dr. Gray.	Committee	ASAP

5. Good of the Order

- Program Reviews will be ready to be reviewed after April 30th, possibly the following Monday, May 3rd.
- Reviews of assigned Program Reviews are due by May 26th, if you are able to get your reviews done by May 15th please inform Dr. Gray.

6. Adjournment

- 2:06 pm

Next Meeting

May 27, 2021

12:50- 1:50pm

Location: Zoom

Area being evaluated	4	3	2	1	0
Required responses	EMP Goals responded to				No Responses to EMP goal questions
Goals	Current status and future goals are clearly stated with appropriate ties to EMP	Current status and future goals are clearly stated but link to EMP is nebulous or unclear	Either Current status or future goal is not present or is unclear but makes appropriate tie to EMP	Either Current status or future goal is not present or is unclear but an appropriate tie to EMP has been attempted	No current status or future goal is stated and no link is present
Evidence	Evidence of support of EMP is clear with either assessment data or other appropriate data support	Evidence of support of EMP is present with either assessment data or other appropriate data support	Evidence is present but may not clearly support the EMP or evidence addressed but not analyzed in detail	Some type of qualitative evidence is provided that is not based on data	No Evidence is Provided
Resource Request	Existing resources identified and needs responded to with dollar amounts filled in and funding source addressed (can be none or no request)	Existing resources not identified but needs responded to with dollar amounts filled in and funding source addressed. (Can be none)	Existing resources and needs not identified but Dollar amounts filled in and funding source addressed (can be none)	Dollar amount filled in with no funding source addressed or missing dollar amount with needs identified	Missing dollar amount, missing identified needs and missing funding source
Curriculum Review	All Curriculum is up to date (within the last five years)	Majority of curriculum is up to date (no more than 10% requiring update) with those requiring update in progress	Most of curriculum is up to date (no more than 25% requiring update) with those requiring update in progress	More than 25% of curriculum is out of date with those requiring update in progress	Any of the curriculum is out of date with no update in progress.