Program Review Committee
Agenda, January 27, 2015

Alfred Guzman, Craig Gawlick, Roland Amit, Cara Miyasaki,
Simon Pennington, , Andrew LaManque, Pat Hyland
Dawn Girardelli, Elaine Kuo, Cindy Fransisca, Teresa Zwack

Tri Chairs – Al, Andrew, Simon

1) Review timeline – next meeting Friday March 13 – do we need to schedule an additional time?

2) Review Minutes

3) Updates - Rubric and Training

4) Discuss Academic Senate graphic on PR and SLO's

5) Individually read and rate program review and then discuss as a group
Here's the minutes.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 27, 2015, at 3:15 PM, Cara Miyasaki
<ucsf_rdh@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> PRC
>

> Have another meeting the following week after March 13
>
> skip green to start on ratings
>
> We would go back and discuss all greens right (Elaine) - Yes, Andrew will look at comments and put something together
>
> Start with all out of cycle, then ones that are of concern (yellow and reds) working to the all greens
>
> Need to be done for PaRC by April 15th.
>
> Have discussions, Andrew can do write ups and feed back to committee for review.
>
> Discussion about comments for greens. Try to make comments.
>
> Confirm grading rubric has all comprehensive programs on one page. Craig to check.
>
> For each item write in the letter for Red, Green, Yellow
>
> Review PR, SLOAC, and CO: uses and intersections document created by Carolyn H. To help differentiate the items. To answers questions that arose in Academic Senate. Carolyn has started discussion about SLO assessment cycle.

Discussion of SLO's and who requires it. Accreditation. SLO reflections are attached to PR for a reason. Accred. Standards talk about integrated planning cycle and tied to resource requests. Can public access SLOs? Faculty have to see PR to see reflections and concern about accessibility. What should we tell Carolyn about this document? Have a column for "how often" Depends if it is to clarify the difference and the functions? Should we raise it and make it a planning and cycle document for the community. A condensed document - info is already out there by office of instruction. Is push of academic senate making more useful now. Maybe a document for only academic senate. Andrew will give Carolyn feedback.

Craig demonstrated website navigation. Reorganize and put comprhensives together? Craig to put in dropbox - will do tomorrow and send PRC committee email for dropbox.

Trend analysis
A broad name for looking at enrollment trends in general.
Enrollment, productivity

Equity
Institutional standards
Core missions

OUtcomes assessments - just green or red - attached or not attached. Did they complete their slos.

OUtcomes reflections - for SLOs. Some sort of analysis in some way of how deep the reflection is. For OA and OR basically if they did it and put some thought into it.

Program goals
Overall rating

Art History
Discussion of college mission statement. Make comments if not congruent with college mission or really aggregious(?)

Need to include information on how to calculate % change for people writing the program review.

Referred back to rubric explanation for Trend Analysis. Art Hx is ok for that category.

Is it Equity as a whole? So use it broadly - in terms of the whole document. For example with Art Hx PR
addressed some equity issues in the section above.

Avoid using people's names in the PR document.

Equity the first two sections? Take into account any goals?
Maybe score equity at end of review.

At least one section should be answered Basic Skills, Workforce, Transfer. This is in the Administrative PR and Student services answer all 3.

Section 4 Learning Outcomes attached

SLO reflections.
Programs could include data for outcomes assessments.
Redundant information in this section. Maybe wrap everything up in action plan and delete some questions.

Program goals
Issue last year with program goals. Are they really goals and are they measurable? Is that Yellow? Everyone will score and think about it more globally but make comments if notice something i.e. overall program is green but problem with goals which were marked yellow. But what if plan is not practical - is that PaRC or PRC. PRC flags it for PaRC.

Rubric does not access goals or resource requests. Should resource requests be linked to a goal? It's appropriate for PRC to make comments if no linkage. Make comments in program goals part of rubric.

How much get into comments?

Make sure in Section 8 the program addresses any concerns from the previous PR.

Last year, we had a discussion about what to do if dean and vp or do dean and vp agree with each other.

> Everybody read the PRs and do their own rating then send to Andrew. Then group discussion about the program ratings.

Have a short meeting to go through a couple PRs to prepare for the March meeting. Next meeting in February 10 4pm. Review Counseling, Anthro and International
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone

Out of Cycle Reviews 2014-15
Anthropology, Spanish, KCI, Assessment, Student Activities, Counseling, International