



Program Review Committee Minutes

February 3, 2015

12:30 - 2:00 PM

MB 350A video w/KRVPL5, MAM228, BIS 197

Present: Suzie Ama, Christine Abbott, Lisa Fuller, Karee Hamilton, Kim Kelly, Corey Marvin, Joe Slovacek, Sylvia Sotomayor, Laura Vasquez, David Villacana

Absent:

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. Call to order	S. Ama	12:30 PM		x
2. Approval of Agenda	S. Ama	Approved with no changes		x
4. Honors – 1 st Review	C. Swiridoff	This was an outstanding program review. The committee approved it for a first and final review, pending very minor typographical corrections.	x	
5. Liberal Arts Math and Science – 2 nd Review	J. Stenger-Smith	<p>The committee commended John on the many improvements made since the first review, however, it is not quite ready to approve for a second review. The committee wants to see it again with the following areas addressed:</p> <p>Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several typos (I noted on a hard copy I'll bring to the meeting. Writing levels were changed to classes 2 years ago. <p>Part 1 – Relevance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Didn't find the department meeting minutes or email exchange appropriate 	x	

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>here. These discussions should be summarized and related to the topics in this section. If you wish, the emails can be provided as attachments.</p> <p>Parts 2 – Appropriateness / Part 3 - Currency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to college mission - Small typo found • Determination of students’ needs – Small typo found <p>Part 4 – Achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor misspellings in 3rd paragraph of section 1, “migh” should read “might”. Section 4, 1st paragraph, “ot” should read “to”. • This section needs the most work lacking an in depth analysis – or any real analysis at all. • Section 3 pg 21 – I’m not sure how the lack of an IR is relevant to assessing SLO’s – this is done at the department level?? • The outcomes and suggestions together were confusing – I originally thought these were all SLOs which didn’t make sense. – And why are emails included in the outcomes section – If they are relevant, I would include them as appendices. • The sections on the various SLOs were written by different people and do not present a unified discussion. Emails were simply copied and pasted in. • I found the SLO section confusing. Content appeared to be duplicated. Suggest that there be headings to show a clearer hierarchy. Following an outcome, indicate the gap, and then describe the improvement plan. • Email content should be in the appendices. The results of discussion should be summarized in the main report. <p>Part V – Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Okay, but there needs to be a more specific discussion on how student learning outcomes can be improved. 		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>Overall Impression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document is somewhat difficult to sort through—especially with accompanying attachments. • Synthesize some areas of information in order to make overall document easier to read. • This is definitely improved from the first draft we saw, but there is still work that needs to be done – especially in Part 4. 		
6. Adjournment	S. Ama	1:40 PM		

Meeting Chair: S. Ama

Recorder: S. Ama

Open/ Closed

DRAFT