Task Force & Strategic Planning Meeting
October 22, 2012 1 – 2:30
Topic: Annual Instructional Program Review Process

Attendees: Dennis Anderson, Cordell Briggs, Bob Fontaine, Natalie Hannum, Cheryl Honore, Bonavito Quinto, Debbi Renfrow, Angela Thomas, Eric Thompson, Eugenia Vincent

I. Overview
    Objective of the meeting: To ask the subcommittees, as the receiving bodies of annual program reviews, what they feel they would need from the program reviews in terms of information to make decisions on request requests.
    Natalie provided a quick overview of what the Task Force was charged with and the progress made thus far. The DRAFT flow chart for the program review process was presented as well as new program review forms under development and the rubrics that were used at the review meeting held Oct. 19, 2012.

II. Flowchart
    Angela Thomas asked who to direct comments to regarding the flow chart. It was indicated that questions regarding the flow chart should be directed to Subcommittee IV.

III. Program Review Forms - General comments/discussion
   a. Common thoughts regarding the program review forms under development:
       The inverted ratings were confusing.
       The document was too long. Some of the information in the forms should be put into a handbook.
   b. Some questions that arose regarding the program reviews under development:
       Should faculty/departments be the body that completes the rubric?
       Should the rubrics be completed by the ‘Participatory Governance Council?’
       Should there be some sort of sign off sheet included in the forms so people know to ask for assistance. Ex: If requesting computers, IT should be consulted. If requesting AV equipment, IMC should be consulted. If requesting library materials, the library should be consulted. Etc.
       There should be some mandated training for those reviewing the APRs as well as training for everyone in completing the ARPs.
       The forms should allow for some connection between personnel requests and resource requests for items such as desks, computers, etc.
   c. According to Eugenia Vincent, the Student Services department is in the process of creating a reviewing body similar to APC.
   d. There was discussion, an idea, that all three areas (Student Services, Instructional, and Administration/Business Services) organize their APR’s according to the four standards.
   e. The question was raised on how to prioritize resource requests among departments across the college.
   f. Action Items
       Action Item: Standard IV should be the body to determine the exact make-up of the ‘Participatory Governance Council’ so that this process is part of our institutional process.
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- **Action Item:** Standard IV should be the body to define what each step does in the process flowchart, including determining the function of the ‘PGC’ at all stages, before and after the APR’s go to the four subcommittees. Standard IV may wish to work with Standard I, or create a separate ‘standards committee.’

- **Action Item:** Standard III will review and revise the draft rubrics as well as those used for the APRs for 2012.

- **Action Item:** Natalie Hannum will provide Dr. Mayo an update on the progress of the task force as well as seek her guidance on a name change for the Strategic Planning Council. The SPC may need to review its overall subcommittee structure, particularly in light of changes to the ACCJC standards. ACCJC now has 10 standards.

- **Action Item:** Natalie Hannum, Cheryl Honore, and Debbi Renfrow are going to work on developing revised forms that reflect all of the input received from the task force, SPC, Academic Senate, and APC.