



# Program Review Committee Minutes

[February 28, 2024, 3:00 pm]

Recorder: Nadiyah Taylor

| LPC Mission Statement   | LPC Planning Priorities  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Las Positas College is an inclusive, learning-centered, equity-focused environment that offers educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, and career-technical goals while promoting life-long learning. | Establish a knowledge base and an appreciation for equity; create a sense of urgency about moving toward equity; institutionalize equity in decision-making, assessment, and accountability; and build capacity to resolve inequities. | Increase student success and completion through change in college practices and processes: coordinating needed academic support, removing barriers, and supporting focused professional development across the campus. |
| <b>Chair</b>  | <b>Faculty Association (1)</b>   | <b>SEIU (1)</b>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nadiyah Taylor   | <input type="checkbox"/> Name  | <input type="checkbox"/> Name  |
| <b>Academic Senate (2)</b>  | <b>Classified Senate (2)</b>   | <b>Student Senate (2)</b>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Name<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name  | <input type="checkbox"/> Name<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name   | <input type="checkbox"/> Isabella Qui<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name   |
| <b>Vice Presidents</b>  | <b>Deans</b>   | <b>Faculty</b>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amy Mattern (designee)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name   | <input type="checkbox"/> Stuart McElderry<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name  | Bhairav Singh<br>Kai Blaisdell<br>Irena Keller<br>Michael Schwarz  |
| <b>Classified Professionals</b>   | <b>Guests</b>  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Name<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name   | <input type="checkbox"/> Name<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name<br><input type="checkbox"/> Name  |  |

Attendance (Quorum = [5])

| Agenda Item | Information/Discussion   | Action/Assigned To |
|-------------|--|--------------------|
| 1.          | <b>Call to Order</b><br><i>For information</i>   |                    |
| 2.          | <b>Review &amp; Approve Agenda</b><br>The agenda was approved.   |                    |
| 3.          | <b>Review &amp; Approve Prior Minutes</b><br><i>The minutes from 2/14 were approved.</i>   |                    |
| 4.          | <b>Action Items</b><br><i>For action</i><br>Approve the Shared Governance form – <b>tabled since waiting for more information.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dean Mattern mentioned that at Chabot they have a tri-chair model; they report to PBC, not Academic Senate</li> <li>• PRC will continue to investigate leadership options.</li> </ul>  |                    |
| 5.          | <b>Old Business</b><br><i>For discussion</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A new chair is needed for the next academic year.</li> <li>2. Debrief from the 2023-24 Program Review Process               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The deans were the second readers for the update, and this seemed to work because the Deans would have already gone through the reviews and add to the points already captured. The Deans present enjoyed the process of creating the division summaries with the readers.</li> <li>• Summary meetings were efficient, adding some missing items, removing repetitions, and determining priorities.</li> <li>• Some deans did not know they had to review their division’s program reviews or prepare for the summary process – make sure that in the future, the dean’s role is communicated very clearly.</li> <li>• Division members made comments in several divisions’ summaries, indicating some interest.</li> <li>• SLO comments: This was the end of the 3-year cycle SLO cycle, and programs could have written more about student learning outcomes, which is a challenge for the committee. The program review update will coincide with the end of the 3-year cycle in the future, so coordination with the SLO committee will be important.</li> <li>• Writers appreciated that they could write a short update.                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provided what was important, not necessarily focused on a specific length.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some readers liked that they were the only readers (rather than having two)</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |                    |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reader instructions were clear.</li> <li>• Should readers read programs within their division? This may make it easier to allocate reviews among the committee and make sure there are enough people to cover the division summary meetings. Perhaps allow some reading within the same division as needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the PRC stick with having only one reader per review (outside of the Dean)? Pros = easier to schedule and make sure all is done; Cons = how to make sure all readers are available to attend the division summary meeting?</li> <li>• Allocate more reviews to the people on the PRC committee rather than the additional readers.</li> <li>• Make sure at least one PRC member is reading in each division.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>3. Suggestions for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss the PRC update timeline related to the full 3-year SLO cycle with the S:LO committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Include SLO language that is more flexible about the timing of the SLO assessment, for example, “in the most recent meaningful assessment cycle.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Have some work sessions where readers can get together during the reading cycle.</li> <li>• Clarify which PRC member sets the meeting date with the dean if there are multiple PRC readers in one division.</li> <li>• When determining the PRC timeline and review process, ensure enough time for feedback before the summaries are due to IPEC.</li> </ul> <p>4. Review of the Template for the full 2024-25 Program Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CTE section will not be needed for the 24-25 review template.</li> <li>• The committee needs to decide/receive feedback on “Is the goal of PR to document that certain actions happened, or to make sure they happen (remind programs) even if not documented in the PR template?”</li> <li>• Added to section A prompts about the SCFF and planning priorities. Need to determine if there is a need to include references to the education master plan or mission.</li> <li>• Reworded the prompt for section B.</li> </ul> |  |
| 6. | <p><b>New Business</b><br/><i>For discussion</i></p>  |  |

|     |  |                |
|-----|--|----------------|
| 7.  | <b>Information Items</b><br><i>For information</i><br>Committees may be asked to document the work they are doing in support of institutional improvement for the mid-term accreditation report. | <b>None</b>    |
| 8.  | <b>Updates</b><br><i>For information</i>   | <b>None</b>    |
| 9.  | <b>Good of the Order</b><br><i>For information</i>   | .              |
| 10. | <b>Future Agenda Items</b><br><i>For discussion</i><br>1. <i>Finalize the shared governance report and submit it to Rifka.</i><br>2. <i>Continue revision of next year's template</i>            | <b>Nadiyah</b> |

**Meeting adjourned at [4:35 pm]**

**Next meeting: [March 13, 2024]**