I. Call to Order & Roll Call
Committee Chairman, John Hannigan called the meeting to order at 2:35.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hannigan, John, Faculty, Program Review Chair and Comm. Studies Chair</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Hanton, Tanya, Classified, Sr. Administrative Asst. and Program Review Recorder</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond, Inge, Administrator, Director of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kashima, Stephanie, Administrator, Dean of Instruction and Student Success</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Heidi, Faculty, PE</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>McGinley, LeAnn, Faculty, Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn, Paula, Classified, Language Arts SOC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Order of the Agenda
No changes to the agenda.

III. Approve Minutes
The meeting minutes dated November 20 were approved.

IV. Comments from Guests
On behalf of the Classified Senate, Tanya stated that President Laurel Kinley had relayed to the Senators that John Hannigan had sent an e-mail asking both the Academic and Classified Senates for feedback on the non-instructional Program Review questionnaire. She asked the Senators to look at the previous questionnaire for their area and send feedback to John.
Tanya asked John what the timeline was, and he said the questionnaires were in the process of being finalized, so any suggestions needed to be sent immediately.

Tanya related that one comment the Classified Senate discussion had produced was the difference between serving internal vs. external “customers.” For example, Admissions and Records serves students (external) through registration and records, as well as staff (internal) by producing reports and statistics. LeAnn said that it might be better to have two non-instructional questionnaires as the issues encountered by the Office of the President, for
example, could be very different from those faced by Career Programs. The group decided to make this a discussion topic for the next meeting’s agenda.

V. Review Draft Version of New Data Collection Instrument for 2013 PR
John demonstrated the proposed delivery methods of the questionnaire and data for the 2013 Program Review. An e-mail will be sent to each department with a link to a collaborative PDF document. Only one person in each department will be responsible for submitting the form, but it will be possible for other people in the department to fill in sections that the point person can cut and paste into the main PDF file, which will be formatted to allow the user to write and save the changes to the document.

Although it will not be possible to access the documents that were previously saved in Zoho, there will be a link to some of the prior year’s information such as timelines set for goals. The new questionnaire will also have a menu bar that the user can use to jump back and forth between various sections of the form. Minor changes to some of the questions have been made to elicit more thoughtful analytical answers.

Survey Monkey will be used for data collection and qualitative analyses. For example, Survey Monkey can list the number of times each word was used in a particular response, making it easier to spot college-wide themes.

Inge is the owner of Survey Monkey and the electronic version of the questionnaire.

John spoke with Pat Fenton, the Interim Vice President of Administrative Services, about the need for integration of the budget and program review. Pat requested that a dialog box be used to gather budget requests rather than a breakdown by object code which was used in the past.

The rubric will need to be revised to accommodate the changes. Once the rubric is complete it will be posted online so those preparing the program reviews will have a clear understanding of what is expected of them.

VI. Discussion with Eric Pape, President Elect of the Academic Senate
The discussion with Eric Pape focused on due process of consequences resulting from the program review process. Everyone agreed that the role of the Program Review committee is to identify problems, such as unanswered questions or refusal to participate. A discussion followed as to how the due process would proceed. LeAnn asked if the State Academic Senate had a model, and Eric said he would look into the idea. The consensus was that the Program Review committee would pass along the information to the Academic Senate (or to the Academic Directions Committee and then the Academic Senate) for a recommendation to be sent to the Office of Instruction.

John also told Eric that the Program Review committee needs more members to share the work load and also to ensure a broader representation – perhaps one representation from each instructional division and non-instructional area. Also, John’s term as chair is up, so either the term needs to be changed from two to three years, or a new chairperson needs to be appointed. Eric will take the issue to the Academic Senate for discussion.
VII. Priorities for 2013 Program Review Self-Evaluation
   a. Analysis of efficiency and success
      Whitney Clay asked that someone look into the negative relationship between efficiency and success. In the current type of graph, it appears that success declines as efficiency goes up. Inge Bond is working on finding a way to present the data that will be more valuable and helpful.
   b. Non-instructional calendar
      Currently, there is a calendar showing when each instructional program is due for a full evaluation or an update. A similar timeline needs to be developed for the non-instructional programs. Paula will create a calendar for non-instructional reviews and check for errors in the instructional one. LeAnn will edit. John will not amend the final report, but will post both calendars on the website.
   c. Stragglers who have not submitted or resubmitted questionnaires for 2012
      John and Tanya are in the process of putting together documentation and e-mails relating to programs that have not submitted or completed the process for 2012. These will be given to Stephanie Kashima who will help us reach 100% completion.
   d. Non-instructional evaluation tool and rubric for 2013
      Needs to be completed.

VIII. Discuss Committee Roles/Membership
   The following tasks need to be overseen by a committee member. Some will be assigned when we have more committee members. The goal is for each sub-committee to meet, do the work and report back to the main committee.
   a. Instrument and data sets – Inge
   b. Readers – several are needed
   c. Writing/Updating procedures
   d. Communicator, including web page
   e. Editor
   f. Organizer – Tanya
   g. Coordinator - Chair

IX. Adjournment
   The meeting was adjourned at 4:00.

   The next meeting will be Tuesday, February 19, 2013.

   Minutes prepared by Tanya Hanton.