



## PROAC

### PLANNING, PROGRAM REVIEW AND OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE A Standing Committee of the College Council

Tuesday, December 14, 2010, 3:30 p. m. to 5:00 p. m.  
N5, As Terlaje Campus

#### **Minutes of Regular Meeting**

- I. CALL TO ORDER
  - Quorum established at 3:47PM
- II. ROLL CALL/ATTENDANCE
  - Quorum was established. Please see attendance sheet.
- III. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
- IV. ADOPTION OF MINUTES
  - A. December 07, 2010 Regular Meeting Minutes
    - a. Tabled**
- V. OLD BUSINESS
  - A. Cycle 3 of Program Review—Form II
    - 1. Bobbi found that getting together to evaluate the Form 2's is a strength. In addition, programs turning in Form 2 is a strength.
    - 2. More consistency with the format to assist the programs and dept. chairs. Possibly more professional training to understand program review.
    - 3. Randall: Strength, were done in English
    - 4. Forms must be clear and concise (weakness), milestones must be clear. Data must be standardized (weakness).
    - 5. John Griffin: weakness, training. We need to be trained, some of us lack that expertise.
    - 6. Galvin asked how you see training happening.
    - 7. John answered to meet with departments one on one.

8. Galvin asked what about the training that OIE did?
9. Randall stated that we must simplify the process of training.
10. Galvin asked if we should continue with program review training over and over again.
11. All agreed.
12. Randall supported Bobbi's point in having an orientation. We don't have a specific orientation to program review.
13. Jim stated that we could designate program review training in specific times of the year.
14. Randall suggested to having a manual for orientation and a Form 2 from their program.
15. Dave agreed.
16. Rose stated that she sees new employees on campus and asked OIE to develop an overview manual on what employees will do for PROAC.
17. Galvin stated that some people are not doing what they are supposed to be doing due to their supervisors.
18. Amanda asked if we have an NMC resource guide on program review.
19. Galvin answered that the IE Guide is the guide that discusses what program review is.
20. Bobbi stated that it should be part of the Human Resource packet upon signing their contract.
21. Randall stated that all employees must be given a checklist that includes program review materials (IE Guide, Form I and Form II)
22. Dave: strength: possibly linking the budget to program review.  
Weakness: evidence is not standardized.  
Jim: strength: working in groups and got a better perspective on what should be in a Form 2 and what is more effective. He wrote his Form 2 and could see a road to improvement. Weakness: had no idea what a Form 2 was and had no idea on how to create one. So more training is needed for Form 2.

Amanda: strength: discussion questions, without that then no discussions in IT would be productive. Weakness: different depts. do one form instead of different units. Programs merging into one too.

- Galvin stated that Counseling Programs and Services faced the same problem.
- Galvin stated that it's not good to do across the board cuts. What should happen is have programs prioritize.
- Randall stated that Form 2's are planning documents but do not share it with other programs.
- Leo strength: Planning Summit, what needs to be in a Form 1 and Form 2. What program should be extracting this data? Weakness: It's still not second nature to most people of NMC. It's a challenge to have one voice.
- Dave stated that Cycle One was chaotic. To discuss strengths and weaknesses is an improvement compared to Cycle One. It's a learning process on trying to understand program review.
- Skep stated that even involving everyone is an improvement compared to Cycle One.
- Galvin stated that when we do a lot of "hand holding" things get done, but it takes a lot of time.
- Galvin stated that a lack of buy in is a weakness.
- John stated that turnover rates relate to more training.
- Galvin stated that there has not been any paradigm shifts from focusing on outcomes instead of outputs.
- Galvin assigned Bobbi and Dave to email recommendations to Galvin by Thursday, 12/16/10.
- Galvin briefly went over the strengths and weakness from PROAC.
- Galvin asked members of PROAC for recommendations.
- Rose asked to have one template for program review.
- Galvin stated that we have that template right now.
- Galvin asked how the template can be further standardized.

- Frankie stated that a recommendation can be to connect more with programs. There was still that disconnect from PROAC to the programs. Maybe have one person from each department to attend PROAC Meetings rather than hear it from 3<sup>rd</sup> parties. Frankie also suggested that the rating sheet was helpful but there was no “teeth” in it.
- Amanda stated that there needs to be a link between recommendations and evidence.
- Jim recommended having a data packet.
- John recommended to PROAC attendance by not including the end time.
- Randall recommended that Academic Council review all academic programs. Data standardizations. Have program goals instead of outcomes to support the mission. What makes us qualified to review a program? Ex. Have someone from TRIO review Upward Bound’s Form 2
- Leo recommended that we organize program review the same way we organize a course. We can tell programs that it is a requirement to be part of their “program review course” have required and recommended readings. Have seminar dates on program review. This could lead to programs earning grades.
- Galvin recommended simplifying Form II’s and Academic Council should take over program review on all academic programs.
- Randall asked how does Learning Communities fit into program review. Do we review individual courses?
- Galvin answered that we could treat Learning in Communities as a separate program.

B. FY 2011 Budget Prioritizing

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Mission Mapping

B. Proposed BOR Policies

VII. OTHER MATTERS

A. Book Discussion: Core Indicators of Effectiveness for Community Colleges, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition by Alfred, Shults, and Seybert)

B. Accreditation Update

C. What impact has the dialogue had on student learning

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

- Adjourned at 4:57PM

**Regular Meeting/Work Session**

**Date: 12/14/10                      Day: Wednesday                      Time:  
3:30PM to 5:00PM                      Place: N5**

**SIGN-IN SHEET**

	<b>NAME</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>SIGN/INITIAL</b>
1.	<b>Galvin Guerrero</b>	Director of Institutional Effectiveness (PROAC Chair)	PRESENT
2.	<b>Anthony Tipples</b>	Student (Appointed by ASNMC)/ASNMC Vice President	
3.	<b>Lorraine Cabrera</b>	Interim NMC President	
4.	<b>Barbara Merfalen</b>	Dean of Academic Programs and Services	PRESENT
5.	<b>Leo Pangelinan</b>	Dean, Student Services	PRESENT
6.	<b>Dave Attao</b>	Dean, Community Programs and Services	PRESENT
7.	<b>Dawn Chrytal Revilla</b>	Acting, Chief Financial and Administrative Officer	
8.	<b>Jennifer Barcinas/ Martin Mendiola</b>	Staff Representative, Rota Instructional Site	PRESENT.
9.	<b>Maria Aguon/ Rose Lazarro</b>	Staff Representative, Tinian Instructional Site	PRESENT
10.	<b>John Jenkins</b>	Faculty Representative, School of Education	
11.	<b>Dr. John Griffin</b>	Vice President of the Faculty Senate/ <i>Permanent Proxy</i>	PRESENT
12.		Faculty Member (Appointed by Faculty Senate)	
13.	<b>Dr. Eric Belky</b>	Faculty Member (Appointed by Faculty Senate)	
14.	<b>Matt Pastula</b> (John Cook served as a proxy)	Faculty Member (Appointed by Faculty Senate)	PRESENT
15.	<b>James Kline</b>	Faculty Representative, Academic Council	PRESENT
16.	<b>Randall Nelson</b>	Vice President of the Staff Senate	PRESENT
<b>OTHERS PRESENT</b>			

	Keane Palacios	Program Coordinator, OIE	PRESENT
	Amanda Allen	IT	PRESENT
	Lisa Hacskaylo	Institutional Researcher, OIE	PRESENT
	Ray Mafnas Muna	Program Coordinator, OIE	PRESENT