### Fullerton College

### Program Review and Planning Committee meeting notes

### 14-Apr 22 meeting, 3-4:30P, Zoom

**Present:** Mary Bogan (faculty, co-chair), Josh Ashenmiller (faculty, co-chair), Dave Brown (faculty, Lib), Doug Eisner (faculty, Hum), Megan Harris (OIE), Chuck Helms (classified professional, ASC), Barry McCarthy (faculty, Bus/CIS), Rachel Nevarez (faculty, Tech/Eng), Luciano Rodriguez (faculty, Math/CS), David Sarabia (Tutoring Center Coordinator), Todd Smith (faculty, Fine Arts), Ken Starkman (Dean, Tech/Eng), Cal Young (Nat Sci)

1. **Agenda and notes from last meeting (10-Mar 22) approved**
2. **Report to Faculty Senate**
	1. We are on the agenda for either next week, 21-Apr, or the meeting after that, 5-May 21.
	2. Committee members had more suggestions to add to the section about “extra-curriculars,” i.e. departments going above and beyond the call of duty.
	3. It will not be too late to send in suggestions after this meeting as long as you send them before Monday, when our report will have to go out with the Senate agenda.
	4. The major edit still to be made:
		1. Committee members get one common feedback from faculty: if there isn’t enough funding for most program review requests, then why do we bother writing the self-studies?
		2. We still do not know enough about the process by which the College decides how much discretionary funding is available for allocation each year.
		3. We still don’t know exactly how program review self-studies get integrated into planning, such as the Student Equity Plan.
3. **Non-instructional template**
	1. In his capacity as an accreditation writing team member, Doug met with several Student Services managers.
		1. They indicated that they were not keen to do a total rewrite of the non-instructional template, since it might only be good for next year, seeing as how the accrediting Commission will issue new accreditation standards in 2025, and they might have new requirements for program review.
		2. They also decided that division offices do not have to write self-studies.
		3. Doug, and the rest of us, were not so sure about that last assertion.
		4. Doug plans to bring this up with the Accreditation Steering Committee tomorrow.
	2. This is a slight change of plans from what the student services managers told Mary and Josh two weeks ago, but we respect their decision. We want a template that makes sense to them.
	3. Research agenda:
		1. How do other colleges handle Service Area Outcomes (SAOs)?
		2. Do other colleges require division offices to write program review self-studies?
4. **Readers’ reports**
	1. Most of the responses came in before the 1-Apr deadline. Some trickled in later.
	2. Committee members have been very diligent about responding to their responses to our readers’ reports. Thank you, Committee members.
5. **Committee goals**
	1. Mary has big plans for her First 100 Days.
	2. She wants to do some program reviewing of program review.
		1. Can we do this process better?
		2. She wants to consult with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) and the Institutional Integrity Committee (IIC) to come up with recommendations for the Faculty Senate.
		3. Possible reforms: best practices, planning, budget transparency, the Equity Plan, the length of the program review cycle.
6. **Remaining Spring 2022 meeting dates (2nd & 4th Thu, 3-4:30P)**
	* 1. 28-Apr
		2. 12-May