Accreditation Workgroup #3 Meeting Notes  
Monday, July 23, 2012

Present: Joanne Low, Loren Bell, Pam Mery, Torrance Bynum, Andrea Niosi, Fabio Saniee, Minh Hoa Ta, Bill Goodyear

The Program Review manual should not be a thick book. It should be something available online that everyone can refer to.

Program Review and Budgeting must be integrated. We have to keep in mind the need to have one process that ties in all the parts. College of the Canyons makes appropriate completion of the program review process as a step in the planning and budgeting process.

SLO components in PR report items 3, 4, and 5 needs to be measurable. The data should be in a form that can be placed on a matrix as well as in narrative form. A description of resulting changes must be included.

Identify best practices as samples for what types of changes took place. See the reports for the eight (8) departments and the Library before we meet again.

Institutional effectiveness must be measurable directly from PR reports.

We need clear resources for training and guiding the PR report development process @ department and @ dean level. Deans need clear guidelines as to their roles and responsibilities in this process.

CCSF is weak in dialogues that are documented  
= among faculty  
= perhaps with students  
= among departments  
= across disciplines  
= institutional

Another weakness was measurement of non-credit outcomes and student survey results.

We need SLO of the PR process. The PR process should be reviewed annually by the PR Committee.

**Next Meeting:** Monday, July 30, 2012 from 3:00 – 4:40 in C308

**Tentative Agenda:**

1) Discuss impressive points for the exemplary program reviews listed on page 10 of the ACCJC Evaluation Report. Read the reports for these programs and the one for the Library. Also re-read the 65 page report.

2) Make a list of different types of dialogue that should take place. Dialogue is one of CCSF’s weak points.

3) Discuss non-instructional data elements and availability of data.