

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE  
March 18, 2010 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
#319, District Office  
MINUTES

**Members Present:**

**Riverside**

Hall, Lewis

**Moreno Valley**

Bufalino, Patricia  
Dumer, Olga

**Norco**

Gray, Alexis  
Nery, Annabelle  
Thomas, Jim

**RCCD**

Kauffman, Kristina

**Members Absent:**

**Riverside**

Acharya, Surekha  
Chenoweth, Rita  
Daddona-Moya, Michelle  
Hall, Barbara  
Kennedy, Stephen  
McKee-Leone, Virginia  
Mills, Susan  
Vito, Ron

**Moreno Valley**

Drake, Sean  
Fontaine, Bob

**Norco**

Elizalde, Andres  
Rey, Jason  
Tschetter, Sheryl

**RCCD**

Brown, Aaron  
DiThomas, Debbie

1. **Approval of November 19, 2009 Minutes/Received without a motion**
2. **Administrative Issues**
  - a. Revised Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Guidelines – Discussed revisions that came out of the meeting held on March 5<sup>th</sup>. The document has been narrowed down and is more simplistic. David Torres has prepared for each discipline the Retention and Success Rates including explanatory notes supporting the data. This will allow the disciplines to easily compare data with the other colleges. On Page 13 demographic information has been reformatted and added as an Appendix. SLOs have been reduced to one line. Comprehensive Program Reviews are for long range planning and Annual Program Reviews are year to year. **Concerns:** How can faculty more effectively collaborate with the other campuses regarding curriculum to complete their program review?
  - b. Revised Annual Instructional Program Review Guidelines – Assessment portion has been removed. **Concerns:** Need to find a way to alleviate stress on faculty so they are more willing to coordinate with other faculty.
  - c. Transition Model for Spring – Assessment at each College  
The Assessment portion of the Annual Program Review has been deleted. The Assessment forms will now be reported at the college level.
  - d. Other – Add Bob Fontaine to the member list as the Academic Senate representative for Moreno Valley.
3. **Program Review Submittals**

**Comprehensive Instructional Program Review**

  - a. **ECE** – re-submit – Recommendations were implemented and concerns were addressed.  
**Comments:** Remove asterisk on page 9, Table 5.  
**Motion – to approve ECE program review/MSC/L.Hall/Gray**

**District Administration Unit Program Reviews**

  - a. **Office of Institutional Effectiveness** – Kristina Kauffman  
Surveys were gathered to determine how the department can better help faculty to understand what they actually do and the resources that are available to them. We want to make sure services aren't being duplicated. Suggestion: If the District had more support people, then they could better serve the needs of the colleges.  
**Comments:** Add this statement to the document "Here are the potential policy implications that would result from this data". Faculty teaching online courses need to discuss common curriculum. Need to structure the department to allow communication to flow freely between the District and the colleges. This discussion will continue at our next meeting.  
**Motion – to receive Institutional Effectiveness Unit Program Review/MSC/Gray/Nery**

**b. Office of Student Services** – Student Services will be completely de-centralized. The District Student Services person will be eliminated.

**Comments:** *District Services* – Page 8 - Goals and Objectives table start date and status of project left blank. Page 12 – Academic Evaluation Specialist is of high importance. Table #6 – Numbers under Staffing Profile for Food Services don't add up and there is no narrative to explain. Page 14 – Grants Office – lengthy reason due to split into three colleges. *Health Services* - Staffing Profile numbers don't add up and there's no narrative. Page 114 – Staff Needs table annual TCP left blank.

*Disabled Student Programs* – Page 49 - Staff Needs table - unknown reference to AB 500. What is it? Perhaps a footnote would clarify point.

**Motion – to receive Student Services Unit Program Review/MS/L.Hall/Gray**

**c. College Safety and Police**

Page 4- Under Major Goals spell out acronyms such as “CLETS”. Page 5 – SEMS/NIMS training & PERS training. Perhaps a footnote would make the document more readable. Page 11 - Technology Needs table needs correction in spelling error “too small”. Page 7 – Staffing Profile Table numbers don't add up. Table #6 is unclear. Their mission statement needs to be re-written to reflect what they actually do which would strengthen the document. Note under Equipment – critical issues needed.

**Motion – to receive College Safety and Police Unit Program Review/MS/Nery/Bufalino**

**Next Meeting:**

**Thursday, April 22, 2010**

**2:30 – 4:30 pm**

**District Office - #319**

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE  
April 22, 2010 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
#319, District Office  
MINUTES

**Members Present:**

**Riverside**

Hall, Barbara  
Mills, Susan

**Moreno Valley**

Bufalino, Patricia  
Drake, Sean

**Norco**

Gray, Alexis  
Thomas, Jim

**RCCD**

**Members Absent:**

**Riverside**

Acharya, Surekha  
Chenoweth, Rita  
Daddona-Moya, Michelle  
Hall, Lewis  
Kennedy, Stephen  
McKee-Leone, Virginia  
Vito, Ron

**Moreno Valley**

Dumer, Olga  
Fontaine, Bob

**Norco**

Elizalde, Andres  
Nery, Annabelle  
Rey, Jason  
Tschetter, Sheryl

**RCCD**

Brown, Aaron  
DiThomas, Debbie  
Kauffman, Kristina

**Guests: Richard Davin**

**1. Approval of March 18, 2010 Minutes/Consensus to receive minutes**

**2. Administrative Issues**

Discussion on Transition Model for Program Review

- District committee to help facilitate the organizational design for all three campuses.
- The Assessment portion has been separated out from the Comprehensive Program Review allowing the colleges to move forward with their own assessment.
- On the Riverside campus the term Annual Program Review has been changed to “Unit Plan”. There will be three Unit Plan review committees built into the Strategic Planning Committee. The latest idea is to fold the five senate program review members into the Strategic Unit Plan Review committee.
- (Discussion Item) With the transition, what will be the charge of the District Program Review Committee be? (1) Continue to review comprehensive reports as they go through their four year cycle. Let the college handle their own program review if requested (2) Continue to be overseers of the forms, structure and processes (3) Look at program reviews to reflect the collaboration and to keep consistency and continuity among the District and all three colleges.
- (Discussion Item) Concern was voiced that splitting the responsibilities to the campuses may ultimately be detrimental to program review and to the disciplines themselves. Keep comprehensive program review at District level because program review reflects their cohesiveness as a district. We have one common curriculum where they need that collaboration. Jim stated that they are trying to formulate the process as we evolve without forming more committees.
- (Discussion Item ) It’s up to the deans and departments whether or not they want to submit three separate comprehensive program reviews or submit as one or both.
- Each strategic plan needs to link with the District themes. The structure of the comprehensive report needs a place where each college can describe what’s going on with themselves in relation to their strategic planning process. Need to identify where each discipline is headed strategically and have a document that links everyone together, to be collaborative but not burdensome.

Discussion to be continued at our next meeting.

**3. Program Review Submittals - Comprehensive Instructional Program Review**

**World Languages** – Page 6, misspelled “enrollment and accomplishments”. Page 17, under Frequency of the Offerings, they need to list what they are offering only. Need to remove the Annual Program Review section. The portion of this document that contains the Annual Program Review information needs to have the total cost of equipment or position. Make sure they submitted their Annual Program Review as a separate document and extract from this document. The “Staff Needs” list in the Annual Program Review section needs to change a word to “tasked” and streamline their request for a lab aide.

Someone on the college or discipline needs to go through their analysis and concur or give an unbiased opinion on how they came up with their information. Need to minimize document to a readable size. This committee doesn't want to be tasked with local issues which should be dealt with by the local committee. Need to rewrite guidelines to reflect more of a district level model with the ability to expand out at the local college level.

**Motion – Consensus to receive World Languages Program Review since there wasn't a quorum. Will forward to the next meeting for an official vote.**

**District Annual Program Review**

**Finance** – A finance person will be assigned to each college. The document reflects that they are in transition.

**Motion – Consensus to receive the District Annual Finance Program Review without a quorum. Will forward to the next meeting for an official vote.**

**Next Meeting:**

**Thursday, May 20, 2010  
2:30 – 4:30 pm  
District Office - #319**

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE  
September 16, 2010 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
#319, District Office  
MINUTES

**Members Present:**

**Riverside**

Chenoweth, Rita  
Daddona-Moya, Michelle  
Hall, Barbara  
Hall, Lewis  
Kennedy, Stephen  
Mills, Susan

**Moreno Valley**

Bufalino, Patricia

**Norco**

Elizalde, Andres  
Gray, Alexis  
Thomas, Jim

**RCCD**

Kauffman, Kristina

**Members Absent:**

**Riverside**

Acharya, Surekha  
McKee-Leone, Virginia  
Vito, Ron

**Moreno Valley**

Drake, Sean  
Dumer, Olga  
Fontaine, Bob

**Norco**

Nery, Annabelle  
Rey, Jason  
Tschetter, Sheryl

**RCCD**

Brown, Aaron

**1. Approval of April 22, 2010 Minutes/Consensus to receive minutes**

**2. Administrative Issues**

Discussion on Program Review Transition Model for Spring 2011 – Jim reviewed the draft of the Program Review Transition Plan and encouraged committee to bring their comments and revisions to the next meeting. On the first page the title “Program Review” will be changed to a larger, bold font and “Office of Institutional Mission & Effectiveness” will be changed to a smaller, un-bolded font. This plan needs to be developed and in place by 6/30/11. Duties of this committee will be transferred to the colleges with a selected point person as chair. This position could be linked with the Faculty Development Coordinator or Assessment chair. We are in the process of implementing SharePoint which will allow faculty to collect and add data to their program review online and run their own reports. The minutes from our meetings will be the main source of data collection. The committee will be thinking about data to be collected for the end of the year annual report. Jim discussed the four strategies and action steps of the proposed plan. The transition plan must be in alignment with the Academic Senate and accreditation standards.

**Motion – to move forward with the Program Review Transition Plan/MSC/L.Hall/Gray**

**Other** – Kristina will speak to and select an administrator to represent their college on the program review committee. Kristina and Jim will circulate the transition plan as approved and open to receiving comments. Susan Mills concurred that as far as the Strategic Planning Process goes, the unit plans should be informed by the comprehensive program reviews as each discipline works on their individual program review in addition to collaborating with the colleges to complete their final document.

**Motion – committee approved Jim Thomas to continue as co-chair for 2010-2011/MSC/L.Hall/Gray**

**3. Program Review Submittals - Comprehensive Instructional Program Review**

Jim proposed that if the discipline spans three colleges, then they could work on their individual program reviews at the same time and share their information with each other to strengthen their document, and then link them all together to show how they work as a unit. We could have one joint committee meeting or have the three program review chairs from the colleges get together and submit their program review to the District committee.

**Economics - Comments:** Need to include statistics data. Page 12 – there’s a lack of coordination among the three colleges. Need to clarify who “I” refers to. Page 12 – only place where they address

efficiency. Need to engage in some dialogue with each other. There are some formatting and numbering issues which will be sent to Max to reformat. Pages 6 and 7 have incomplete sentences. Need to further discuss whether or not adding prerequisites would improve student success. It was suggested not to redo the whole program review but take the existing document and revise it.

**Motion – to receive Economics Program Review/MSC/Gray/L. Hall**

**Accounting – Comments:** Accounting has been removed from the Business Administration discipline to become their own discipline. It was suggested that they pull their program review information from that document and revise it accordingly for their current program review. Some areas were not addressed. Data is not accurate and needs to be corrected and resubmitted. Page 4 – under “History” they mention a full-time Business/Accounting position in Moreno Valley that has remained vacant for the second year, but there has never been a request from the department to hire a business/accounting faculty member. Page 5 – change spin “of” to spin “off”. Page 5 - Enrollment is not an indicator of student success. Page 6 – revise first few paragraphs. Page 7 – under “Efficiency” the number should be an average number not a total. Appendix referred to is missing. Page 12 – the statement “the district should allow disciplines to offer more online classes to meet the demand that is due” is not a correct statement. The District does not control how departments schedule their classes.

**Motion – to table Accounting Program Review pending suggestions that the committee has recommended to the discipline for resubmission at a later date/MSC/Chenoweth/Kennedy**

**Physical Science – Comments:** Change year at top document to current year. Page 4 – under Goals and Objectives the reference to RCC needs to be clarified: are they referring to Riverside City College or Riverside Community College District? Page 4 – Need to eliminate “faculty of” Physical Science discipline. Eliminate Riv abbreviation. Page 6 – remove references to personal names. Page 5 & 6 – change spacing, font, etc. Page 7 – bottom paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence needs to be reworded to reflect a more positive view. Page 7 – They state data is inconsistent so we will have David Torres respond this statement. Should they change “persistence from Fall to Fall” to “persistence from Fall to Spring”?

**Motion – to receive Physical Science Program Review pending suggestions that the committee has recommended to the discipline/MSC/L.Hall/Gray**

**Welding** – Formatting changes are needed along with page numbers. Under Topic E “Student Learning Outcomes Assessments” the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph needs to be reworded. Remove personal names. Efficiency needs to be addressed in the next round. How many units are needed for the Certificate and how many electives need to be taken? A cover letter needs to be included. Page 5 – under “Associate and Science Degree” didn’t include the development of three “mini-certifications” under Recent Curricular Changes.

**Motion – to receive Welding Program Review/Kennedy/Chenoweth (uploaded to website 5/27/11)**

**Next Meeting:**

**Thursday, October 21, 2010  
2:30 – 4:30 pm  
District Office - #319**

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE  
November 18, 2010 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
#319, District Office  
MINUTES

**Members Present:**

**Riverside**

Chenoweth, Rita  
Hall, Lewis  
Kennedy, Stephen  
Mills, Susan  
Vito, Ron

**Moreno Valley**

Dumer, Olga  
Fontaine, Bob

**Norco**

Elizalde, Andres  
Thomas, Jim

**RCCD**

Kauffman, Kristina

**Members Absent:**

**Riverside**

Acharya, Surekha  
Daddona-Moya, Michelle  
Hall, Barbara  
McKee-Leone, Virginia

**Moreno Valley**

Bufalino, Patricia  
Drake, Sean

**Norco**

Gray, Alexis  
Nery, Annabelle  
Rey, Jason  
Tschetter, Sheryl

**RCCD**

Brown, Aaron

**Guests**

1. **Approval of October 21, 2010 Minutes/MS/L.Hall/S.Kennedy**

2. **Administrative Issues**

**Discussion on Program Review Transition Model for Spring 2011** – Jim handed out copies of the transition plan which is a proposal for each college to review and a final plan will be voted on in the Spring 2011. This transition is to be fully implemented by June 2011. District committee's charge will be revised as the colleges form their own program review committees. The District committee will consist of a district representative, Sylvia Thomas, the chair from the college committees, and David Torres as the Institutional Research representative. The District will be responsible to review comprehensive reviews which span all three colleges.

**Action Steps Completed and those in Progress:**

- Make sure the transition plan aligns with the state academic senate and the accreditation standards.
- The colleges can combine their program review committee with an existing committee such as one of the standards committee.
- Duties of the college program review committee: (1) make sure all information requested has been addressed; give feedback stating how they can strengthen the document; make sure goals and objectives are measurable and have been properly assessed.
- District committee will be keeper of the forms and keep the process semi-standard.
- Suggestion: send out a bullet list stating what the college's charge is in reviewing and accepting program reviews.

**Riverside** – Organizational process – (1) the comprehensive program review will be completed by the discipline of the department in a manner to reflect a four year forward plan which identifies accomplishments, etc. (2) The review would be forwarded to the VP of Academic Affairs for recording only to determine due dates. (3) Forward to the Riverside program review committee for review of content and completeness for approval or disapproval. (4) Forward to the appropriate Riverside strategic planning council body. (5) Then the document should go back to the originator after the document is linked from the discipline and departments to the strategic planning process. Utilize pieces into the annual program review plan.

**Concern:** The annual program review needs to read off of the comprehensive program review.

**Norco** – is in the process of working on the implementation of program review into their strategic planning process.

**Moreno Valley** – The Standard I committee could be the program review committee. The charge of the Moreno Valley program review committee will be to read the comprehensive reviews and be overseer of the forms. Business Services will be reading the annual program reviews and extracting information needed. **Simple process:** The disciplines develop the program reviews, talk about them in their departments, the departments take them to the APC and then forward it to the VP. Explain to faculty that this process is to collect information to serve our students better. Need to identify leadership and help the colleges understand what's involved in the transition process with better understanding.

### **3. Program Review Submittals - Comprehensive Instructional Program Review**

**Sociology – Comments: (To be sent to Jami Brown)** Jim Thomas suggested that we have someone come in and show us how to put comments into the program review documents which could then be forwarded the discipline for easy revisions. Page 13 – under “Outreach Activities External” it was suggested that they use bullet points to categorize accomplishments by type of work being done. Some of the items listed are not outreach and would be more appropriate in the collaborative section. Page 8 – Student Outcomes Assessment – Is assessment common to the entire discipline district wide? Richard stated that each college is doing their own assessment so to clarify a preamble needs to be added stating that there are no shared practices across the district. Page 3 – Clarify whether or not information under History section is just for Riverside College or is this district wide information? Contact David Torres by email to receive data analysis information needed. Page 7, Item 3 – Sociology 49 was suppose to be deleted. There is missing information on the CORs.

**Motion – to receive Sociology Program Review/MSC/Chenoweth/L.Hall**

Receiving a program review means that it has met the content and format requirements and then the information is to be used to inform the annual program review.

**Engineering, Architect, Electronics and Manufacturing Technology – Comments:** Well done! Page 3 – the information at the bottom should be moved to the Outreach section. Page 4 – What does CNC stand for? Page 5 – Use “the program” instead of using “I”. Page 9 – reword language regarding hiring a PT faculty for a FT faculty position. Page 11 – Don't use cut and paste graphs. Page 12 – Delete the memo section at the top of Page 12. This data also needs narrative interpretation. Page 15 – industrial design is not listed as stated. Page 20 – five manufacturing programs are mentioned but only two are listed. Separate out information on Electronics instead of including it with Manufacturing.

**Motion – to receive Engineering, Architect, Electronic & Manufacturing Program Review MSC/L.Hall/Chenoweth (Uploaded to website 5/27/11)**

**Next Meeting:**

**Thursday, November 18, 2010  
2:30 – 4:30 pm  
District Office - #319**

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE  
November 18, 2010 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
#319, District Office  
MINUTES

**Members Present:**

**Riverside**

Chenoweth, Rita  
Daddona-Moya, Michelle  
Hall, Barbara  
Hall, Lewis  
Kennedy, Stephen  
Mills, Susan  
Vito, Ron

**Moreno Valley**

Bufalino, Patricia  
Dumer, Olga  
Tovares, Carlos

**Norco**

Elizalde, Andres  
Thomas, Jim

**RCCD**

Kauffman, Kristina

**Members Absent:**

**Riverside**

Acharya, Surekha  
McKee-Leone, Virginia

**Moreno Valley**

Drake, Sean  
Fontaine, Bob

**Norco**

Gray, Alexis  
Nery, Annabelle  
Rey, Jason  
Tschetter, Sheryl

**RCCD**

Brown, Aaron

**Guests:** Debbie Renfrow; Celia Brockenbrough; Jackie Lesch

**1. Approval of October 21, 2010 Minutes/MS/L.Hall/S.Kennedy/Motion carried  
(1) abstention - Ron Vito**

**2. Administrative Issues**

**Meetings with constituent groups** – Jim discussed his meetings with different constituent groups such as the academic senate, district academic senate, CTA, and program review committees on each college. No feedback yet.

**Work on Strategies and Action Steps:**

- How is each college strategizing to make decisions?
- Keeping the four year cycle is appropriate
- Who will collect the annual program reviews?
- Each college is working towards having their own website for program reviews.
- Each college will review their own individual comprehensive reviews and those covering all three colleges would move forward to the District Program Review committee consisting of five members, the co-chair from each college's program review committee, Sylvia Thomas and David Torres.
- Annual Administrative Units – pull all needs and requests from each category.

Each college to give Jim Thomas their strategies before the December 16<sup>th</sup> meeting which he will e-mail to all the committee members.

**3. Program Review Submittals - Comprehensive Instructional Program Review**

**Library, Moreno Valley – Comments:** Page 3 – under the History section add paragraph breaks to the main points in the narrative to bring more emphasis to each point. Page 5 – The success rate for LIB 1 was 40% may not be a true indicator of student achievement since this is a new course being taught. They could state that more data will be supplied over time. Page 6 – Pie charts need a breakout of the numbers. Page 10 – Enrollment for LIB 1 has very strong numbers. Page 12 – under Long Term Major Resource Planning, bulleted items need to be transferred to the annual program review as requests.

**Motion – to receive Moreno Valley Library program review/MS/L.Hall/Kennedy**

**Library, Norco – Comments:** Good job on how they placed the history section in the context of the history of the college. Page 7 – it was suggested that the comments could be placed first and then followed by the supporting data/responses. Page 8 – what kind of resources can the District/College offer to approach a cost benefit analysis of how to make a transition into the electronic age? The response was to look at the Library in terms of the student body and the college as a whole. Page 11 – duplicate note regarding Library 1 Course outline of record has been updated in CurricUNET can be removed. Page 13 – Long Term Resource Planning requests can be inserted into the Annual Program Review.

**Motion – to receive Norco Library Program Review/MS/L.Hall/Chenoweth**

**Library, Riverside – Comments:** Their program review shows a lot of changes that have taken place and how they have kept a positive outlook despite challenges they have faced. Page 4 – refer to positions instead of using names. Page 19 – Overall Goals should be inserted into the Administrative and the Instructional Unit plans to make a stronger document. As a discipline, they could state that additional courses may be needed in the future. **Suggestion** - use their building for other meetings such as strategic planning, academic planning council, etc. to showcase their facilities.

**Motion – to receive Riverside Library Program Review/MS/L.Hall/Chenoweth**

Continued discussion regarding the future of having three committees for the comprehensive program reviews. How often would they need to meet - once or twice a semester? Another alternative could be the three co-chairs, Sylvia Thomas and David Torres meeting to review and provide feedback to their committees.

Discussed the need to finalize and vote on a recommendation to the District Academic Senate.

Adjourned at 3:50.

**Next Meeting:**

**Thursday, December 16, 2010  
2:30 – 4:30 pm  
District Office - #319**

**\*Refreshments will be served\***

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE  
December 16, 2010 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
#307, District Office  
MINUTES

**Members Present:**

**Riverside**

Chenoweth, Rita  
Daddona-Moya, Michelle  
Hall, Lewis  
Mills, Susan  
Vito, Ron

**Moreno Valley**

Bufalino, Patricia  
Dumer, Olga

**Norco**

Gray, Alexis  
Thomas, Jim

**RCCD**

Kauffman, Kristina  
Thomas, Sylvia

**Members Absent:**

**Riverside**

Acharya, Surekha  
Hall, Barbara  
Kennedy, Stephen  
McKee-Leone, Virginia

**Moreno Valley**

Drake, Sean  
Fontaine, Bob  
Tovares, Carlos

**Norco**

Elizalde, Andres  
Nery, Annabelle  
Rey, Jason  
Tschetter, Sheryl

**RCCD**

Brown, Aaron

1. **Approval of November 18, 2010 Minutes/MS/L.Hall/Chenoweth/(1) abstention – Alexis Gray/Motion carried**

2. **Administrative Issues**

Patti Bufalino presented the Moreno Valley Program Review transition plan. Carol Farrar is working on implementing and integrating program review along with the Facilities Master Plan into an overall Strategic Plan on the Norco College.

Sheila Pisa will most likely be the new assessment chair replacing Carlos Tovares on the Moreno Valley Campus. Working on having access to program review forms online by January/February 2011. Need to help faculty better understand the difference between the comprehensive and the annual program reviews since they see the comprehensive more as a historical document than as a planning document.

**Discussion of when meetings should be scheduled in Spring 2011. Options:**

- Meet same time and same place with the 1<sup>st</sup> hour as a joint venture and then break out into the college meetings.
- District meeting every other month alternating with college meetings
- District meeting once per quarter and the rest would be at the colleges

**Standing Functions of the District Program Review Committee** - as it evolves to the three colleges:

- Standardized forms
- To review comprehensive program reviews that share a common curriculum

Discussion of how the Curriculum Committee operates and possible lessons to learn. A concern about common curriculum was raised. Sylvia Thomas discussed SB 1440 where the state faculty CID groups have released six transfer model curriculums two of which are coming forward in CurricUNET. They hope to have these two in place by Fall 2011.

Training for the comprehensive program review will be centralized. There was a discussion regarding concern for one-person disciplines and the workload issues related to a more detailed Section H requiring a four year plan. This discussion will be continued at our next meeting.

**Motion** - to accept the current comprehensive program review guidelines with modifications discussed, particularly to Section H.

**MSC/L.Hall/Gray**

**Next Meeting: Thursday, February 24, 2011 / 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.**