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|  | SAC Program Review Committee  December 6th, 2021  12:30p.m. – 1:30 p.m.  Zoom: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/91384625284> |

**Members:** Jaki King, Dr. Brenda Estrada, Kim Smith, Kyle Bradley, Cristina Gheorghe, Saeid Eidgahy, Catherine Emley, Kathy Walczak, Stacey Bass, Matthew Beyersdorf, Cherylee Kushida,

**Guests:** Stephanie Clark, Celia Perez

**Introductions and Welcome** –Jaki welcomed us to the meeting at 12:30pm

November 1st, 2021, Minutes moved to approve by Catherine Emley and 2nd by Matthew Beyersdorf. Minutes were approved unanimously.

**PROGRAM REVIEW DOCUMENT – 4 YEAR TEMPLATE:**

Jaki reviewed the annual 4 yr. template and discussed a rubric; opened discussion for feedback over the year. Main point addressed is the summary and to keep as bullet points

Some reviewers going in-depth, possibly best to summarize and request to review progress, strengths, recommendations, or list in brackets

Kathy Walczak stated that bullets makes sense instead of separate summary for points that could be repetitious; the way it’s put is redundant and perhaps make a cohesive analysis of the document. Saeid supports the idea of being more flexible. Catherine added the last summary had strengths and weaknesses; opportunities for improvements in the next 4 year with mission, goals and objectives. Less bullets. Under recommendation: action plan to improve weakness was suggested.

**DOCUMENT REVIEW:**

Stephanie Clark brought up centralized funding with SWP/Perkins; doesn’t know if program can streamline with that process. Connecting funding request to vision goals feels like on an island by itself

Dr. Estrada posted what is the current request and area of funding, and explain where you would be requesting funding from and that way its inclusive of all programs. RARs not for grant funded. Include your current funding resource/allocation request and area from which you are looking to be funded

Cherylee: possible to have a table that can be filled out; might be areas already funded and say current funding and/or funding request to learn if already funded

Jaki: ultimately shouldn’t be needed: Ideally all funding request will be done on Nuventive; do program review, then funding request and before that tie to program review

Jaki: Per Brenda just include funding resource. Tie to a vision goal/strategic plan

Saied: point made is critical that’s why there’s a struggle, depend on RARS, agreed with how Jaki stated. Program review should be driving resource request

Jaki asked if the group wanted to look at a different area.

Stephanie: possibly #4 in program review – what improvements to ensure have been made to ensure improvements; online teaching cert is an example where faculty don’t ensure learning. Training around best practices. Will add to Wednesday agenda for innovative language to add to 3 questions. Any other areas/sections that should be updated, changed, deleted, added?

**Annual Review:**

RUBRIC: recommendation of resources – any update or change before spring?

**Announcements**

Facilitated round table discussion will need to meet ahead to figure out what group will ask-discuss in spring

Two development workshops/Wed. 1 for 4-year preview 2022; get research analysis and an overview workshop for presenters. Any committee member that would like to present and get presenter credit please contact Jaki.

Spring Schedule – Will still be on Monday from 1pm to 2:30pm to accommodate the 26 presentations.

Jaki will send meeting invites this week and a doodle poll to presenters to choose their presentation date.

Meeting ended at 1:58pm.