

PURPOSE:

Mumert, Judy Miner, Ken Horowitz, Kimberlee Messina, Kurt Hueg, Lauren Wilson, Leslye Noone, Mark Anderson, Meredith Heiser, Omar Zeitoun, Paul Starer, Roberto Sias, Sarah Munoz

Meeting began at 1:31PM.

1. Welcome

2. Approval of Minutes: May 7, 2014

Minutes approved by consensus.

3. PRC Recommendations – 2nd Read

John Mummert acknowledged the PRC members present at the meeting. Mummert reiterated that the seven programs that received a yellow rating were required to submit a remediation plan to PRC. Miner invited PaRC to share any comments and suggestions for the program review process. Meredith Heiser suggested that PRC's comments could be summarized on a cover page so that those interested could quickly review the program's rating.

PRC Recommendations approved by consensus.

4. PRC Remediation Update

Mummert presented the PRC Remediation Update. Mummert again noted that the remediation plans were due to PRC by June 13, 2014 so that PRC could report out at the June 18 PaRC meeting. Mummert stated that PRC was unsure about its authority in regard to holding programs accountable for acting upon their remediation plans. Roberto Sias asked if the campus understood the importance of the program review process. Cara Miyaskai stated that each program had different levels of awareness, noting that PRC gives a great amount of feedback.

Chris White asked PaRC to clarify PRC's role to enforce a yellow-rated program to develop, submit, and act upon a remediation plan. Kimberlee Messina commented that remediation plans should go through the program's vice president and then to PRC. Messina added that PRC could then recommend to PaRC and the president that a program be discontinued, shifted, eliminated, etc. White stated that PRC's official charge was to give color ratings and recommendations to each program during the program review process; and that it was not PRC's responsibility

LaManque reported that the Workgroup Tri-Chairs met on May 12, 2014 to discuss the vision and goals of the college. Elaine Kuo recorded that the group spoke about many ideas leading to the college's vision statement and president's vision statement, which were previously discussed by PaRC in February 2014. The group's research showed that many of the president's vision statements from other colleges were used to drive annual priorities and decision making throughout the year. LaManque stated that the group came to no definitive recommendations. Hueg noted that the struggle with the president's vision was that it contained the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), which made it appear like a vision statement. Starer commented that there were many documents that contained competing verbiage and that the college should look to produce a unified message. Miner stated that the language used in the president's vision statement included specific suggestions that could be implemented in college planning. Hueg commented that the college was required to focus on the mission statement for accreditation purposes, and that everything else would be at the college's discretion. Messina noted that the idea of a taskforce to move forward with the vision and goals work would be helpful.

Miner volunteered to participate in the first meeting of the taskforce. Miner stated that she would like to lead the campus in student equity. In the past, Miner continued, she had to take a fiscal leadership stance; however moving forward, Miner commented, the way in which the college discussed approaches to lead the campus should flow through a student equity lens. Miner added that a piece on online learning as a function of the Online Education Initiative (OEI)

