Program Review Committee				Tuesday, February 26, 2013
				12:00 p.m.
				Building 1, Conference Room
Chair:	Almeta Woolard			
Vice-chair:	Ben Cole	**Secretary:**		Millie House
Members Attending:	Ben Cole (Instructor, Electrical/Electronics Engineering) Donna Dunn (Lead Instructor Business Administration) Mike Davis (Lead Instructor, English) Kim Mullis (Lead Instructor, Mathematics) Almeta Woolard (Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Grants) Millie House (Instructor, ADN Program) Velma Worsley (Lead Instructor, Cosmetology)			
Members Absent:				
Agenda Item				

I. Approval of January Minutes	**Presenter:**	Almeta Woolard

Minutes were sent via email and copies were provided at the meeting. Kimberly Mullis motioned we approved the minutes as written, seconded by Mike Davis. The motion was carried by all members.

Almeta Woolard shared that in the future the minutes could be approved by email if supported by the group. All feedback should be "reply all" so that members would all receive the communication. Everyone was in agreement that this would be an acceptable method of approving the minutes.

II. Format and process at other institutions	**Presenter:**	Almeta Woolard

Discussion: Almeta thanked all members for completing the Program Review questionnaire. She summarized the findings of 15 community colleges and disseminated copies (see attached). Survey findings varied significantly as noted below.

Three colleges provided their Program Reviews on the website for public display, three schools provided Program reviews on the website with password protection, and seven colleges did not display Program Reviews on the website. One school was in the process of making the current *Review* and immediate past *Review* available.

The responsibility for oversight and direction at most institutions was held by the Intuitional Effectiveness office. However, the individual departments and committees were responsible for completion of the Program Reviews.

A standard template or set of guidelines was used at all institutions to direct the process. The timeline review process ranged from one to five years. There was a lack of clarity in some instances as to how the rotation of programs was defined.

Best practice exemplars characterized by having plans that demonstrated continuous improvement, effective Program Review processes and met SACS requirements were shared from three community colleges as well as one suboptimal performance measurement reporting process.

Action: Almeta ask those who presented website findings to email the website links to committee members. All members are to review the documents and be prepared to make recommendations for a Program Review template at the next meeting.		
III. Adjournment	**Presenter:**	Almeta Woolard
Meeting adjourned at 1300 hours. Next meeting will convene in April. Almeta will email date, time, and location.		