



**MINUTES
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE**

DATE: February 11, 2015

TIME: 3:00-4:30 pm

PLACE: Room 507

PRESENT:

Christina Lee, Lisa Everett, Marsha Vernoga, Catherine Suarez, Nadiyah Taylor, Tina Inzerilla, Karin Spirn, Michelle Zapata

1. Program Planning Update (PPU) survey results

- PPU Survey will be posted on the Program Review Website
- Faculty and administrator filled out PPU survey
- If anyone has feedback about the PPU Survey, email feedback to Karin
- Questions:
 - *The purpose of PPU was clear to me:* 14 of 21 agreed
 - *I was able find and download the PPU form easily:* 18 of 21 agreed
 - *The timeline for PPU deadlines was clear to me:* 18 of 21 agreed
 - *The PPU template form sections were appropriate for my program planning update:* 4 Strongly Agree, 8 Agree, 8 Neither agree nor disagree, 1 Disagree, a total of 21 surveyed
 - *The date (i.e. Discipline/Student Services Data Packets, enrollment management data) provided on the Office of institutional research and planning website was easily accessible:* 8 Strongly Agree, 10 Agree, 1, Disagree
 - Suggestion: data should be split into a Fall and Spring term, along with the data of the complete year
 - People need more access to IR office because Program Review is research heavy
 - *The information contained in the Discipline/Student Services Date Packets was easily understood:* 6 Strongly Agreed, 5, Agree, 4 Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 6 Missing
 - *All the data and information that I need for my PPU was easily available:* over half agree
 - *SLO data in eLumen was easily accessible:* 3 Strongly Agree, 5 Agree, 4 Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 2 Disagree, 5 Strongly Disagree, 3 Missing Responses
 - A lot of people have problems with eLumen but college is close to accreditation so it would not be smart to change eLumen software
 - DE question needed for accreditation

- *I would support one or more scheduled flex days to work on program planning updates:* 11 Strongly Agree, 6 Agree, 1 Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 2 Disagree, 1 Strongly Disagree
- *If offered, I would attend a PPU workshop:* 6 Strongly Agree, 5 Agree, 6 Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 2 Disagree, 1 Strongly Disagree
- *I personally spent __ hours working on program's PPU this year:* 0-5 hours (6), 11-15 (5), 16-20 (2), 6-10 (5), more than 20 (3)
 - Programs that spent more than 20 hours probably had a single person completing document; usually big departments split work
- *How can the PP Committee improve the questions on the PPU template form:*
 - Have a savable PDF PPU form
 - Consolidate the questions that ask for the progress (looking back and looking forward) of plans
 - a. i.e. looking at curriculum achievements and the plans for the curriculum looking forward
- *How can the college improve the PPU process:*
 - Don't make it option, make it shorter
 - Do it online; Maybe have PPU as a Google doc/word doc to make it fillable and online
 - College of Canyons have online homegrown program review document (district IT connection) – get in contact with them to use their model
 - Recent PPU was so labor intensive, had a lot to do with ACCJC visit
 - Concerns: Who is reading this? What will be done with this information? PPU should be read by higher up administrator; Should Integrated Planning Committee (IPC) read PPU's? was suggested last year
 - Should there be a bigger focus on Dean Summaries so Integrated Planning Committee and administrators won't be too overwhelmed?
 - Suggestion: Opportunity for people to share-out program details in townhalls (for program representation); not feasible but people could volunteer, attendance could be voluntary; maybe have a poster session to substitute meeting time
 - With so much data big picture is hard to take in; make PPU more narrative?
 - What do ACCJC visits do with Program Review forms? ACCJC reads everything, sees updates, see how process is being used in planning
 - VP's read summaries because you do not have time to read program reviews; maybe programs should do their own summaries?
- *Are you satisfied the Dean's Summary for your division or area? Why or why not?*
 - Academic Deans submitted form promptly, Student Services Summaries are still not done
 - Deans should share and give time to get feedback from programs in summaries
 - What are the programs expectations of the Dean's Summary?
- *How can the College improve PPU are used in planning and budgeting:*
 - Everyone should have feedback for their PPU (programs want feedback)

- There is a need in administrative leadership in Program Review process

2. Next year's Program Review Update (PRU) form

- Emailed to Program Review Committee
- Reviewing PRU form:
 - Part One:
 - Will keep the 1st question from previous PPU
 - Questions drafted from the last Program Review Committee meeting are included in Part One
 - Change Question: **CHANGE** “Are the planning priorities reflected in your accomplishments and future plans, and how so?” **TO** “Do plans in this program review update connect to this year's planning priorities?”
 - Note: planning priorities come out of program review

3. Possible language for allocation forms

- All allocation forms should have this language because every program/division requires allocation forms
- Questions:
 - This need was described explicitly in a Program Review or Program Review Update.
 - This need was implied in a Program Review or Program Review Update.
 - This need was not included in a Program Review or Program Review Update but has become a need since that time.
- Make wording consistent for all programs/committees
- Program Review should be a space where programs make requests; there should not be so many request forms required for one request
- Allocation and budgeting should be part of Program Review

Spring 2014 PR Committee Meetings (2nd and 4th Wednesdays, 3-4:30, Room 507)

February 25

March 11

March 25

April 8

April 22

May 6

May 20