INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW
Wednesday, February 12, 2014

MINUTES

Attendees: Teri Henson, Jill Carbone, Catherine Suarez, Jason Morris, Tina Inzerilla, Angella VenJohn, Karin Spirn, Nadiyah Taylor, Lisa Everett, Barbara Morrissey, Rajinder Samra, Janice Noble, Rafi Ansari.

Teri Henson convened the meeting at 2:34 pm. Welcome!

Discussion Points:
1. APR Survey Results
2. Integrated Planning Model and Program Review
3. Summary Process and Forms: Team Feedback
4. Spring Tasks

Teri: Rajinder has survey results. Let's start the discussion on the summary process. How did it go . . . readers, Deans, etc? Forms – what worked and didn't work. How did the Fall 2013 Program Review Survey look on the web? People had two weeks to respond.

Rajinder: Reviewed survey with the group. Only 37 respondents. I may tweak next time to include discipline. I do have written comments if you'd like them.

Teri: 16 Program Reviews from Student Services – all the others are from the Academic areas. Roughly, 1/3 survey results from faculty.

Rajinder: Discussed issues surrounding the time line (question three).

Lisa: Are there any themes that emerge?

Rajinder: The gap. Some people want more data (more than a year). They didn't have access to data – SARS, HR, etc. The form was too long. Items didn't apply.

Nadiyah: I'm curious about the comment about working over the summer.

Rajinder: It wasn't specifically mentioned – it was generally a time line issue.

Teri: I find these comments about the time line interesting.

Rajinder: The Institutional Research (IR) data was helpful. Not sure how we can provide consistent data. SARS – more systematic and clear. Where does that fall? Identify items, particularly in Student Services. Be able to pull SARS data correctly and easily. Counseling – IT – IR – all on the same page. Might look good but not correct. What mechanism do we have in place? How is information truly captured? Elumen – some people have great difficulties with it. Access, training – need Scott to help as the perception is it's not working. It is NOT an official data source. People just don't attend Scott's trainings.

Teri: 54% out 37 people said they'd attend a workshop. Not a great stat.

Rajinder: There's a perception that we're just doing this for accreditation purposes vs. improving ourselves and the college.

Teri: The problem is – no one has seen us implement a planning cycle yet. It's a big disconnect now. I'm one voice doing Program Review – how effective is it?

Rajinder: SLOs – some disciplines doing best practices. Some don't go into it like that.

Teri: The Elumen issue – easier if using it in a small department. Math w/ 15 sections doesn't mean as much. Hard to extrapolate data. Do we base planning on this?

Tina: It's the job of each Faculty member to mine results. It's hard to act as a whole.

Karin: We need to think out of the box – communicate.

Rajinder: How does it come back to student learning?

Karin: We can't show correlation w/ Elumen data.

Rajinder: True.

Teri: Let's look at the Program Review Template questions - Student Services vs. instructional and the type of data.

Tina: I agree w/ the tech/equipment/supplies point. It seems to overlap – miscategorized.

Nadiyah: How did people interpret the last page? Control vs. no control. New initiatives and curriculum. People confused.

Teri: Jason, myself and Justin read the Student Service's Program Reviews. People struggled to make the template work.

Tina: For my review it was appropriate, however, not filled out correctly. What about the budget? It should be the top objective.

Angella: As a Counselor, we don't know the budget.

Tina: There was an expressed need for budget information then it never came up again.

Lisa: The outcomes page seemed . . . they couldn't articulate. There's a disconnect on the page across the board.

Nadiyah: There were requests made when we didn't have any control. There is some room for clarification.

Jason: CalWORKs did well w/ it. Student Life was really light. I ended up not knowing what Student Life was.

Teri: A lot of Student Services just didn't fit. I'd like to invite all Student Services Program Review folks to talk about the process. What worked, what didn't.

Barbara: From what I've seen, Student Services Program Review is not always the same because we have services AND programs. Program Review doesn't account for services. There are lots of questions w/ no answers.

Teri: How does it fit into integrated planning? Example: Campus Safety needs more staff.

Barbara: If that's the intent – resource allocation – we need to flow into the same pool. We get there in a different way.

Tina: You'd want the summarizing effect.

Teri: We tried but need some separation. Let's have an honest discussion w/ Student Services. Let's make it work.

Jason: Have you found a form you liked?

Teri: Not really.

Barbara: There must be a way of connecting things.

Angella: It's important to look at services data and best practices. Different from SLO/SLAs.

Rajinder: Some people want to develop their own data.

Barbara: EOPS – they do state reporting. Can use that data.

Rajinder: It's great to mine your own data.

Teri: Does anything else stand out?

Rajinder: Themes – use of universal form, make it simple.

Jason: The rank objectives – mini common tool. There's no point to the one on the end. Streamline.

Teri: That page was supposed to move forward.

Lisa: Can we auto populate to capture information on the template?

Teri: We can't build until it's formalized.

Rajinder: IT is looking into it.

Lisa: Let's concentrate on the narrative.

Rajinder: We're looking at other things to streamline. We need a more systematic process as it's very complex as it stands. Now, there's a challenge to determine how much we are spending. Move it to on-line to streamline.

Nadiyah: Mission – Some of these comments are really valuable. Define college mission not program mission. Lots of complaints about the length of the form.

Rajinder: Long, long, long. If we know what's happening at the end . . . make it more comprehensive.

Karin: Do people need to know Program Review for its data – for planning purposes? Simply stated . . . what is it that you need?

Lisa: We take caution that Program Reviews don't become a wish list. Data is included for that reason.

Angella: We have a culture of looking at the data. Data needs to be easily accessible. Talk about it . . . use it. It's going to be a struggle to get the process in place – dashboard, etc.   A fillable template is easier to use.

Teri: A thoughtful discussion is needed. The first Program Reviews were used as a time for taking stock – wants, needs, student success.

Tina: It ends up being a frantic gathering and analyzing of data.

Teri: It also ends up being – what's the answer administrators want to see.

Rajinder: The deeper you drill, the more meaningful it becomes.

Nadiyah: I found Rajinder's packet a great help. Received good feedback from my Dean.

Lisa: I don't know what the summary process looks like in the end. I found it helpful. Good for focus, efforts and goals. It think it's useful.

Teri: Thank you for conducting and compiling the survey Rajinder.

Unknown: I'd like to hear back from those doing the summary process. I enjoyed summarizing what I read. Angella worked w/ Cheryl. Got a sense of other disciplines. Some people got it and some didn't.

Teri: We need to think about how to help people do it.

Lisa: Some people are open and receptive to feedback. Other program suggestions for correction didn't happen. What happens when Program Reviews are finalized w/ errors? I would like to hear the readers' perspectives.

Barbara: Program Reviews are all very different. It's hard to rate. For instance – categorical programs use funding for support.

Jill: I worked w/ Peter and Dyan. There were huge variances in Program Reviews. Dyan said it would have been helpful to work together to develop follow up questions.

Catherine: I enjoyed reading, however, issues w/ acronyms. I'd like to know what acronyms stand for in an easier way. Fire Safety, AJ – hard to figure out.

Nadiyah: I was interested . . . they were all very different. I liked the clarity of some writers. Surprised at the brevity of some. The worksheet helped me focus.

Angella: It would be great to work w/ Staff Development as a FLEX Day before classes start. Build time into our schedules.

Teri: There was no FLEX Day approval from Staff Development when we last asked.

Lisa: There's a difference in writing and reading – different outcomes.

Catherine: Time doesn't get used – just look at the parking lot on those days . . . it's empty.

Nadiyah: Identify Program Reviews – get permission to use models that people could look at.

Karin: I enjoyed reading w/ this form. Cluster programs – all the work put on one form for all three.

Rajinder: People loved the data that was posted.

Teri: At the next meeting we'll invite the Deans and Program Review teams to start an in depth discussion. The SLO Committee is doing a separate analysis. Tina will bring information back to us. On March 12th, we'll invite Student Services to focus and work on the template. We won't know if Program Review is effective as Integrated Planning Committee only has three meetings this Spring. We really need their feedback. I'm not sure if they're going to have the time.

Jan: We'll clarify at the meeting in March. Today, the Academic Senate is meeting to define membership. Send your request and concerns to me to put on the agenda. I don't know when they're going to write their plan.

Teri: It is unlikely we'll get their feedback . . . it's hard to hit the target.

Jill: Why aren't they meeting 2x/month? It's discouraging as, for years, we've tried to get Program Review established . . . it's hard to incentivize the Faculty.

Jan: There's no other time for a second meeting.

Tina: We've been saying Program Review will go to planning. If it doesn't go . . .

Jan: I'll use the summary to push information out.

Teri: 14/15 planning probably won't be implemented.

Rajinder: We are currently behind the time line stated.

Jan: It has to happen before May. We met some months ago. Did our conversation about my summary get translated yet?

Rajinder: No.

Teri: Is this next year's model?

Jan: It's the approved model.

Teri: No triennial review at this time. Program Review Fall 2014 – planning for 15/16 to close the gap. It basically eliminates the summary process. Do Classified/Faculty/ Equipment Requests in the Spring ahead of the budget.

Barbara: Where's the Faculty Hiring Committee on this?

Teri: It goes to the Allocation Committee.

Tina: Faculty and RAC hiring decisions – I like the timing . . . post in the Spring to hire in the Fall.

Catherine: Based on the Chancellor's visit, does Integrated Planning Committee go then to the District?

Jan: The task of the committee, in breakout sessions, is how it feeds into District committees.

Lisa: Look at the boxes – IPC to President. President has to communicate to the College Council, then to District.

Nadiyah: If this connects w/ the District process at what point is this communicated? Are the District priorities feeding in?

Jan: What if we need mass purchase of computers? How does that feed into the District? There are some tweaks to be made.

Rajinder: We need mechanism in place to constantly assess the integrated model. District-wide communication . . . we have to figure out what it means to them.

Teri: There are lots of questions. Thanks very much everyone – great discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 4 pm.

Minutes submitted by Julie Thornburg.