



INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW
Wednesday, February 26, 2014

MINUTES

Attendees: Teri Henson, Jill Carbone, Catherine Suarez, Jason Morris, Tina Inzerilla, Angella VenJohn, Karin Spirn, Nadiyah Taylor, Lisa Everett, Dyan Miller, Barbara Morrissey, Robin Roy, Justin Garoupa, Rajinder Samra, Jon Dimercurio, Janice Noble, Rafi Ansari.

Teri Henson convened the meeting at 2:40 pm. Today we are hosting a round-table discussion of the Program Review Template, the Fall program review process and the summarization process with the goal of improving the template and processes.

Questions to guide the discussion attached.

Teri: Welcome to the meeting today. It's a big day. Our focus is on processes and the template. Welcome Deans!

Rajinder: Talked about survey results.

Teri: Let's start with the perspectives of the Deans. Please be frank and open. We want to make it better. No war stories!

Jill: Yes, let's focus on the Deans today.

Justin: My faculty had suggestions about the rolling deadlines. Is the information valid?

Lisa: My faculty didn't know some of the information. Is there a way to pre-populate some of the sections, for instance, # of Classified, 10-11 month positions, etc.? Frontloading could help.

Rajinder: Was the HR information important? There are a lot of requests to make Program Review shorter.

Teri: Let's focus on the Fall process – any feedback?

Lisa: It was extremely helpful to have the feedback form. The writers were appreciative. Some programs didn't heed the advice or make any changes. Start the readers earlier to strengthen it.

Dyan: Seemed like the feedback was in a bubble. I enjoyed the time spent with the readers. I liked hearing it from the peer perspective, not just the Deans. The readers had a lot of questions. Perhaps we're missing a step?

Barbara: The hardest part is putting the Student Services programs into this process. There has to be an intermediate step for a meaningful review.

Teri: We probably have to create a new form. We didn't get a lot of input last year from Student Services.

Jill: Did you like the summaries?

Justin: Labeling it a summary is not accurate as it's more of an analysis – patterns, themes, recommendations.

Lisa: I found them very helpful. It allowed me to capture commonalities and challenges. It captures Fall 2013 but the information has already changed. Include updates?

Dyan: We haven't shared our summaries yet. I would be interested to compare them.

Lisa: We only just presented last week at the Division Meeting.

Jill: I thought the summary was very clear and captured our program.

Teri: Did you look at the Program Review summaries; did you find it helpful?

Lisa: Yes.

Jill: How should we handle inaccuracies?

Dyan: The stated data was unclear. Deans and readers might give feedback together. The summaries could be started at this point.

Janice: Deans: 1) Division AU outcomes; 2) Analysis – themes, patterns; 3) Conclusions; and 4) Recommendations. It helped me to review. There is always room for improvement and further research. Once I review, I'll work with Teri and Jill. We may have an extra step in there. We had a good conversation at the Dean's Meeting. When we do triennial, it will all help. Think about changing verbiage – at a conference they called Program Review a Unit Plan. It took some of the anxiety out of it.

Teri: How about the structure of the summary form?

Lisa: Let's stick with the narrative format per VPAS. Whether it's changing the name . . . the goal is to get Faculty to plan. The focus seemed to be on external items. It was never tied back to student success . . . it's missing that connection.

Justin: Internal plans vs external plans – requests, newer initiatives.

Teri: The resource requests are based on numbers. There's never been a lot of planning.

Jill: How about the time frames . . . is there enough time to read/write?

Dyan: I set time aside and got them out. The late ones were already due and just received them. I would have preferred to receive everything all at once.

Jill: Why weren't they on time? Did they need more time, more structure?

Lisa: Probably a bit of procrastination.

Teri: The template was out there!

Lisa: Let's keep the time line short.

Teri: We spot read – a lot of stuff didn't need to be included.

Angella: I agree with self-population.

Lisa: Don't send them out to review/obtain more information. Back to Dyan's comment – I scheduled time blocks to complete.

Justin: I did too – closed my door.

Teri: Are there any questions we should have asked the Deans?

Collective: No.

Jill: About the spectrum of quality . . . Deans and readers together? How do we know the writers are accurate?

Lisa: Program Review is the purview of Faculty. I left the documents as written. In the summary document, I clarified and corrected.

Karin: How often did people accept changes and revisions?

Lisa and Justin: About 80%.

Justin: The programs without F/T Faculty – I spent the most time on. There were about four – very difficult – we didn't get one as everyone declined to do it even with compensation offered.

Jill: Should we have more separation of clusters?

Lisa: Biology worked well. Public Safety, not so well.

Jill: For the future . . . should we approach Faculty about clusters or no clusters?

Lisa: I suggest front loading the confusing aspects as we'll get more buy in.

Dyan: They wanted to do separate Program Reviews but ended up clustering. They were overwhelmed.

Justin: This is still a process. Generally one person wants to write it. However, if it's linked back to resource requests, they feel they want to write their own Program Review.

Teri: Specific programs needed more help. Do they learn on their own or should we be more proactive in identifying people needing support?

Lisa: It's time and capacity . . . not sure how to help. It goes back to stronger Program Reviews because of requests being made. Help strengthen – spread the wealth.

Teri: The planning piece is important. Goes forward with resource requests – that's not what integrated planning is. What are the goals - student success?

Lisa: It wasn't strong enough to emerge in Program Review this time.

Barbara: We never talk about where the program is going. We mostly talk about cutting, no budget, and less resources.

Nadiyah: Maybe an additional template of information to make clear? It's almost like two opposing views. What are we managing? Reflection vs moving forward.

Lisa: Need explicit clarity – where do your students want to go?

Teri: Need to focus on resources to analyze data for student needs, then what resources do you need.

Lisa: Reallocating or reprioritizing as opposed to "new" resources.

Catherine: I want to do it but don't have the time. Where does the reassigned time come from? How is it paid for?

Karin: Coordination gets reassigned time.

Janice: The reality is assigned time is the most fair way. However, that's negotiated with the Faculty Association and the District.

Catherine: Where is this funded?

Janice: The General Fund.

Lisa: Yes, this is something to consider. I don't know the historical background.

Rafi: What is reassigned time?

Karin: You get less time to teach in order to work on special projects.

Jill: This isn't within our purview today.

Teri: Five hours a week for professional duties. It's a problem as more things get requested.

Lisa: Don't change the template, just clarify. Offer assistance.

Justin: The time line in November might have been a bit difficult.

Jill: I like the idea of reading together.

Jason: I didn't check data. Reading with the Deans might help. I didn't know if my summaries would help the Deans.

Teri: Do you like the idea of working together?

Nadiyah: Paired across roles was very helpful when done a few years ago, however, timing was an issue.

Karin: Reading together might be problematic time wise. Meet with individuals to develop summaries.

Lisa: If the goal is to strengthen – is anyone going back to source documents?

Jill: A lot of it is educating the Deans.

Teri: I'm advocating the Planning Committee reads them all. How are the Program Reviews ultimately reviewed? We want people to put quality and thoughtfulness into it.

Catherine: What I read was poorly written – not a good writer – needed some support. Didn't look up the information . . . why is that happening? May need two types of support.

Jill: Writers and Deans can provide feedback for revisions.

Nadiyah: Are people being lazy or just not trying? Are we just getting a bunch of stuff? How can we frame feedback? And yes . . . time is an issue.

Justin: Who are the audiences? Is it intended as an internal document? As it becomes apparent where it goes – will it play a strong role?

Teri: I'd say reasonably useful next Fall. Simplify, focus, a reflective piece that needs to be done in order to plan resources.

Angella: Maybe it's no longer important to review. Maybe the name should change. LPC struggles about dialoging what students need. More discussions are necessary and important. Speak during Convocation . . . use Staff Development. We need time set aside at these functions to dialog. What do our students need to be successful campus wide?

Teri: Everything is connected. Who on this campus facilitates these big things? Is there any consolidation?

Lisa: I presume at the Integrated Planning Meeting. What are we planning for?

Jill: Should the summaries go to the Integrated Planning Meeting or the entire Program Review Committee?

Lisa: The summaries are sufficient moving forward. Do the summaries capture the Program Review? I think so.

Teri: Think about next Fall. Jill and I will work with the Deans. What would the timing look like? Jan, when would the Integrated Planning Committee get a summary?

Janice: The Integrated Planning Committee would need by December/January because we receive the Governor's budget in January. The Dean's information would assist in balancing the budget in April. Propose allocations in February. Start September 1st, end in October to Deans. Readers and Deans begin in the Summer and ready in February. I don't know if that works.

Lisa: The Dean summaries need to go to the Division Meetings. Do we have any other mechanisms? Email?

Catherine: Town Meeting?

Janice: It would have to be at the February Town Meeting.

Lisa: What about the December Town Meeting?

Nadiyah: Need clarity about where we are sharing information or an opportunity to provide feedback.

Justin: What is the mechanism? Does that group need to go to the Integrated Planning Committee? What about rebuttals? I wouldn't want my document altered but would welcome the feedback.

Janice: Let's try to take ½ hour at the Town Meeting in early February.

Teri: What about August 20th (Convocation) 2014? Push out template earlier? When would the data be ready?

Rajinder: Data doable at the end of Summer.

Lisa: Can I help populate some of the templates once the data is available? There's a lot of confusion surrounding data.

Teri: Can we do at Convocation on the 2nd day using ½ of the time to instruct on Program Review?

Rajinder: The workshops Scott and I held were very poorly attended.

Janice: How about doing it at the Division Meeting? Part of the time would be Program Review instruction. The Program Review Committee could circulate to the different meetings.

Lisa: Classified staff are at these (Division) meetings.

Teri: Jump start when do Program Reviews start coming in? How much time . . . any staggering?

Collective: All at once.

Jill: Let's pencil in mid October (15). The Deans can read and provide feedback by mid November (15). Provide an opportunity to revise in mid December (15). Deans would finalize summary in January, to VPs in February, and review at the February Town Meeting AND Division Meetings.

Janice: Have the template available.

Teri: Yes, in May.

Jill: Good sketch for now.

Teri: Yes, a great start.

Lisa: I wasn't sure how to approach the Classified Staff at the Computer Center. Most people aren't here in the Summer.

Teri: Regarding Campus Safety – service areas might have to be revised. The Unit Plan idea is tailored as the template doesn't work.

Barbara: What is a program? Student Services has services – we haven't delineated. We link to resources, that's why we write program reviews.

Justin: Services need planning and resources.

Teri and Jill: Good stuff! Next meeting we'll meet with Student Services.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm

Minutes submitted by: Julie Thornburg

Questions to guide the discussion of the annual program review template and process.

From the perspective of those who wrote annual program reviews:

1. What were the primary concerns of those responding to the survey?
2. What suggestions for improvement did the respondents have?

From the perspective of the Deans:

1. What difficulties did you encounter in the reviewing process? What would make it better?
2. How did APR writers react to the feedback you provided?
3. Were the individual summaries, prepared by the PRC readers, helpful?
4. What difficulties did you encounter in preparing the Division summary? Do you consider it worthwhile to continue producing a Division summary?
5. Were the summary worksheet and summary form useful? How could they be improved?

From the perspective of the PRC readers/summarizers:

1. Was the summary worksheet useful? How could it be improved?
2. What difficulties did you encounter in conducting the reading/summarization process?
3. Would you recommend continuing this process?

The APR template:

1. What worked well?
2. What did not work well?
3. What sections did we include that were
 - a. unnecessary?
 - b. confusing?
4. Are there sections we should
 - a. discard?
 - b. add?
 - c. combine?
5. What questions did we not ask that we should have asked?
6. Was there data we did not provide that we should have provided? Was some data unnecessary?

General Questions:

1. What do we want program review to accomplish?
2. How can we best accomplish that?
3. How can we help program review writers do this work efficiently and understand what they need to do?
4. How do we handle concerns about the quality of individual program reviews?
5. How do we do a better job providing appropriate data?