INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW
Wednesday, March 12, 2014

MINUTES

Attendees: Teri Henson, Jill Carbone, Catherine Suarez, Jason Morris, Tina Inzerilla, Angella VenJohn, Karin Spirn, Nadiyah Taylor, Barbara Morrissey, Rajinder Samra, Rafi Ansari, Frances DeNisco, Bill Eddy, Scott Miner, Andi Schreibman, Sylvia Rodriguez, Debbie Earney

PRC hosts a roundtable discussion of the program review template, the fall program review process and the summarization process as implemented within Student Services. Goals: Improving the template and process for use in Student Services. Discussion guide attached.

Teri: Welcome Student Services! We should have a great conversation.   Feel free to speak your minds! I sent out a list of questions to consider. Let's start w/ the writers.

Frances: I wrote one. It didn't have a lot to do w/ me. Funding, resource requests – I'm fee based so the resources part of it wasn't applicable. It didn't fairly reflect my program. How do we push out my type of information?

Teri: That is the main question!! How do you fit into the plan process?

Frances: When I have funding I purchase differently. I can't ask for anything. I'm supposed to cover my salary.

Teri: What is the purpose of program review? Consolidate resources/requests going through regular channels? Meta level – 3 to 5 years. What programs are going fee based? Are you in that level?

Karin: I liked your comments that you wanted to do program review . . . represent your program.

Teri: Do you collect data?

Frances: Yes. My software spits out a lot of data. Goal: let people know about lifelong learning.

Teri: Build ideas to modify, including summative output at the end of review. Will take the next month to figure it all out.

Jill: Trial and error at this point.

Frances: Specific to resource allocation could be intimidating.

Debbie: The form was fine although a lot of areas didn't apply to us (A/R). We got together and thought about things. It was kind of challenging but collaborative.

Teri: Our wish is to do an online form which would be partially filled. We need money and IT assistance. Was it hard for you to find data?

Debbie: It wasn't easy to write SLOs. The student satisfaction data was easily available. Do we have to put this on Elumen?

Tina: Get Scott V. to help!

Angella: It was challenging from the service perspective. Some of the data was in SARS – here, there and everywhere. Moving forward it will be easier. Rajinder's student survey is good but it's only done every 2 years. Looking at trends was important.

Sylvia: We need help w/ point of service surveys. What kinds of questions needed to generate meaningful data? The big survey helps but we need more tools to advance. We need immediate feedback. It was difficult to navigate.

Teri: We need some concrete ideas to improve a different template.

Jill: Should we go section by section?

Teri: It might require a more detailed conversation.

MISSION: Accreditation calls for it. We need to work w/ people and provide more clarification.

CURRICULUM: Need services areas including Community Education.

NEW INITIATIVES: It worked for us.

SLOs/SAOs: It has to be included for accreditation. SLOs OK – SAOs are challenging – service surveys needed.

Teri: Maybe the SLO Committee could help.

Frances: It needs to be clearer – separate boxes for SLOs/SAOs. Maybe a separate template.

Teri: Are these questions relevant? Yes.

DISTANCE ED: Not relevant.

RESOURCE REQUESTS: The surveys showed satisfaction but went down when 4 Counselors left.

ASSESSMENT PLAN: Keep.

SURVEYS: OK.

Teri: Dialog – this is a hard one – one on the academic side too?

Sylvia: Should we take informal notes during the meetings?

Frances: Are emails OK? Yes, a quick agenda and minutes.

Teri: Develop a culture of evidence – we'll get better at it.

Angella: The Counselors meet 1x/month. We took our own notes but they aren't formalized. Now the Administrative Assistant does it.

SUMMERIZE: Yes.

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT: It doesn't apply. Do we need to report in a different way? Services – we don't know how to capture that.

Rajinder: CalWORKs, EOPS, Vets and DSPS get their own data packets – customized for their areas.

HUMAN RESOURCES: Need to capture classified staff and Counselors?

Jason: PSCN – would still need it.

Rajinder: Is it a duplicated effort when requesting positions through Program Review vs. the position request process?

Karin: It all becomes confusing when trying to plan.

Teri: If used for planning, why is this information useful?

Nadiyah: The justification doesn't seem to be based on this chart.

Barbara: This information is a description of "what is." We need the FTEF information. Do you really need the classified information? Is it fair to drop?

Scott: If the Dean is doing pre-fill information there is a concern as it's clearly a different perspective from administration.

Frances: Maybe use a narrative description of historical staffing . . . not so intense.

Sylvia: There are "snap shots" in the old program reviews – name, title, FT/PT, etc.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT – yes.

TECHNOLOGY – yes.

FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT – often overlaps w/ technology.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES – Angella: I don't know what the Counseling budget is.

Scott: Prefill by the Deans.

Barbara: Why is the budget question included?

Teri: It's a comparison for new needs - knowledge of budget. Overall, it's not a line item.

Jill: How can we reword "financial?" General supply budget, allowance.

OTHER INFORMATION PERTINENT TO THE PROGRAM – yes.

SUMMARY – Sylvia: it worked; Jill: there is some redundancy.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS PLAN:

Frances: It requires you to know where Program Review is going. It's hard to come up w/ a committee source.

Jill: We don't know.

Teri: It's read by the Deans and Program Review committee. At this time it doesn't go anywhere. This page is extracted and sent to the Planning committee. We want to improve the feedback process.

Jason: Student Life increased faculty release time.

Cynthia: VPSS asked the FA . . . FA said no. Is the program effectiveness plan the most important document?

Teri: The VP summaries and effectiveness plan go to the Planning committee.

Angella: I didn't realize this was such an important document. It was hard to fill out when coming to the end of the review. More energy should be devoted to this documentation.

Scott: Benchmark where we are at now vs. vision.

Teri: Program Review is evidence based. We have to have the analysis. Maybe less reflective looking back.

Nadiyah: Let's go back to the committee comment. I don't know the campus system all that well. Provide a "key." More communication w/ the Deans.

Scott: Put the effectiveness plan document at the very top. Everything else you write supports this.

Frances: List the goals so we can pick and choose.

Rajinder: Common Tool feedback – When identified as a committee . . . what to do w/ it? Perhaps we can leave this column off?

Teri: This goes to IPC. It's used as "at a glance." It would be helpful to come up w/ a different SAO area. Would help to capture Student Services information.

Barbara/Sylvia: The summaries are now w/ the VPSS.

Barbara: Some programs are N/A so there's nothing to summarize.

Teri: The summaries may be to general. I'm afraid that some information may be lost.

Cynthia: What about any training for the Deans?

Jill: The VPs need to tell the Deans about consistency.

Barbara: What is a program . . . what is not? Articulation is not a program. We need to sort it out.

Frances: Where would articulation resources show up?

Barbara: Articulation is under Counseling. The budget is under Counseling. We need to figure out measured effectiveness of Student Services, however, it ends up at the same place as everyone else.

Teri: There needs to be a more free form discussion. We have no idea if anyone is going to look at Program Reviews.

Frances: We used to celebrate successes.

Karin: Let's go back to III – SUMMARY. It's kind of misleading. Maybe we can say "objectives."

Barbara: I'll provide you w/ the last copy of Student Services Program Review so the committee can review it.

Teri: Lots of food for thought! We us WORD to utilize expandable boxes as fillable PDF boxes do not expand.

Barbara: Thank you . . . this is a great start on and an incredible amount of work.

Teri: Please send your suggestions.

Catherine: I'm concerned about the buy-in for next year. Example: We're not writing a Program Review if we don't know where it's going.

Jill: We share the concern.

Teri: There's an April Town Meeting presentation discussing our goals for next year, lessons learned, etc. Administration will be talking about how we're using Program Review and who is the target. We are concerned about the shortness of the timeline. The template is OK for a 3 year review. On an annual basis, it's too much.

Catherine: Can we condense it?

Teri: Probably. Other colleges do a 3 year staggered process – once a year a resource request. It's been 5 years since we submitted a major Program Review – Fall 2010. What do we do next?

Tina: Can't we just do an annual resource request? Analyze the SLOs and SAOs every year also.

Karin: Isn't an accreditation requirement a 3 – 5 year Program Review?

Teri: Dr. Noble says it would be good to have 2 complete Program Review cycles in 7 years. It's good to feed into the long range planning.

Rajinder: It's needed for the Master Plan.

Barbara: It's overwhelming and ineffective to do it again next year. In Student Services . . . what is going to change? We need a visible outcome of the current Program Review.

Teri: Goals: Feedback from Student Services; think long range; review and update form at next meeting; and, send out the Orange Coast College link to everyone.

Nadiyah: The shorter the process, the shorter the form. Is there a way to take the feedback and use the current form? Maybe take some things out? Need to look at it w/ any eye to future planning. It's hard to quantify an "update" form b/c it's so open.

Jason: Use this as a 3 year and supplement w/ an update form.

Jill: Will be nice to communicate at the next Town Meeting.

Teri: Use PURR – Planning Update and Resource Request form.

Nadiyah: At the planning level, what information do they need? What planning are you doing? How is the document going to be used?

Catherine: Is Program Review even on this year's IPC agenda?

Rajinder: Program Review may be on it.

Jill: Thank you all. Great work!

Meeting adjourned at 4:21 pm

Minutes submitted by Julie Thornburg

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

From the perspective of Student Services faculty and staff who wrote annual program reviews:
1. Was it appropriate for your area to write a program review?
2. Did the template fit the needs of your program?
3. What difficulties did you encounter in writing the program review?
4. What suggestions for improvement do you 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? To what extent did they make the changes you suggested?
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?

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?
6. How can the PRC or Deans help guide programs to cluster (if appropriate) or not write a program review (if not appropriate)