

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Committee

Meeting – Friday, March 1, 2013, 11:00 a.m. -12:30 pm
Room I4-207

PRESENT: Jill Baker (Co-chair), Manny Bautista, Anar Brahmhatt, Kristan Clark (co-chair), Brian Cushing, Anne Geller, Ashanti Hands, Brianna Hays, Ian Kay, Angela Liewen, Andrew MacNeill, Marichu Magana, Laura Mathis, Jonathan McLeod, Dina Miyoshi, Claude Mona, Bruce Naschak, Caterina Palestini, Sue Saetia, Ebony Tyree (Co-chair), Robin Watkins, Kathleen Wells (Co-chair).

ABSENT: Cesar Lopez (excused), Jill Moreno-Ikari, Robert Will.

GUEST(S): None.

The meeting was called to order at 11:15 a.m. by Dr. Jill Baker, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness and Acting Dean, Business and Technology, Co-chair, in I4-207. An agenda was previously distributed.

1. Review and Approval of Agenda ().** No items were added to the agenda. It was M/S/C by Kathleen Wells and Andrew MacNeill to approve the Agenda as submitted.

2. Minutes of February 1, 2013 Meeting. The Minutes of the February 1, 2013 meeting were posted and a link was sent to the Committee. It was M/S/C by Kris Clark and Ian Kay to approve the Minutes as submitted.

3. Postponement of Annual Program Review and Summaries Reports to March 5 President's Cabinet ().** Baker noted the Annual Report and Summaries Report were postponed from the February 19th President's Cabinet meeting will be presented at the March 5th meeting. A minor grammatical error on the report was corrected. Baker invited the Committee to attend President's Cabinet for this presentation.

4. Program Review Evaluation Plan ().** Baker reviewed the Program Review Evaluation Plan as part of the spring activities. She noted last year, an evaluation was conducted and feedback was obtained. This year, the evaluation will be expanded to include a separate survey for deans/managers and chairs/supervisors. Bri Hays provided an overview of the plan. She highlighted the objectives of the program review redesign, noting the evaluation goals which include ways to improve communication and the training/format of program review. The evaluation activities were reported including a web survey and a feedback session.

It was suggested to include a note with the survey invitation to explain issues that are in the process of being resolved or have been resolved. It was also suggested as an improvement to the process to ensure there is one set of instructions available at the beginning of the cycle and any changes to the process during the cycle would be implemented in the following cycle. Baker noted a presentation will be given to the faculty hiring priority committees to assist them with improvements to their process. It was noted that communication is key concerning announcements for faculty positions without any indication as to how that position fits into the hiring priorities. Discussion continued the reasons behind why certain faculty positions are/would be advertised outside of the hiring priorities.

Hays noted the previous surveys for lead writers and liaisons were combined into one that is programmed for use by both groups. Questions reflect input on the online module, trainings they attended, and information available to write the program review. Some questions are repeated from last year to measure changes. She asked for feedback on the survey. It was suggested in the future to administer a short survey after the trainings and then send a more comprehensive survey at a later date. It was suggested to add a “not applicable” choice however, after discussion it was agreed to use branching, for example, to ask first if they worked with their liaison and then ask if this help was beneficial.

Baker indicated the Committee will be contacted for their feedback on such items as “norming”, especially with the Annual Report responses.

Another suggestion was to add a question – “did you attend a Lead Writer Training” before question #3 about the training.

5. Update – Resource Allocation. Baker reported the resource allocation requests are being collated at this time for the 4000, 5000 and 6000 budget number requests as well as 1000 requests for items such as FTEF. Hard copy information is being integrated with online submissions. She noted some requests have already been funded.

6. Spring Planning. Baker noted the Evaluation Plan is part of the spring planning process. Once the results have been tabulated, the Committee will analyze this information to assist with plans for the future. The goal for this summer is to develop additional online training tools. Kathleen Wells indicated her agreement with this plan in her role as a representative for the Classified Hiring Priorities Committee who suggested program review emphasize the importance of how to write the program review requests for Classified Staff. It was noted that this type of training should be offered by the hiring priorities committees and not this Committee. It was suggested the hiring priorities committees collaborate with the Program Review Committee prior to posting any training modules.

Clark reminded the Committee that the intent of this cycle was to be an update and suggested discussion take place this spring about how this update affects the process for the next cycle. Baker added discussion should include what information is needed to inform the various bodies as plans move forward for next year. She added the plan is to reassess the process for the fall and data is being collected at this time. One example for improvement for the next cycle is to change the format of the online document to include separate text boxes for strengths, weaknesses and external influences so this information can be extrapolated and distributed to those bodies needing it.

Bruce Naschak suggested keeping the format changes to a minimum for the next cycle rather than make overwhelming changes to the process/format. Baker noted she would be mindful of this as she works to ensure collaboration with bodies that need information from program review. She also stays current with identifying the requirements of the Commission and other external accountability bodies, to assure compliance.

Naschak provided feedback on the changing formats of program review. He noted regardless of the varied formats used to write the program review document, lead writers have effectively communicated their program/service area information. He indicated the continuous changes to the format could be the result of requirements from outside entities. Clark noted the changes, for example, to an online format, have been more for extraction purposes so the information can be extracted and organized in a particular way. Baker will provide clarification

of the requirements of program review, citing a 2009 publication by the State Academic Senate on the topic of program review. McLeod suggested a forward be included with the next iteration of program review that distills the distribution of program reviews to whom and why, along with what any changes made to the format/process for next year. He noted the availability of this information will clarify from the beginning that program review has multiple applications.

7. Flex Credit. Baker noted a meeting with the Vice President of Instruction intended to be scheduled after a District-wide Flex meeting. The District-wide Flex meeting has not been scheduled to date. She indicated that Flex credit will be available for the responsibilities associated with liaisons and lead writers. Time spent at committee meetings is not eligible for Flex credit. Baker indicated Flex credit will be set up in the near future.

8. Roundtable. Manny Bautista suggested showcasing those programs/service areas whose requests for resources were funded to demonstrate the effectiveness of their program review document. This will provide a visual aide to other lead writers when they write their requests for resources. The rankings and requests that were funded may be publicized by the allocation bodies. Baker noted she would work with the resource allocating bodies to clarify what information is required and how they can provide support. Additional training would be offered to deans/managers and chairs/supervisors. Baker suggested a two-pronged approach to first review the requests submitted and then obtain the results from the faculty priority hiring committee and then align the two.

Baker noted if anyone interested in serving as the Committee's faculty co-chair should contact her or Clark for further information.

9. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:22 pm.

Submitted by Caterina Palestini, Senior Secretary,
Ex-Officio Administrative Support
Reviewed and approved by Jill Baker, Co-Chair