

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Committee

**Meeting – Friday, April 5, 2013, 11:00 a.m. -12:30 pm
Room LRC 435**

PRESENT: Jill Baker (Co-chair), Anar Brahmhatt, Kristan Clark (co-chair), Ashanti Hands, Brianna Hays, Angela Liewen, Cesar Lopez, Laura Mathis, Jonathan McLeod, Dina Miyoshi,, Bruce Naschak, Caterina Palestini, Sue Saetia, Ebony Tyree (Co-chair), Robin Watkins, Kathleen Wells (Co-chair).

ABSENT: Manny Bautista (excused) (proxy to Jill Baker), Brian Cushing (excused) (proxy to Laura Mathis), Anne Geller (excused) (proxy to Anar Brahmhatt), Ian Kay (excused) (proxy to Jonathan McLeod), Jill Moreno-Ikari, Andrew MacNeill (excused) (proxy to Jill Baker), Marichu Magana (excused) (proxy to Laura Mathis), Claude Mona (excused) (proxy to Anar Brahmhatt), Robert Will.

GUEST(S): None.

The meeting was called to order at 11:11 a.m. by Dr. Jill Baker, Dean, Institutional Effectiveness and Acting Dean, Business and Technology, Co-chair, in LRC 435. An agenda was previously distributed.

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

2. Minutes of March 1, 2013 Meeting. The Minutes of the March 1, 2013 meeting were posted and a link was sent to the Committee. It was M/S/C by Kristan Clark and Kathleen Wells to approve the Minutes as submitted.

3. Program Review Evaluation: Update and Discussion of Preliminary Results (*). Baker indicated she and Bri Hays have requested feedback on the program review process from the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIE). The Budget and Allocation Recommendation Committee (BARC) is scheduled to prioritize shortly and will then provide feedback. A Program Review Feedback Session has been scheduled for April 18th from 2:00 - 3:30 p.m. A survey will be distributed to administrators. Any changes to the process would be made during the planning stages for the next cycle.

Baker noted the feedback from the lead writer and liaison surveys were organized by themes and summaries. Hays presented this information, noting the strengths and opportunities for improvement as well as next steps will be discussed. It was noted that 49% of lead writers, 19% of chairs/supervisors, 77% of liaisons and 93% deans/managers responded.

In reviewing the charts, it was noted that the green bars represent favorable responses. The online program review module questions received favorable responses. Discussion followed as to the responses that appeared to be “on the fence”. Kathleen Wells suggested a link to the survey be included online upon submission of the program review. Baker will follow up to determine if this is feasible. Anar Brahmhatt suggested administering a brief survey upon submission and then a more in-depth survey at a later date. Hays noted feedback about the

process may be gathered via a brief survey upon submission followed by the more in-depth survey to obtain feedback about the overarching process.

Baker reviewed the questions regarding the online program review module noting the highest positive response was ease of access to the information. The questions concerning navigating online yielded less positive feedback. Where responses were lower, it was with regard to finding information, instructions, connections, data and navigation. Baker shared a recent panel discussion at an RP Group conference. It was found that no matter the online system, other colleges reported similar issues.

Another issue that arose from the survey was the need for additional training on how to use data to answer the questions. Clark noted though several workshops were offered, attendance was low and there are still questions about using data. Naschak added the allocation process itself has not stabilized. Baker added this is a year of fluctuation and the goal is to have a process that works. There will be an opportunity for an addendum to the requests for faculty/classified staff for next year's lists. This committee provides a "pass through" of information to the allocation committees and corrections may be given to them. For all programs that submitted a new faculty request or rolled one forward, they have an opportunity to submit an addendum based on feedback from allocating committees. It was clarified that these requests were those reviewed by the allocating committees in March not those submitted in December. Personnel are prioritized in the fall to move forward with search committees in the spring. The current prioritized list will not change; the next list will be formed based on the requests submitted in December. Those requests submitted in December are not on the current list. The new list will be created in Fall 2013 using the December requests, along with any addenda requested by the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee.

Baker indicated that the allocating committees will have an opportunity to review the process used this year, analyze potential areas for change and then allow the Program Review Committee to make revisions to the process prior to the next cycle.

Wells inquired about rolling forward requests and Baker clarified there is a check-and-balance to determine what requests rolled forward, what changed, and this information will be confirmed. Clark added there are systems in place for faculty hiring and steps are being made toward making it a transparent process. A question arose about the timing of the March list to be superseded by the December list and Baker clarified that the list from March was developed and with the use of a rubric, lead writers were able to readdress their requests for the December list. This is a year to "catch-up" with the allocation process. Reviews will be done in the fall semester based on December's list and the allocation committees will publish their findings prior to the next deadline in December. There are two timelines: Spring is for supplies, equipment, and facilities and fall is for personnel. Ashanti Hands suggested creating a timeline for prioritization to assist with understanding the allocation process. Baker will follow up to obtain such a timeline from the allocating committees. McLeod noted his agreement with a policy to allocate on an annual basis. Robin Watkins added the Classified Hiring Priority Committee reviews on a yearly basis. Naschak suggested creating a list of all allocation committees to include their membership and purpose/functions.

Baker noted less favorable feedback was received concerning the website and Baker noted the website will be updated during the summer. However, questions about communication received more favorable responses. The next section addressed the liaison trainings and it was noted responses were less favorable. The summer work group will address this issue to ensure better

support for liaisons in the future. Questions about the liaison experiences yielded more favorable responses.

Hays noted lead writers responded favorably when asked about the one-on-one assistance and availability of committee members to provide assistance. They appreciated the specialized trainings as well as the clear delineation of the roles and responsibilities as noted in the Timeline. They appreciated the accessibility of the online module and the question format.

Hays noted some opportunities for improvement included additional hands-on, step-by-step and one-on-one training. Also feedback suggested providing sample program reviews and hiring priorities requests as well as improving the format of the website. Feedback also suggested improvements should be made to the online program review navigation (submission, etc.), and further integration of the program review components (pertaining to hiring priorities requests) so they are more streamlined. Suggestions were also made to address the need for additional training on data at the beginner's level.

Hays noted the next steps include document analysis (areas for more instruction/examples), feedback sessions, summary of program review evaluation findings (one component is this survey), survey of resource allocation recommendation committee members (forthcoming), and the plan for 2013-2014 program review cycle. Baker noted the more comprehensive report from these surveys will be provided at the next meeting.

4. Update – Resource Allocation. This topic was discussed under item #3.

5. Spring and Summer Planning. Baker noted recommendations for next year will be discussed at the May meeting.

6. Flex Credit. Baker noted all faculty liaisons and lead writers have been enrolled in the respective Flex workshops and were notified to self report their participation in order to receive Flex credit for their work in the fall semester.

7. Roundtable. Baker reminded the Committee about the faculty co-chair vacancy. Clark outlined the responsibilities associated with the faculty co-chair position are to attend the Academic Senate and Senate Executive meetings on Mondays. Also, faculty co-chair is involved with the summer work group and attends monthly co-chair meetings. Additional tasks are completed virtually when possible.

8. Adjournment. It was M/S/C by Laura Mathis and Robin Watkins to adjourn the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:24 pm.

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