

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Committee

**Meeting – Friday, December 7, 2012, 11:00 a.m. -12:30 pm
Room I4-207**

PRESENT: Jill Baker (Co-chair), Manny Bautista, Anar Brahmhatt, Kristan Clark (Co-chair), Anne Geller, Ashanti Hands (was absent for part of the meeting - proxy to Jill Baker), Brianna Hays, Ian Kay, Angela Liewen, Marichu Magana, Jonathan McLeod, Dina Miyoshi Claude Mona, Bruce Naschak, Caterina Palestini, Monica Romero (Co-chair) Robin Watkins, Kathleen Wells (Co-chair).

ABSENT: Brian Cushing (proxy to Ian Kay), Cesar Lopez, Andrew MacNeill, Laura Mathis (proxy to Kris Clark), Jill Moreno-Ikari, Sue Saetia (proxy to Monica Romero), Ebony Tyree (proxy to Caterina Palestini), Robert Will.

GUEST: None.

The meeting was called to order at 11:12 a.m. by Dr. Jill Baker, 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 McLeod and Mona to approve the Agenda as submitted.

2. Minutes of August 31 (meeting), September 7 (liaison training), October 5 (virtual meeting) and November 2 (meeting). The minutes of these meetings are under review and will be posted online.

3. Feedback on Automation Process. Baker thanked the Committee for their work as well as Caterina Palestini, Bri Hays, and the Co-chairs for their support during this process. She noted there are some outstanding items that will be reconciled and submitted as well as some minor issues that arose during the process such as multiple notices sent to individuals especially those who played multiple roles (i.e. department chair/supervisor/dean and liaison/lead writer). Baker is working closely with TaskStream to correct this problem in the future. She added that the preliminary liaison feedback form will be removed from the process. She will work with TaskStream to determine if two screens will open to assist with the review process. Additionally, the format of the trainings will be reviewed to assist with additional “just-in-time” training at various points in the process. The focus at this time is on the next steps and follow-up with missing items.

Jonathan McLeod suggested improvement in communication about the faculty priority process. Discussion followed as to further clarification from the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIE). Baker noted the role of the Program Review Committee’s is to pass the requests along to the next steps in resource allocation. She added 60 requests for faculty were sent forward from last year. The requests for Classified will be sent forward shortly. She is working with TaskStream to continue making improvements for the next cycle. McLeod suggested one improvement would be for all information to be available from the beginning rather than being introduced after the process has been launched. Baker noted suggestions will be brought forward to PIE as well as President’s Cabinet. Kris Clark noted that part of the confusion is due to the fact that PIE is ranking last year’s cycle of requests at this time and will soon be ranking requests for this cycle. Monica Romero indicated there has been discussion

at PIE on this topic. Also, the Classified Hiring Committee has discussed ways to assist with writing requests for staff. Baker suggested those who wrote requests have the opportunity to write an update based on feedback from the requests reviewed now. McLeod expressed his agreement with this suggestion and suggested an executive summary with bulleted suggestions be developed. Baker noted this document could be developed at the February meeting. Romero suggested this information be presented to the resource allocation bodies at this time while prioritization is taking place. Kathleen Wells added the automation of program review took place quickly in response to campus feedback/ needs. She suggested not making any changes to the process midstream.

Baker indicated an email will be sent to the lead writers and other participants in program review to thank them for their work and to show appreciation for their work. Also, Hays will be sending out a survey on behalf of the Committee to these participants. A feedback session will be scheduled in the spring. Baker added there were other benefits from automating the program review process such as ease of reporting information. These reports were used to monitor submissions and track missing information.

Baker reviewed the list of programs/service areas by liaison to determine whether or not the final review was completed. It was noted that at least three programs submitted their report as preliminary on 11/26 instead of their final report. In these cases, the liaisons still need to complete their final reviews. Baker reviewed remaining liaison assignments and outstanding items. It was suggested that goals currently listed separately be combined to avoid the need for reviewing separate areas. Bruce Naschak expressed his experience with the ease of using TaskStream.

Anne Geller inquired about how to address the “relevant institutional plans”. Baker indicated when there is a new goal, the lead writer addresses how it fits into the Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs). Geller provided feedback regarding automation, noting the final review screen does not open alongside the program review. Baker indicated that she will work closely with TaskStream to determine if this is possible as it was previously understood that the two screens would open simultaneously. Baker added when the chairs/supervisors and deans/managers review, the two screens open side-by-side.

Anar Brahmhatt suggested dialogue take place regardless if there is a preliminary feedback form in place. Geller suggested adding an option of “N/A” on the the liaison final feedback if none of the choices apply. Discussion followed as to information that is missing from the program reviews and Baker explained the program review goes forward as is with no additional feedback or revision.

Naschak provided feedback concerning the use of “SMART” goals rather than stating the need for new faculty. He suggested simplifying the goal to stating the need for new faculty. Baker added the goal could be more global and include objectives within it. McLeod added the format could be “Goal One, sub-points A-E”. This format would simplify the feedback aspect when referring to a specific part of a goal. Wells asked for clarification about the implied suggestion to remove the SMART goal concept. Romero added the idea of a SMART goal is to account for all the pieces that comprise the goal. Geller suggested if a faculty member is requested, it would already be known the resources that are necessary to their hiring rather than documenting these resources individually (such as a computer, office, phone, etc.). Naschak added, for example, if extra FTEF is requested, the lead writer would list the reasons why it is needed. Romero expressed her agreement with the idea of College-wide “bundling”. Wells added her agreement with bundling and now closing the loop with resource allocation.

Baker continued with review of the liaisons and outstanding items. Naschak reported some glitches he suggested pop-up areas as goals area added rather than displaying 8 empty sections. Discussion continued and Claude Mona noted he sent back one review in error and Palestini will follow up to release it for final review. Discussion continued and Dina Miyoshi reported one of her areas is inaccessible. Palestini will follow up and release it for her review. Ian Kay reported he is finishing review of one area. McLeod inquired about a typo on a date and he will make a comment about it in that section of the form. Wells inquired about the inaccessibility of one area and Palestini will follow up to release it. Wells also inquired on the area where she is a supervisor and a glitch in the review process. Baker noted she is reconciling all areas to determine where other glitches may appear in the review process.

Discussion followed and Clark asked for clarification on the use of the term “major issue” when relative to faculty hiring. It was noted this is a question for the Faculty Hiring Committee. Clark added this was a question carried forward from the previous process but using the new format, the system does not allow the question to be left blank. Geller suggested reviewing all the forms and discussing the suggestions for improvement. Manny Bautista indicated one of his areas does not appear for review and Palestini will follow up. Monica Romero and Robin Watkins indicated some glitches with areas and Palestini will follow up. Watkins added a suggestion about the use of “model” to describe a program review and how that is determined. These are terms that were used in the past and rolled forward. Brahmhatt suggested the model program reviews be noted to assist others when writing reviews. Naschak suggested the term be used in-house rather than making this judgment call within the report. The report would list the areas that were completed and those that were not.

4. Next Steps.

- **Final Liaison Evaluation Due December 10, 2012.** Baker noted this final feedback becomes part of the Annual Report.
- **Annual Report/Presentation to President’s Cabinet February 2013.** Baker noted the Annual Report will be presented to President’s Cabinet in February 2013. The Committee will be notified once a date has been scheduled.

5. Spring Planning. This item was discussed under item 3.

6. Roundtable. No items were added.

7. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:50 pm.

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