

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Committee

Practice Session for Lead Writer Training – Friday, September 23, 2011, 11:00 a.m. -1:00 pm
LRC, Room 435

PRESENT: Jill Baker (Co-chair), William Craft, Anne Geller, Ashanti Hands, Ian Kay, Angela Liewen Romeo, Marichu Magana, Laura Mathis, Jonathan McLeod, Bruce Naschak, Caterina Palestini, Monica Romero (co-chair), Saloua Saidane, Danielle Short, Chris Sullivan, Ebony Tyree, Kathleen Wells (Co-chair).

ABSENT: Morlette Adame, Manny Bautista, Kristan Clark (co-chair), Ailene Crakes, Brian Cushing.

GUEST: None.

The practice session began at 11:14 a.m. by Dr. Jill Baker, Dean, Business, Computer Studies and Technologies, Co-chair, in LRC 435. An agenda and handouts were distributed with the circulation of a sign-in sheet.

1. Welcome and Introduction of Guests and New Members. Baker introduced Marichu Magana and Angela Liewen Romeo. Additionally she noted there are still five vacancies. She noted two members are willing to serve but are unable to attend all meetings. Discussion followed as to participation on the committee and attendance at meetings. The workload involved with this committee will be communicated with new members. It was clarified that members who are absent from meetings would be able to give written statement or report to their proxy to ensure this information is communicated to the rest of the committee. The new members will be partnered with mentors. After discussion, it was M/S/C by Anne Geller and Laura Mathis to accept any faculty who is willing to serve regardless if they are able to attend the committee meetings.

2. Assignment of Committee Liaisons.

- **Remaining Programs – Annual Process for 2011-2012.** Baker noted assignments for liaisons are being finalized at this time, using the approved one-liaison system. It was clarified that the programs currently in Year One under the previous process will continue using the two liaison system.

3. Continued Discussion – Practice for Lead Writer Training

- **Draft PowerPoint (**).** The draft PowerPoint was discussed below.
- **Draft Resources (**).** The draft resources were discussed below.
- **Revised Program Review Handbook (**).** Baker noted the timeline was revised to clarify and include information approved via online committee vote. The section with revised information about the one liaison system was reviewed. The liaison statement was removed and in its place, liaisons will provide their feedback on the Liaison Evaluation Guide. This feedback will be used to develop the Annual Report. Also, changes were made to the Liaison Evaluation Guide and the form itself to reflect the one liaison system and the liaison statement regarding the report.

Discussion followed as to the one liaison process and how the liaison statement is incorporated into the report. Baker noted that the co-chairs are available to answer questions. Additionally, Caterina Palestini is available to answer questions about attachments and missing information that can be checked with the original documents. Baker indicated that a Flex workshop may be scheduled in the future to assist lead writers with creating electronic attachments. Jonathan McLeod suggested a two-level session: One for individuals who need an overview and another for those individuals who require more in-depth instruction. Additionally, Baker noted that there will be a data integration workshop scheduled for November.

The next part of the practice session focused on the practice for the Lead Writer Training. Monica Romero went to the SMART goals section of the PowerPoint to describe in detail how to develop these goals. Discussion followed as to how to justify the number of faculty requested, etc. using data. It was noted liaisons give feedback to ensure that the questions and components of the program review document are addressed. For example, it is appropriate for the liaison to indicate that a timeframe is missing but not to judge the logic behind the timeframe listed. Palestini noted this committee has traditionally helped the lead writers “put their best foot forward” and it was agreed that this is an appropriate approach.

Romero suggested that liaisons work together with other individuals who are familiar with SMART goals. Anne Geller suggested scheduling a working session to help liaisons better understand the components of the program review document so they may better assist lead writers. Discussion continued as to incorporating several goals into a few SMART goals. Lead writers may create as many SMART goal sheets as needed but a better approach would be to consider if some of these goals may be combined. The grid will expand to fit the information in the appropriate areas.

Baker noted that a program in her school participated in the pilot from last year and submitted their Year One document containing their goals. She indicated feedback received indicates there is a process for figuring out how to combine several goals into a few SMART goals. McLeod inquired about some of the figures that may be unknown and how to address this information. Baker clarified that the Vice President of Administrative Services is providing reference materials to assist, such as the cost of a staff member. A question about adjunct faculty was asked and this information is not included on the sheet. Baker indicated this could be added. It was noted that although quotes are required for items, a reasonable amount should be listed based on available information. It was noted that the cost of all components should be taken into consideration when listing the amount of funding needed. Lead writers should obtain the most accurate information possible, then, when funding is available, obtain the actual quote. Discussion followed as to this being a learning process and ensuring that information is online and available for their use.

Romero noted the importance of the funding source section on the matrix. This section contains the allocation silos – classified, faculty, equipment, facilities, Perkins, and supplies/materials. A table for each of the resource allocation silos is available in the binder and will be posted online. She noted, for example, a separate Classified staff criteria table is to be used when requesting funds for each additional staff. The rubric for faculty is under development. The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIE) is working closely with these silos to develop the respective rubrics for them.

A quick exercise on cutting paper revealed that everyone may be given the same directions but would naturally end up with different outcomes. Romeo emphasized that this is also true when it comes to program review.

The slide on research and documentation was discussed. It was noted that information that is cited in the program review document should include supporting documentation. Program pages from the catalog and the curriculum grid are also required attachments. Wells discussed the next steps relative to the review, signatures and submissions process. She noted the liaison, department, chair, and manager work together during the process. It was noted that some areas do not have a department chair. This section of the Handbook will be revised to read “department chair/supervisor” as appropriate.

Additionally, Wells addressed the Liaison Evaluation Guide. It was noted that the completed guide is to be submitted to Palestini so that information can be used to develop the Annual Report. It was clarified that if the research and/or other documentation is included or missing that a statement will be added to reflect this information. The liaison will be completing the Evaluation Guide during the process of working with the lead writer. By the time it is submitted, all items should be present in the program review document.

The timeline was discussed. The February 28th date is for the liaisons to have a “last look” at the document. Preliminary reports may be given at the March 2nd committee meeting. The Guide is due by March 30th in order for the Report to be developed. It was suggested to set up a session for liaisons and lead writers during Flex days. Discussion continued as to the liaisons statement. It was noted the suggested wording may be used and any further comments may be added. It was noted that since the liaisons will be working closely with the lead writers, any feedback that is incorporated into the Annual Report would already have been shared with the lead writers earlier in the process.

Naschak indicated his appreciation of this revised process and the work that has been completed to update information. This work has led to a better understanding of the revised process. It was noted that additional resources will be available in hard copy and online.

- **ACCJC Revised Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness (**)**. This was an informational item from the last meeting. No further discussion.
- **Lead Writer Training – Friday, October 7, 2011, G101, 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.** Baker indicated a notice was sent to all lead writers, managers, supervisors and committee members to invite them to the Lead Writer Training. The President will open the session followed by a presentation on the integration of program review and planning/resource allocation by Professor Donald Abbott. The revised process will be presented by the co-chairs followed by break-out sessions and lunch. Make up sessions may be scheduled for lead writers who are unable to attend the Training. Baker noted that revised information from this meeting will be provided to the Committee.

After discussion, it was M/S/C by Ebony Tyree and Saloua Saidane to accept the Handbook as revised.

4. Roundtable. No items were added.

5. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:07pm.

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