



Planning & Program Review Committee

11/23/2009

3:00 – 5:00

Members:

* Present

Cheryl Marshall (co-chair) *

Charlie Ng

Wayne Bogh

Robert McAtee *

Ralph Rabago *

Gary Williams *

Gloria Harrison (ex-officio)

Catherine Pace-Pequeño (co-chair) *

Rebecca Warren-Marlatt *

Denise Hoyt *

Jessica McCambly *

Michelle Riggs *

Matthew Lee *

----- Minutes -----

Guest: Rick Hogrefe

- I. Reviewed ASL Program Review Document:
 - A. This was a pleasure to read. Excellent reflection of results.
 - B. Discussed retention data and pass rate. Pass rate is calculated by of the number of students retained, how many of them passed the class.
 - C. Discussed goal #3, there is a strong case made to hire a FT faculty member; the Resource should not be listed as the goal.
 - D. Discussion of why ASL is separate from other Foreign Languages. This is appropriate because it is unique and the needs can be justified separately.
- II. Reviewed Intdis Program Review:
 - A. This document includes Multiculturalism, Humanities, and Honors which are all orphan programs with no leadership. They were grouped together because the goal of the Dean is that they are each developed.
 - B. Committee agrees this is an appropriate step to determine if these programs will be pursued for further allocation. The document itself is well-written, the program health/effectiveness is impossible to rate since there isn't any data to evaluate.
 - C. Committee believes that Honors should write its own Program Review document.
 - D. Need to determine from President if we are committed to these programs. If yes, the Dean will take the steps necessary to develop the programs. If not, the current resources

should be reallocated.

- E. The PPRC looks at program viability and utility, and then makes recommendations to the President. The Curriculum committee approved Humanities as a degree. Although it is a logical outcome of Program Review, there aren't any policies and procedures in place for program discontinuance.
 - F. All of these programs will receive informal feedback with no formal rubrics. The recommendation is that the President gives direction on the commitment of the campus to these programs.
- III. Across campus, goals and resources are still an issue. Discussed posting a new link on website with a "thing's we've learned this year" page showing examples of how to take an incorrect goal and correct it.
- IV. At this time, Psychology is the only unit being asked to completely re-write the Program Review Document. Most units will need to re-write their three-year action plan documents to re-structure goals. The committee doesn't need to re-review the re-written goals, the new documents will go through the pre-existing feedback lines with the VP's and Dean's responsible for working with their areas to help develop and correct goals.
- A. This committee would like to provide samples; it is up to the managers to determine which areas need to re-write their goals while developing their prioritization list. It is important that the campus understand this is not an opportunity to make new requests, and decisions of what to consider in the prioritization will not be based on a case-by-case basis. The goals and resources prioritized must be included in the original document, and the purpose of re-writing is simply for clarification purposes since this is a learning process.
- V. Discussed feedback to Anthropology and Student Life. With a few minor changes, the committee agrees these documents are ready to be given to the units. The committee will provide a signature sheet with the member's signatures agreeing to the contents of these documents, this is to be included with the feedback.

Next Meeting:

11/30/2009 3:00-5:00

- Approve Minutes
- Meeting with Philosophy/Religious Studies and Art to discuss Program Review Documents

NEXT MEETING WILL IN LADM 217, 11/30/2009 FROM 3:00 – 5:00

