



Planning & Program Review Committee

03/22/2010

3:00PM – 5:00PM

Members:

* Present

Cheryl Marshall (co-chair) *

Charlie Ng *

Denise Hoyt *

Jessica McCambly *

Michelle Riggs *

Keith Wurtz *

Catherine Pace-Pequeño (co-chair)

Rebecca Warren-Marlatt *

Robert McAtee

Ralph Rabago *

Gary Williams *

Gloria Harrison (ex-officio)

Guest: Matthew Lee and Rejoice Chavira

----- Minutes -----

- I. The Committee discussed this year's feedback memo to the President with comments on the units who completed Program Review for the 2009/2010 cycle. This document will include the Average for the program health and document quality rubrics as well as comments on the overall average as an indicator of program health/effectiveness, descriptions of specific problems, and specific recommendations.
- II. The Committee reviewed the following units together and will break into sub-committees to finish this process by next Monday March 29, 2010. The feedback discussed today is:
 - A. Chemistry- Comments on the overall average as an indicator; have established and remain faithful to assessment process. Lots of collaboration. Exceed institutional standards for program health indicators. Very strong program. Describe any specific problem areas; Marketing and outreach, Faculty ratio. Specific Recommendations Keep up the good work. Consider how you can influence other disciplines. Use the document as a model. The discipline would like to do more outreach and partnership development with High Schools and 4 year colleges.
 - B. Earth Science- Comments on the overall average as an indicator; Differences in enrollment in Ocean, Geol, Geog. Very good reflection and analysis. Great work on SLOs. Has adjusted to limited resources – makes sure students get what they need as best he can. High performing program. Describe any specific problem areas; Lack of scheduling matrix, army of one. Specific Recommendations Needs assistance in lab/collection Needs support for field trips Determine how to help geol and geog to fill to capacity. Add full time faculty to avoid burn out of one faculty member.
 - C. College Life Comments on the overall average as an indicator; Great vision, excellent pass and retention rates. Very good reflection and analysis. A clear vision for where the program wants to go. Specific Recommendations; Develop a schedule matrix. Expand outreach. Integrate PCD and CHC courses – make it a clearer connection and path. Collect additional data and more focus on service aspects. Encourage continued integration and collaboration with Student Services and institutionalize activities. Describe any specific problem areas; Need to collect and

analyze data on the services aspects of College Life.

- D. Math- Describe any specific problem areas; Weak points are lack of a scheduling matrix, faculty ratio. Need to tie their mission to college mission. Excellent participation in assessment process. Excellent collaboration and reflection in document. Productivity has increased to 545 in Fall 2009. Specific Recommendations; Develop a scheduling matrix. College needs to invest in additional full time faculty. Review mission statement and how it ties to college mission and vision. Look at internal data in addition to external data. Continue to maintain high productivity.
- E. Student Life- Comments on the overall average as an indicator; excellent reflection and analysis. Makes significant contributions to the college mission. This is a healthy program – just needs help in setting goals, objectives, and action plans. Specific Recommendations; Provide training in goal setting and action plans. This program is at its capacity for meeting student needs and will need additional support in order to grow.
- F. EOPS Specific Recommendations; Provide training in goal setting and action plans. Provide support in developing a plan despite budget cuts. Consider how the college will provide these services despite budget cuts. Better analysis of data – charts were unclear.
- G. Library- Comments on the overall average as an indicator; Focused on obstacles instead of opportunity. Describe any specific problem areas; Moving into a new facility but no vision for library programs and services. Lack of vision. Specific Recommendations; The unit needs to develop a vision and take advantage of the new facility. Connect with experts in the field to study best practices and innovation. Facilitate the learning of best practices and innovation techniques. The new dean should work with this unit to help them move forward. Need SLOs in addition to SAOs. Need to improve measurement of programs and services.

III. The subcommittees and their assigned units to discuss are as follows:

- A. Rebecca, Jessica, and Denise; Art, Sociology, ASL, History, Health/P.E., Political Science
- B. Cheryl, Ralph, and Keith; Speech, FL, Theatre, Music, PARS, and Psychology
- C. Charlie, Gary, and Michelle; Economics, ASTRON/PHYS, A&R, Matriculation, DSPS, and Financial Aid.

IV. The Committee brainstormed to create a list of ideas on how to improve the process for the 2010/2011 cycle. (Critique the Process)

- A. Training for units; Handbook- Prologue, Workshops
- B. Revise the Rubrics
- C. Discuss Questions
- D. Review Timeframes/Timelines
- E. Consider a template for document (standardized fonts, etc.)
- F. Research a software Package- District Process
- G. Feedback; efficient and timely
- H. Integration with other plans
- I. Standardized data & access; process for distribution.
- J. Managing Expectations; Face to face meeting is an opportunity for expanding/clarifying/dialogue. The process in general.
- K. Compare to accreditation Standards.

- L. Identify examples and how to share; good documents, models.
- M. Clarity of Consequences
- N. Annual Plans; how to include.
- O. Survey of participants in PR/AP; completion of cycle- evidence from units.

Next Meeting: 3/29/2010 3:00 - 5:00

- Discuss how to improve the planning and program review process for the 2010-2011 cycle.

NEXT MEETING WILL IN LADM 217, 3/29/2010 FROM 3:00 – 5:00