



Planning & Program Review Committee

8/23/2010

3:00PM – 5:00PM

Members:

* Present

Denise Hoyt (co-chair) *

Cheryl Marshall *

Jessica McCambly *

Ralph Rabago *

Michelle Riggs *

Rebecca Warren-Marlatt* (co-chair)

Michael Strong *

Gary Williams *

Sherri Wilson *

Keith Wurtz *

Guest: Matthew Lee

- I. Minutes from 5/17/2010 approved by consensus as submitted
- II. Discussion of summer tasks and review of decisions made in spring.
 - a. Jessica will be taking comments to combine into one summative comment to give the feedback “one voice”. Individual comments will not be included in feedback this year.
 - b. Matthew Lee worked over summer to “clean up” handbook and wording of the Program Review Questions with feedback opportunities via email from committee members.
 - c. Academic Senate and Chairs Council are discussing the questions, layout, format, structure, and process of Annual Plans. Should be a unit driven process that is collaborative and collegial.
 - i. To improve communication this year, the PPR co-chair, Denise Hoyt will be reporting back to the Academic Senate and Chairs Council as a standing agenda item.
 - d. Co-chairs met to discuss the timeline for this year and want to set aside time before the deadlines to give feedback to units who would like the opportunity to get feedback and discuss their document before final submission.
 - e. Mike suggests that the Student Service and Administrative Service areas need to meet with the committee one year in advance to determine how to measure and collect trend data on effectiveness measures.
- III. Lessons Learned
 - a. Although the intended purpose of meeting with the units was to provide the opportunity for dialogue between the units and the committee, at the academic senate retreat the feedback to committee members was less than positive. Units felt “blindsided” because the vibe in the meeting felt positive while the feedback documents were perceived as harsh.
 - b. Discussion- Was the interviewing of units more detrimental than helpful? Campus culture is not receptive to or accepting of constructive criticism. Feedback documents were prepared after reflective thought rather than reactionary comments. Maybe we should give the units the option of meeting in person or communication in writing. This year, units should be invited with the knowledge that the purpose of meeting is to ask and answer questions. This is an opportunity for the committee to ask clarifying questions to better understand what is written in the document. The meeting is not where the unit will receive feedback or evaluation results of their program or document.
 - c. There is a need to give the campus periodic feedback regarding progress on funding prioritized goals and objectives. This can be done via senate meetings. Denise suggested adding a column to the list which would identify the unit, goal, and objective for the prioritized list to increase transparency. Rebecca added the need to include a status line so updates can be included on that list as well.
- IV. Annual Plans
 - a. Purpose of annual plans is to solidify progress on reaching goals and objectives. This is also where units should reflect n how they are dealing with the feedback they received.

- i. A disconnect with this process is that once the units receive their feedback, there is no follow up. Units need support.
- ii. Discussed providing training on focused goals and objectives. Units need to pull out last year's goals, analyze, clean up, and re-write.

V. Training

- a. Gary set aside Professional Development time for training opportunities on opposite Fridays of the Chairs Council. This time should be provided to units who are completing PPR documents. This would give the units the opportunity to obtain assistance and direction in writing their documents and identifying their goals and objectives.
- b. Keith agreed to provide training specific to goals and objectives at the Chairs Council on September 3rd with support from Denise and at the Management Meeting on September 10th with support from Rebecca.

VI. Timeline

- a. Rebecca and Denise presented a draft of this year's timeline for discussion.
 - i. Request from CIS to extend deadline from October 8th to November 15th was approved.
 - ii. October 4th, Chairs available to meet with round 1 and 2 units.
 - iii. September 27th meeting to receive training for the online PPR tool- Denise would like to add a box for Chair's comments, boxes for units to respond to feedback from Deans and Chairs. Also a space for committee comments.
 - iv. Other minor changes made to meetings. Committee satisfied with timeline as revised through February 7, 2011. Co-chairs will communicate the Fall approved schedule to the campus.
 - v. The proposed spring timeline needs revision to move up prioritization of goals and objectives to allow time for developmental budgets and accommodate for annual plans. We will discuss this further at the next meeting.

VII. Blackboard

- a. The addition of authorized user's access to Blackboard was requested through DCS. 2500 names were added by DCS and then they were removed because that is not an accurate up to date list and would compromise the intended purpose of using a secured access site for these documents. All active full-time and part-time faculty, staff, and managers are being added manually.
- b. Brief demonstration was provided by Denise to PPRC members to introduce and familiarize the committee with the site.

Next Meeting August 30, 2010:

- Handbook
- Timeline for Spring
- Annual Planning Process