



Planning & Program Review Committee

03/29/2010

3:00PM – 5:00PM

Members:

* Present

Cheryl Marshall (co-chair) *

Charlie Ng *

Denise Hoyt *

Ralph Rabago *

Gary Williams *

Gloria Harrison (ex-officio)

Catherine Pace-Pequeño (co-chair)

Rebecca Warren-Marlatt *

Jessica McCambly *

Michelle Riggs *

Keith Wurtz *

Guest: Matthew Lee

----- Minutes -----

- I. Robert McAtee has resigned from the committee. Committee discussed pros and cons of finding another faculty member to replace him at this point in the year. Committee agreed it would be a good opportunity for whoever will be replacing Robert to become familiar with the process. Denise will talk to Scott about designating a replacement through Academic Senate.
- II. Cheryl is working on a draft of comments for the President with a compilation of the responses from subcommittees. Committee members were given a complete list to review, provide feedback, changes, additional comments, etc.
- III. Keith and Matthew went through the rubrics.
- IV. Committee discussed how to improve the process for next year. The following ideas were discussed.
 - a. Michelle would like to add a checklist for people to use when they're handing in their packet.
 - b. Gary commented on the improvements including; there was more participation – everyone turned something in. The committee needs to find ways to sustain participation and make it better. Possibly having targeted workshops (i.e. come spend the day working on this with lots of support). Better scheduling next time.
 - c. Denise recommends that we get data to units before the end of the year, and trainings on that data with the opportunity for individual follow ups.
 - d. Keith believes the first step is to revise the rubrics.
 - e. Cheryl is going to verify the number of units who will be responsible for turning in a PR for the 10/11 cycle. (Estimating it will be about 20).
 - f. Jessica would like data available in a one-go-to spot. With the possibility for the data to be projected. Keith will provide data this year because of the way ERIS is set up, we are going to research software. Denise recommended using blackboard or SharePoint.
 - g. What went well this year? The dialogue during face-to-face meetings was helpful to changing the tone.
 - h. Improvements- How to include Annual Plans. Issues with thoroughness of the deans and directors; giving feedback and consolidation of plans. This committee doesn't have time to review each plan and provide feedback but there is concern that the units are expecting to hear back from the committee.
 - i. What we can do now is to check on resource requests that come up now to see if they are in the plan or program review. Need to reinforce the requirement for putting resource requests on the plans and program reviews. Integrity of the process is now in place with the understanding that emergencies do

arise.

- j. There is definite need for better data access and understanding and more support in the writing of goals. Keith will begin to provide trainings in spring. PR next year should link back to the EMP.
- k. Jessica recommends the committee consider using a template for the document to make finding the information easier.

V. Committee reviewed changes to Rubrics

- a. CI is really two separate areas: curriculum and SLO progress. Separate into two categories.
- b. Clarify what assessment and outcomes mean. Should we use SLO and/or SAO? Consensus: use SLOs.
- c. Provide a consistent template for all disciplines to use. In future years we should look at whether the scheduling pattern meets student needs.
- d. Removing persistence
- e. Success rate changed from pass rate.
- f. QEI impact – they are institution-wide and not to target a particular program. Figure out how to evaluate using both qualitative and quantitative measures on success, retention, and productivity.
- g. Enrollment – we are no longer in growth mode, so how do we look at enrollment. Can we look at student progress? Problem with fill rates is you can offer popular classes and not have students complete a sequence. Look at share of FTEs or growth.
- h. Faculty Ratio – Consider whether to use contact hours.
- i. Marketing and Outreach – What to do with this one? No one had a plan. How are in-reach activities different from outreach activities? Drop it for now.
- j. Fill rate – use this instead of faculty load. Watch for caps – they tend to be incorrect.
- k. Goals, Objectives, and Actions were added. Do we need to include Actions? May be too detailed.

Next Meeting: 4/5/2010 3:00 - 5:00

- Review Non-Instructional Rubric and sub-committee comments for recommendation to the President
- Continue discussion of how to improve the planning and program review process for the 2010-2011 cycle.

NEXT MEETING WILL IN LADM 217 4/5/2010 FROM 3:00 – 5:00