



# Planning & Program Review Committee

04/12/2010

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. Reviewed the summary memo and contents for the President. Cheryl spoke with Gloria and asked her to define what she would like in the memo so that it is useful. Gloria did appreciate the compilation of scores (without an average for health and in alphabetical order) as well as the summative comments for each of the areas who submitted a program review for this cycle and would like those included as attachments for her to refer to. In addition, the memo will include a description/overview of the process and a list of programs who are exceptionally healthy as well as those who need to be “watched” or that the committee is concerned with and feel need to make improvements.
- II. Discussed how to rank areas as low, medium, high. Began with rubric rankings for program health/effectiveness excluding marketing/outreach & faculty ratio for instructional units and goals from the non-instructional areas. We will include a general statement that all areas need help and training for goals and objectives, faculty ratio is not an issue the unit has any control over, and marketing and outreach had too much variance of criteria. The committee decided units with scores of 2.5-3 are high, 2-2.49 are medium, <2 are low. Many of the areas who had a rubric score of <2 were not actually “unhealthy” and could be explained in a way that would make sense that they not be included on the “watch” list. Any area that was moved from low to medium will include an explanation of the low score and why the committee feels there is evidence they do not belong in the low category. Similarly each area continuing in the low column will have explanation of specific reasons why they are in that ranking.
  - a. High (exemplary): Chemistry, Student Life
  - b. Strong- Medium (Minor issues): Art, Political Science, History, EOPS, Sociology, ASL, PE, Speech. Those moved from Low to Medium: Foreign Language-(productivity) WSCH is low because they have introduced new languages that aren’t full yet. Earth Science- (scheduling, need faculty) disciplines within the unit differ, Oceanography is doing really well, geology is growing, and geography isn’t doing as well. **Theatre\*** (productivity/faculty load) offer advanced courses too often, need to work with dean on schedule of courses. **Music\*** (prod/sched/fac load) need to work with dean on issues of room availability, scheduling. **Matriculation\***, **College Life\*** (scheduling), **Financial Aid\***, **Admissions and Records\***, **Economics\*** (scheduling) need to work with dean on procedural issues, not really an “unhealthy” program. **Math\*** (scheduling/data).  
\*=Medium Program, have some concerns, need to devote administrative attention to. Fundamentally sound, concerns noted.  
No \*= Strong Program.
  - c. Low (Distressed)- **Physics/Astronomy**, **Psychology**, **PARS**- lack of analysis and reflection, **DSPS**, **Library**

- III. Discussion throughout the ranking process included;
- a. If the document quality should be considered as part of the “health/effectiveness” of the program, because it is a reflection on the program if they are actually making a concerted effort toward continuous improvement. Although there is a definite connection, the purpose of having separate rubrics was because this is a new process for the committee and the units and there will be improvement as we do trainings and the campus becomes familiar with the expectations. Next year the document quality should have a bigger impact on how units fall in the rankings and this year will have a secondary impact and can be part of the rationale for moving a unit.
  - b. Also discussed is that units who are at the top of the list and those at the bottom should be identified, everyone else is “just okay” and don’t necessarily require attention drawn to them. This will focus attention on a handful of low and a handful of high only.
- IV. Committee reviewed the Planning and Program Review survey. The purpose is to determine if the process, expectations, and timelines were clear. The objectives for each unit were considered in the prioritization process and the process was transparent. Also the committee would like to gather feedback which will help us determine ways we can improve this process for the 10/11 cycle.
- V. The committee has a lot of work to do in the meetings left before the end of Spring semester;
- a. Review the schedule and timeline
  - b. Finish evaluation of this year’s process, improvements to implement for next year, and updating the handbook.
  - c. Finalize rubric criteria
  - d. Discuss what data will be provided to the units
  - e. Decide on trainings and how those will be handled, when they will begin, who will facilitate, who will participate, etc.
  - f. Determine a new management chair to replace Cheryl Marshall; Rebecca, Charlie or Keith.
  - g. Update the webpage content
  - h. De-brief of the process- communicate to programs for next year the flow of documents through their deans, to the committee; who/where/when/what to submit with their program review/annual plans.
  - i. Letter to the campus (from the committee) with an overview of the process referencing what we learned and how we intend to improve for next year.

Next Meeting: 4/19/2010 3:00 - 5:00

- Review schedule and timeline for next year.
- Discuss a letter to campus to communicate a summary of what the committee did this year.
- Continue review of Instructional Health Evaluation Rubric and Non-Instructional Rubric
- Review survey with changes
- Review summary memo to be presented to Gloria
- Revisit Purpose of Integrated Planning and Program Review Process
- Continue discussion of how to improve the planning and program review process for the 10/11 cycle.

**NEXT MEETING WILL IN LADM 217 4/19/2010 FROM 3:00 – 5:00**