DRAFT
Summary Notes
Program Review Revision Group
Thursday, July 18, 2013
1:30 to 3:00, 18-206

Attendees: Gary Dilley, David Laderman, Theresa Martin, Laura Demsetz, Bev Madden, Jennifer Mendoza, Cheryl Gregory, David Lock, Lilya Vorobey, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Eileen O'Brien, James Carranza

Notes: James Carranza

1. **Review our work to date and develop a timeline for the next cycle (20 min.)**

   We reviewed the bullet points on the agenda—the past work.

   The group reflected on areas in the form that we're problematic in their own drafting and that came up in the IPC reading. **See below for details.**

   We shared anecdotes and concerns that we've heard from faculty and administrators and we began to identify sections that are absolutely necessary to the form and must remain. And we acknowledged the need for model PRs to be available to faculty for review.

   We are only working on the forms. The process for how the forms are to be reviewed will be something IPC will address at Jennifer Hughes and David Laderman's discretion.

   We decided that the survey should solicit feedback in a way that allows people to tell us which sections were difficult or confusing and why. As Laura pointed out, we aren't looking to quantify responses as much as use them as a guide in revision.

   Other suggestions included having people identify their areas and that we explain on the survey—in the directions, perhaps—how the information is going to be used. The surveys will be sent out to everyone who completed a program review. Perhaps we can send it to Deans as well.

   Timeline:
   > Program review is due March 25, 2014
   > Electronic version is scheduled to go "live" 1/10/14
   > Paper form revisions need to be completed by *9/30/13*

   > a. <u>7/29-9/16</u>   Survey program review completers
   > (Instruction, LSC's, and SS and other?)

   > b. <u>9/13</u>   Collect surveys

   > c. <u>now-9/13</u>   Solicit and collect Deans' feedback
   > Individual meetings, visit Instructional Administrators Council

     d. <u>9/23-9/27</u>   Review, revise, and finalize all forms

Forms completed, 9/30/2013

2. **Electronic database format for PR (20 min.)**
   a. Identify section titles that most likely will not change in revision

      We identified sections that are "must haves" though the titles and directions might change:
          I. Description of Program
          II. Summary of Student and Program Data
          IV. Additional Factors
          V. Institutional Planning
          VI. Resource Requests

   b. Share plans for Phase I and Phase II (Bev and James)
      Bev provided an overview of the two-step process to implement online PR reporting. The first phase will allow us to complete program review online, and the second phase will incorporate the searchable database w/ dashboard.

3. **Draft feedback survey to guide revision (45 min)**
   a. Group "brainstorms" issues with the forms positive and negative—complaints, difficulties, benefits, challenges, and so on.

      Issues:
      PR is time consuming, so we need to streamline it as much as possible. Laura and others seconded that notion that once the PR is completed the first time subsequent years will simply be a reassessment and update. Program descriptions, for example, won't change dramatically year-to-year and neither will Program Vision etc. SLO assessments, year-to-year planning, and resource requests will most likely be the sections needing updates.

      III. SLO Scheduling and Alignment is confusing and, frankly, the group believes the goal of the section could be achieved simply with a check-box option or something along the lines the course outline or website update reporting.

      II.D Course Outline Updates and II. E. Website Review make more sense in their own section—removed from the data reporting section.

      Also, II.F. Additional Career Technical Education Data, should be set-off more clearly as a section to distinguish it from the others. Several of us noted that the CTE section seemed confusing to people.

      VI. Resource Requests is confusing it seems because in addition to ongoing budget requests, we ask for departments to itemize items associated with their plans. *We need to carefully consider how to clarify or distinguish the two.* Or perhaps we simply

make only ongoing budget requests and drop the budget sheets associated with plans.

b. Clarify issues, categorize, and prioritize
Streamlining the forms and process continues to be the priority. As we move forward, we need to consider the pros and cons of moving to a three-year PR cycle instead of the year-to-year cycle we are on. Since we are in the process of revising the forms, we will most likely continue with the year-to-year cycle through spring, after which we'll have completed, revised forms to work from in ensuing years.

c. Draft PR surveys for Instruction, LSCs, and Student Services.
All agreed that we use the same basic survey for all three major PR areas. And all agreed that we keep the questions fairly open so PR completers can tell us specifically what they found most useful or confusing.

4. **Consider IPC review process (If time allows)**
We had no time to discuss this in detail though generally we felt that having IPC read all program reviews is useful. As clunky as the process was this first go-around, we're moving in the right direction. Bev pointed out that as someone not in a program, it was extremely helpful to review PRs. We'll work with IPC to refine the process for the second go-around. Another point to note is that for faculty and staff in programs PR is the most direct, formal way to communicate their concerns, plans, and successes with IPC.