Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Program Review Workgroup

Minutes

Monday, April 28, 2014
9:00 – 11:00
PCR

Present: Ara Aguiar, Agyeman Boateng, Carmen Dones, Adrienne Foster, Alice Taylor, Rebecca Tillberg

1. Biennial review for CTE – Ara reported from a CTE meeting on Friday. Each college should have a report to the Board on the status of each of the CTE programs offered at the college. The contents of the report are dependent on a template developed and approved by the CTE deans, and approved by the VPs. Some years ago, a list of questions was required for CTE reporting. Ara shared West's program review with the CTE deans' committee, which said that the questions were fine.

    CTE deans will develop a process for reporting to the Board. There are several options: 1. Part of the annual IE report; 2. Separate CTE report; 3. Report by discipline; 4. Report by college. If embedded in the annual IE college report, the content would need to be standardized. We discussed the issue of reporting cost per FTES by program, off-setting with additional funding from Perkins.

    When program viability is triggered, how do we follow-up on that with the Senate? Ara gathered the data for Travel despite not having a formal program viability study. No new program viability studies were requested this year. However, we could reach back to the previous requests for program viability studies in order to pilot the existing process so that we can evaluate the process.

    Recommendation: The Program Review Workgroup recommends that the Academic Senate conduct a viability study of the Travel/Hospitality program, based on the 2012-13 program review recommendations.

2. Evaluation of 2013-14 program review. R. Tillberg shared a variety of documents to use in evaluating the previous process, including program review survey results, prioritization retreat information, and Joint Meeting Recommendations.

3. IES changes and new features. R Tillberg described the new features that are being programmed into IES in response to requests made by the IES workgroup, particularly the roll-over capability.

4. Integration of SLO assessment with IES. The current SLO questions were reviewed by Mary-Jo Apigo, who said they would be fine for the coming year. We are working on developing the SLO data system, either integrated with IES, or stand-alone, now that the new Assistant Research Analyst will be joining us.

5. Units that will do program review (Handbook, page 7). Initial discussion took place around the reorganization of instructional divisions that will move forward in the fall. We discussed whether we should look at PR through the lens of reorganization and decided that would not be beneficial at this point. A. Foster pointed out that we can use program review data to inform the reorganization process.

   There was extensive discussion about whether or not program reviews should be done by division, by discipline, or some other grouping. A proposed basis for breaking out divisions: GE/CTE; national accreditation, licensing exams, recognition by an external body. Programs that have large-scale external review could use the same data to answer both sets of questions.

   Question edit: 18.k. remove 'first attempt' from question. Question will read 'Provide a brief analysis of student performance on certification, licensure or board exams for each program in the Division'.

   One option that was discussed related to breaking up program review by disciplines was that then the division chair could do the validation. The chairs should pick a full time faculty to respond to each discipline.

   <u>Recommendation</u>: For this cycle, allow each nationally accredited or certified program to do a separate program review, as a pilot for doing each discipline separately.

6. Timeline (Handbook, page 6). Based on the Program Review Survey, we learned that a number of division chairs would like the program review to be available earlier so that they can work on it during August, rather than later in September when their schedules are busier. The only adjustment to the calendar we decided on was to open the IES software in early August, and then have the major trainings for the other units in September.
7. Modules and questions (Handbook, page 8-25). R. Tillberg reported that Mark Pracher approved deleting the Grants module.
8. Trend Data (Handbook, page 30-35)
9. New Process Development
   a. Program Viability/Program Initiation – process for starting new programs
   b. Budget process for supplies and emergency requests
10. Training. There was brief discussion about training. Two areas emerged for special focus: the planning section and how to use it, especially links between planning elements; better understanding of what is a goal; the prioritization rubric and how to have it inform program review preparation, and further, what is meant by 'high priority'.