Online Program Review Taskforce December 16, 2008 Minutes

Present: Anna Badalyn (City), Gary Colombo (District), Ryan Cornner (East), Michelle Fowles (Valley), Daryl Kinney (City), Carol Kozeracki (Pierce), Kim Misa (East), June Miyasaki (Valley), Ed Pai (District), Maury Pearl (Mission), Rebecca Stein (Valley), Rebecca Tillberg (West), Bradley Vaden (Trade)

Rebecca Tillberg kindly volunteered to chair the committee and was elected unanimously.

Rebecca reviewed the goals from the first draft of the “Online Program Review Development Process 2009” that she and Ed Pai had created. Feedback from the taskforce on the goals included:
- “collegial”: How open should the data be? Should anything be password protected? Are there cultural differences among the colleges about which types of data might be restricted to the participating chairs and deans? “Collegial” should also emphasize the importance of widespread involvement in the process
- “flexible”: able to accommodate future changes
- “linkage”: refer to connections with faculty hiring process, program development, block grant allocation, accreditation, SLOs, alignment with strategic and educational master plans. Need for evidence linking planning and budgeting for accreditation purposes.
- “reporting capability”: reporting across different types of plans
- add “tracking and assessment” as an additional goal – what’s been accomplished? who is responsible for the tasks?

Other comments:
- we want to make this a “personalized process” that engages people by providing them with relevant information (perhaps through a portal) – show why this is beneficial and worthwhile to participants
- some CTE people should provide input on how to relate this to the required biennial program review process
- this process should be tied into the search for a new SIS vendor (but we won’t wait for that selection to move forward on our process)
- how do we avoid overwhelming people with data?
- we have to get buy-in from the appropriate campus committees, and taskforce members will serve as the liaisons to the campus committees

Projected Timeframe: 4 – 6 months to develop the specifications and 6 months to build the program (may be affected by the choice of the SIS vendor).

Our next meeting will take place on Wednesday, January 28, from 9 – 12 at LACC in Library 123. Focus will be a mind mapping exercise led by Bradley and a discussion of individual college program review processes.