May 4, 2010
2:00-3:30, AC 108
Minutes

Present: Yolanda Bellisimo (Co-Chair), Nick Chang (Co-Chair), Jon Gudmundsson, Chialin Hsieh (Staff Resource), Mike Irvine, Peggy Isozaki, Sara McKinnon, Michele Martinisi, Nanda Schorske, Carol Scialli (Staff Resource), David Snyder

Absent: Tom Burke, Ron Gaiz, Patrick Kelly, Sara Lefkowitz, Nathaniel Parker
Others Present: Ed Buckley, Chris Schultz

Welcome/Announcements
- This is special meeting to discuss one item, Integrated Planning Process.

Agenda Review
- Agenda approved.

Minutes
- Minutes of April 27 meeting approved.

Assessing Integrated Planning Process
Instructional Program Review

Close Feedback Loop
- Feedback loop from Program Review needs to be closed in terms of allocation of resources. People need to see what happens with Program Reviews. Example: Instructional equipment approved requests not broadcast globally so individuals know status of requests i.e., what is being recommended.
  o Suggest communicating out via President’s Briefing and provide link to refer to.
  o Include multi-year information via link.
- Each committee needs to submit a summary to show they have read and reviewed respective Program Review.

Expand and Enhance Dialogue and Build in Structure for Dialogue
- Program Review itself is lot of work, and people feel their efforts go nowhere. Cultural shift needed to say Program Review process itself is an outcome for better understanding programs.
- Process reduced to a value of just getting dollars; not focusing on greater value i.e., improving programs and services. How translate into action?
- Example cited from another college re: instructional equipment requests:
  o Chairs and deans worked together with lists and sorted requests already prioritized.
  o Chairs, deans, VP had discussions about needs and understood each others programs.
  o Dialogue among participants is great.
- Suggest doing a Program Review divisional/departmental presentation. Discuss what was done with plan and resources and how things worked.
  o Program Review summary section is supposed to comment on the latter.

Improve Program Review Timeline
- Three huge processes for every department and difficult to accomplish all each year:
  o Program Review
  o SLOs
  o Curriculum Updates
- Program Review is laborious process so maybe change to a 3 year cycle.
Planning & Resource Allocation Committee

- Leave templates up for those who want to do input.
- Workforce does its Program Review every 2 years.
- Enrollment, retention, and other data needed every year depending on needs of program.
- Mandatory, comprehensive Program Review would be every 3 years; if have additional resource, staffing needs, must address each year.
- Why is Program Review the mechanism for replacing staff?
  - All planning and resource allocation must be done through planning process.

Administrative Program Review
- Current form: history, needs and objectives, specific activities. Activities should be more in arena of annual process not in comprehensive Program Review process.
- Example cited from another college: looked historically at program, how providing service to client, looked at institutional goals and objectives, resources to achieve, written every 3 years; was opportunity to get things needed.
- Needs to be more global; set objectives, assess progress, plan to improve.
- Confusion because never had good definition of what program was so not sure what to include as part of program.
  - Take existing Program Review document, define program being reviewed, establish goals and measurable outcomes, create plan.
- Confusion about strategic objectives and Program Review. Should they exist independently? Difficult to make link.
- Suggest when templates and process developed, users participate in design process.

Student Services Program Review
Chris Schultz
- Student Services did comprehensive Program Review 3 years ago.
- Last year Student Access & Success Committee developed online version easy to update.
- Categorical programs used to take turns doing Program Reviews.
- Recommend move to online form and keep consistent pattern.
- As Co-Chair of Student Access & Success: screen Program Reviews and glean retention and success issues.
- Looked for generalizations and arrived at 12 categories of things that could be factors in retention. Sara built these into Program Review so faculty had frame of reference.
- Program Review is still anecdotal; no departmental ownership of Program Review; no reporting back; don’t have dialogue.
- Faculty must take responsibility for department and program; clear that people viewing broad world through small glass.
- Trends Identified in the 2010 Academic Program Review distributed.
  - Last year most pronounced request was hire more full-time people.
  - Look broadly, not department by department.
  - Implement change that will influence access and success; anything in Program Review document that prompts people to do this? Maybe not providing information they need that prompts them to address change.

Comments
- Is Program Review only mechanism in place to tackle such a problem? Some colleges have early intervention mechanisms. When student at point of failure, provides intervention.
  - Program Review should identify weaknesses, arrive at solutions, evaluate how it’s doing.
- SAS section of Program Review, 3 questions pointed people to Robert’s data re: success by demographics. Issue: provide data but do people look at and know what looking at. Need to help people analyze data.
- Prompt people to respond to negative information.
- Maybe Student Access & Success is committee in search of mission.
Planning & Resource Allocation Committee

- Over time, PRAC needs to develop flexibility to respond to Program Reviews. PRAC not supposed to make decisions but forcing the issues.
- Student Access and Success could be place where look at data for red flags and bring back to PRAC.

**Timeline and Process for Program Review**

- Chairs and Deans were added into process.
- Suggest PRAC recommendations require written follow through with signoff and need public tracking system to check on status.
  - Example: Technology Plan was sent out to community but no public announcements of what going on within PRAC.
- Institution, via PRAC, needs discussion of resources being allocated specifically geared to strategic planning objectives.
- Need complete review of strategic planning objectives.
- Is it possible to identify part of budget to fund implementation of strategic planning priorities given they are institutional priorities?
  - Yes, when times were better we had funds. Currently, no funds to carve aside.
  - Bond has paid for Banner and annual maintenance, $300,000.
  - Right now looks like $1 million deficit for next year.
  - Are staffing levels appropriate? Hard decisions may be forthcoming re: possible cuts in order to satisfy institutional priorities.
- Must be repeated that we have strategic plans; may mean reallocations. Otherwise people won’t even want to consider strategic plan.
- Community doesn’t know what we are planning to do and how it relates to strategic objectives, so can’t expect them to buy into process.
- If knew how much to work with or what would be effective, committee might be able to make decisions.
  - Look within own divisions.
- PRAC not comprehensive in its planning.
  - Tech Plan useful; being reviewed for implementation.
  - Maybe can only do one big thing at a time.
- Suggest more conversations with subcommittees.
- Considering enormity of its task and limited time, PRAC has done a good job.

**Other**

- Erik and V-Anne have been invited to next meeting for status report on Facilities Plan.
- PRAC needs to forward report on Institutional Effectiveness to Board of Trustees.
- Ed will prepare first draft of annual Institutional Effectiveness report.

**Meeting Wrap Up/Assignments**

- Next meeting is May 11.
- First meeting in fall agenda item: Review and Approve Revisions to Integrated Planning Manual 2009.

**Next Meeting Agenda**

- Facilities Plan Update
- Supplies