Program Review REVIEW Committee Minutes 3-10-09 CMC 101

In Attendance: Greg Brown, Glenda Case, Greg Gilbert, Cathy Itnyre, Leslie Moody, Doug Morrison, Cheryl Munsey, Roger Wagner

- Meeting called to order at 8:00 a.m.
 Materials were distributed (agendas and copies of the program review packet
- II. Roger Wagner opened with comments about the PR process.
 - a. The need to reduce redundancy
 - b. The first round of PR produced uneven results, some very detailed and comprehensive and some that were not. He acknowledged that some PRs will by necessity be briefer than others and involve fewer data elements, particularly where review don't involve regular student contact, but either way, overall quality is of paramount importance
 - c. CMC is ahead of some colleges by virtue of having completed all PRs college-wide, but there is a need to simplify and to build consistency into our PR process, and that we are looking forward to hearing what the ACCJC has to say as a result of the upcoming visit.
 - d. We are presently research-challenged due to the ongoing switch over to Datatel, so the inability to get PR related data will continue for a handful of weeks.
 - e. President Wagner reiterated the need for annual reviews, particularly as an annual PR process is continuous and, therefore, more thorough than a five year cycle and easier to standardize.
- III. Agenda item concerning the need to streamline the existing process
 - a. Doug Morrison opined that PR could be simplified to two forms and three narratives.
 - i. SWOT (Form)
 - ii. Work Plan (Form)
 - iii. Progress Update (Narrative)
 - 1. Program history would be updated under Progress Update narrative as an assessment of goals.
 - iv. Advisory Minutes (Narrative)
 - v. Executive Summary (Narrative)
 - b. Doug suggested that faculty and staff surveys be PR relevant, that research is a central component, and that servant leadership is foundational to the entire process. To be relevant, research should examine trends and make comparisons. Comparisons may prove to be more difficult to address, particularly as they concern quality improvement issues.
 - c. Leslie Moody said that people fear indictments and to help avoid the attitude that qualitative data is punitive and threatening, we need to focus on best practices as we move forward.
 - d. A discussion ensued wherein it was agreed that academic freedom is not free to ignore indicators and course/program requirements. Academic freedom is primarily a matter of pedagogy in how to meet course requirements. There was consensus to expand awareness on this issue at CMC.

- e. Cheryl added that there is a need for a cultural shift from personal defensiveness to a more systemic and task oriented approach as we build curriculum and address PR findings.
- IV. Agenda item concerning the linking of research, data, and SLOs
 - a. Greg Brown discussed the need to translate data from an academic model to a service model with measurable results. He explained that the new Datatel system will permit all information concerning individuals (students, employees, alumnae) to be retrieved by keying an individual's unique identifier. This will allow for aggregated data and individualized reports.
 - b. Cathy Itnyre mentioned the need for a closer examination of evidence at the program level, including the use of student surveys. Reiterating Cheryl's concern, she stated that there is apprehensiveness about the revelation of negative findings, and there is a general lack of knowledge about what information is available. She added that obtaining research is "the worst of it," and that dealing with the research is time consuming, along with the need to "get in line" after requesting it. She said that she would like to see the Research Committee devote more time to data and research issues as related to PR.
 - c. Roger Wagner said our research/data retrieval situation is "uniquely bad" because researchers don't have direct access to research due to the Datatel transition. He said that PRs should be able to retrieve their own data. Authors of PRs should be able to meet, compare data, and provide overall guidance.
 - d. Greg Gilbert asked where the data retrieval process would be a year from now. Cheryl Munsey predicted that we would have more data available to us than we will be able to deal with and the resultant need for training in how to manage the data.
 - e. Leslie Moody suggested the creation of a basic data set to help forestall confusion. Such a set might focus on enrollment data, attrition and retention.
 - f. General discussion concerned the need for various administrators and key PR participants to raise questions and retrieve information so that the link between data and PR evolves to create a regular cyclical report. Doug Morrison recommended a graduate seminar approach wherein everyone understands the academic model. He said that by streamlining and standardizing the process and providing timely data, an annual PR process would not be a huge burden something on the order of 50 hours per year per program. In answer to a question about the availability of qualified potential Research Committee members, Doug said that there were certainly enough qualified individuals on campus to create a seven person team, wryly adding that he wasn't including himself. He then offered the following elements:
 - i. Research formats that are relevant at the program level
 - ii. A taxonomy of programs
 - iii. Know who needs the information and when
 - iv. Calendars need to be developed and synchronized
 - 1. PR
 - 2. Budget Advisory
 - 3. Research (Datatel with PR)
 - g. Doug also provided three overriding goals for the Program Review REVIEW Committee:
 - i. Full compliance with the WASC cycle by May 2010
 - ii. Standardize PR content and formats (essential components)
 - iii. Provide relevant and timely quantitative and qualitative evidence to support planning and assessment for all college programs

- h. Cheryl Munsey brought up budgetary concerns, and Leslie Moody asked about operational and expansion budgets and their relationships to PR. Doug said that budgetary concerns were both decremental and incremental. Fixed costs can be taken out up front. With PR we are mostly dealing with issues involving extra money and by necessity may have to wait until P1 for confirmation of budgetary supports. Glenda mentioned Perkins IV and external timelines, and Doug acknowledged that state and catagoricals are also outside the PR process in terms of goals that require additional funding.
- V. Agenda item concerning timelines and steps for having a college-adopted annual PR process in place for the next academic year.
 - a. Senate President Cheryl Munsey said that a strawman would move from the Program Review REVIEW Committee to College Council to constituent groups for consultation.
 - b. Doug Morrison suggested that we link our existing PRs to next year's calendar and get the data out as soon as possible. There is a risk that WASC would have expected our completed PRs, but we need to align our efforts with the academic year.
 - c. Leslie Moody brought up the question of how we should link our PRs to organizational goals and plans. Discussion concerned the relationship of SLOs, the Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan, "where the rubber meets the road." Where PR exists at the micro level, research allocation must link to the Strategic Plan as a means of setting goals and work plans.
 - d. Doug agreed to email piñata documents to the committee concerning the PR process and related calendars.

VI. Adjournment: 9:30 a.m.

Future meetings: Weekly on Mondays in CMC 2 from 8-9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted: Greg Gilbert