Program Review Meeting Minutes 11/01/16

Start time: 1533

Attendance- Neely Hatridge, Nicole Hernandez, Kim Nickel, Savannah, Anna, Sue Vaughn, Odella, Manny, Heather, Mark Osea

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Discussion | Action and/or Future Action |
| Approve agenda items | Minutes from last program review meeting- | Approved by all in attendance |
| Debrief on checklists and Reads- trend, issues, patterns | * At the end of this semester PRC need to report ot college counsel * Need to create ppt for presentation * Need to discuss issues and trends that were observed when completing reviews   + Mark: “The question that states what were the trend changes and escribe how it impacted your program”- no analysis was provided.   + Multiple people agree that data was not analyzed.   + There may be problems with the way to questions is written   + Perhaps reformat to have questions as boxes to not have questions skipped   + Sue: Overall reviews submitted were poor quality   + Time constraint may be cause for poor quality of document (program will not have data as data is obtainable in August   + Mark: the portion where it says to attached form, but some do not say to attach forms.   + Sue: need to improve instructions- instructions lack clarity   + Elumen may help improve issues/confusion for forms   + Savannah: some forms overlap     - Overlapping may intentional because of how sections are broken out to different committees   + Confusion with assessment form, and then having to attach assessment   + Assessment form need improvement of formatting   + Sue: directions do not make it clear that review needs to read as though it is being written for “outsiders”   + Anna: reword goal sections- some people didn’t give goals or gave vague description of goals.   + Odella: department focused on what they need as faculty versus focusing on the student. Reviews need to focus on students. There was struggle with how to respond to equity. Seems as those programs did not know what equity was.   + Equity may have different views depending how they serve the school.   + Odella: many programs had difficulty responding to professional development   + Unclear definition of what prof. development is.   + Manny on prof. development: What degree does this information (prof. development) assist program in self eval and reviewing effectiveness of whole program?   + Prof development might allow us to see what program are requesting for prof. development. We could refer these requests to prof. development committee   + Repeat; Elumen may fix many of these issues (i.e. duplicate information, form retrieval)   + Sue: We need to make the forms ask questions in way that make people answer   + Anna: AU may as well be a comprehensive. AU has grown and is labor intensive. Not all Deans take interest in ensuring AU are adequately complete.   + The AU is continuously evolving   + AU needs to have all questions to re-evaluate how new processes worked.- We need the feedback   + Elumen may help minimize insufficiency. We can create a flow chart with Elumen to require certain answers. Can allow certain sections to be repopulated.   + Sue: We have complicated the process with all the forms/needed repeats of sections   + Overall, program review has improved compared to how it previously functioned.   + Manny we need to collectively walk through the program review process to ensure everything aligns and decrease duplicate questions. May make the transition to Elumen easier.   + FDCD can be surveyed to eval questions they thought were unclear or “tricky”   + When they report on ongoing goals need to report on why it is ongoing   + Final comments/conclusion were not well summarized.   + ACCJC reviews conclusion so summary needs to be well written | Forms should be attached to AU for ease of use  Need to train and make workshops to discuss what goals are  Get a person from equity to be a part of the conversation or workshop. Allows faculty to reflect on equity.  Need to provide different examples for different types of programs (instruction vs non-instructional  Talk with Reese W. about how to approach the prof. development section  Word it to “What have to done to add strength to your program” and how does that relate to your goals…  Reduce AU to one piece of paper.  In spring time PRC needs to reevaluate the AU, what it is asking, and length  Elumen may help.  Elumen may fix some of these issues  Perhaps retitle as “snapshot” or “highlights” and explain why this section is important  Overall: need to review and prepare in spring 2017 |
| November Survey | * Will be survey monkey * Send the survey in November * Will go to everyone, and then the ones who completed the program review will continue answering questions * Point of survey is to receive feedback from faculty/staff * Question 1- tells us what we need to better to get this process across. * Question 2- does ask if there was department involvement   + Uncertainty of purpose of question   + What is the “provided data”   + Anna: data may be from IR   + Why are they answering this question if they put it in the program review * Question 3- * Question 4- * Question 5- * Question 6- * Question 7- * Question 8- * Question 9- * Question 10- | Need to add a following question of how much involvement of everyone in department  Q2 Needs to be worded as “was it helpful”  Kim changed question based upon committee feedback  Add questions: if they went to workshop and did they know there was a workshop offered.  Need to follow up and complete review of survey |
| Strategic Direction | * Program review is one part of the overall accreditation * Program review is a part of direction 4 oversight and accountability * Will be on committee page for review * Action plans are updated in Fall and then reviewed in spring | Kim will speak more about strategic direction next meeting  Kim to send out document  PRC need to read and provide comments or feedback  No further action needed- no need to update |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |