Program Review Committee Notes

Tuesday, Nov. 19 2019 3:30 pm- 5:00 pm

L160

Chairs: Stephen Waller, Dean of Instruction; Kimberly Nickell, ACDV, Faculty Co-Chair; Kristin Rabe, Media Services, Classified Co-Chair

Members: Mindy Wilmot, Library; Anna Poetker-Collins, Philosophy; Anna Melby, FACE; Andrea Tumblin, Mathematics; LeAnn Riley, Agriculture; Brent Burton, Fire Technology/EMS; Neeley Hatridge, Communication; Nicole Hernandez, Nursing; Keri Wolf, English; Jennifer Johnson, Nursing (Curriculum Liaison); Scott Dameron, Health & PE; Klint Rigby, Engineering; Jason Dixon, Industrial Technology; Katie Ganster, Biology; Brent Wilson, Assessment Liaison; Linda McLaughlin, Foreign Language; Gabriel Searcy, Psychology; Aneesha Awrey, Counseling; Casandra Goodman, Athletics;

F. Javier Llamas, Social Sciences; Maurice Muller-Quinhoneiro, adjunct Chemistry

Admin and Managers: Amber Hroch, OIE

Kalina Hill, TAPC

Classified: Meg Stidham, CSEA designee

SGA: David Wayne Collins II, SGA Senator 2

**Present:**

**Absent:**

* Call to Order 3:32 pm
* Note taker Kim
* Approval of Minutes
* Approval of Agenda Items:
* Update on the read and feedback process; last minute questions, concerns.
  + Kalina-program reviews with limited comments, give them encouragement. There have been last minute updates and previously not completed program reviews. One in particular had resource requests.
* Trends, issues, feedback on the process, including
  + eLumen
    - eLumen does not do spell check. Try copy and paste from Word.
    - Just the process of eLumen may have tripped up departments.
  + help documents and guides
    - Exemplary program reviews as examples
    - Help, tips and short cuts, quick tips.
    - Do a better job at getting the above information to our end users.
  + workshops for PRC members and end users
    - Specific for departments. Roles, navigating outreach
  + questions
    - Norming the language and designing a rubric for feedback, so the dialog matches the verbage used for Guided Pathways, etc. describing the work they do. The program reviews language should meet a higher standard. A language that all reviewers should have.
    - Assessment committee will be doing an internal series of guidelines to norm the language.
    - Goals: Status update…we need to revamp this within the question. New, continuing, completed goals. There was confusion within this question.
    - Work with Assessment Committee to make sure formatting and questions are correct for their section.
  + Format
    - Links within the prompts/questions to guide end users with general knowledge about how to get your resource request through. Link to a page within PRC page explaining. What does it mean? What happens to my request?
    - One box at the end that is designated for feedback from PRC
    - Program Mapper as part of program review
* PRC response
* Give feedback to programs about changing their dialog when requesting resources in response to “We get denied.”
* Departments/programs should keep requesting even if they’ve been denied. Sometimes money shows up. Wheels of bureaucracy…
* Issues and trends with the program reviews
  + So many program reviews were brief w/out meaningful analysis. Either they were great, or they were completely isolated and not addressing the question.
  + Make the importance of what is in the program review clear. Program reviews are meant for reflection, to see if we meet the needs of our students. If it’s not memorable, or if appropriate committees don’t have a clear understanding of what a program’s needs are, it’s not going to go through.
  + Understanding what to do with data, disproportionate impact, equity. Maybe OIE can help us with this. Help them with narrative.
  + Goals still reading as resource requests. Refine the goals.
  + Blank conclusions.
  + Are programs reading their feedback. Give a link to access it.
* FCDC time slots to get ready for Program Review starting in Feb.
  + Expectations
  + 10 minutes
  + New cycle out by April