Present: Kuo, Lauffer, Singh, Taylor, Burks, Alina Verzi (LPCSG rep), Spirn

 Discussion of Program Review reading process:

1. What did you learn from reading this year's Program Review? What themes or trends in the reviews stood out to you and why?

AB705

Need for unified public safety facility—they are all spread out

STEM—facilities needs in all areas, urgent

Facilities, budgets, human resources

New classroom buildings are positive—programs appreciated less impacting of classrooms

Wanting to move paper records online

OEI certification and course development

**Time for department meetings to work on mandates and initiatives**

**Department meeting times for flex day and college day**

**Professional development. For part-time—need compensation and accessible times.**

Professional development around mandates such as AB705.

AB705/Guided pathways—growth mindset, need time to build relationship with students.

Increased collaboration—learning communities, ESL and counseling, English and STEM/reading apprenticeship, music and theater.

Guided pathways.

Increased community outreach and collaborations.

Need for coordinator reassigned time—still inequitable.

Need for coordinated scheduling.

Repeated requests—let people know what to do (work with dean or administrator)

Clarify how PR connects to resource allocation.

More ways to inform people of the planning process—maybe a town meeting with IPEC in Spring.

PR is not the request. It’s a place to document the request.

2. How did the reading process go in terms of accessing materials, working with your team, etc?

Remind readers that they can identify the themes that weren’t checked.

3. Were there any themes that we should add to the list (or clarify/update)?

Current themes:

<http://www.laspositascollege.edu/instructionalprogramreview/programreviewglossary.php>

(diversity, accessibility and equity?)

student success—with a suggestion about diversity, equity, accessibility

call it “outcomes.”

Look at enrollment management. Could it be changed to something clearer? Or broken up? Or broadened to include scheduling issues? (Such as changed class times and how that affects enrollment)?

What is the best way to address the planning priorities and make sure it is noted when requests/issues connect to them?

LPC collaboration—could add something like, Could also include opportunities and obstacles for collaborating.

4. Were there any questions on the template that did not solicit the needed response? Which ones?

Changes to program? (if no significant changes, no need to fill out?)

Obstacles and needs

Possibly put which committee or campus body each section came from

Program set standard seems punitive—maybe PR should not be the way it’s recorded.

Maybe IR just contacts them individually.

Add a suggestion of putting it in a google doc. Maybe we can make some suggestions of process issues.

Do we need to add boxes for processes such as Instructional Equipment requests?

My suggestions:

* take the word "needs" out of the "changes" question and put it in the obstacles question
* add an equity theme--diversity, accessiblity and equity
* Also one on student success?
* Clarify the description of enrollment management (class size)
* clarify purpose of program set standard

Spring 2019 Plans:

* Contact president's office to get a notetaker
* Work with Student Services to make sure process works for them
* Work with allocation committees on alignment of processes
* Work with SLO committee on their questions
* Make a chart of program review features on the PR website
* reach out to stakeholders for sections (e.g. curriculum) once final drafts are posted

Program Review Feedback Comments 2018

Section 2, A: Feels like rehashing of everything else stated in this document.  (Educational Master Plan)

A suggestion would be a shorter, more concise document. However, I believe this year’s document is more approachable than prior documents. “Shout out” to the Program Review Committee!

I feel as though I repeat the same information multiple times throughout the review. Is that something that is helpful or does it slow the PR process for readers? Perhaps during a workshop, you could help newer faculty members who are completing program review to learn ways to better organize the reviews.

I love program review and the program review committee.

Mass Communications is a program with only one full-time instructor. This makes the option to “opt out” especially important. I encourage additional options like that. Also, I wonder about including the Educational Master Plan Categories earlier as organizing principles or structures.

Some sections get very redundant. It Might be efficient(?) to have Appendix Request Forms to be added for those you want/need such as Chabot used a few years back. They were very simple (Academic Support, New Initiatives, Full-Time Faculty/Staff, FTEF Requests, Supplies & Services, Conference & Travel, Technology/Other Equipment Requests…) This way when asked “is this in your PR?” we could simply pull up the Request Form Appendix or direct committee members/Administration to pertinent Appendix.

The RAC process for Instructional Equipment asks for information on whether the request is mentioned in the program review. There isn’t really an explicit place in the Program Review document that encourages faculty to list Classroom Instructional Equipment needs. The two documents don’t appear to be linked in this way. I think that this needs to be included in the program review so faculty and departments are explicitly stating in the program review instructional equipment needs, and not just buying willy-nilly. Additionally, I worry that RAC committee members might score a request lower if it is not included in the review. Just a box, perhaps?

Continue to carve out the time to give us the opportunity to work together during College Day and Flex Days.

A "fillable" PDF (or other) form would be great. The assistance and availability of faculty to help in Program Review preparation is very helpful and appreciated.

The Program Review process is time consuming. Not sure the best process, but do know that allowing faculty more time to actually teach, develop pedagogy, and assess than doing “forms” every year would help.

Suggestion for future program reviews. Reword the question in this section. Should Read: Did your program meet or exceed the COLLEGE –WIDE AVERAGE for Program Set Standards? If not, explain what your plans are to increase the measure of success next year? This method pursues the departments that are dragging the college-wide average down. Departments in this current cycle that would have below 72.5%. There is no reason to have programs that are above average writing up what they are going to do to improve. Improvement and text needs to come from programs that are below the college-wide average and serving thousands of enrollments.

The Program Review process is cumbersome and redundant. There is no logical reason why we need to focus on one aspect or another every year. A three-year cycle would be much more beneficial to programs, and there would be much less busy work for faculty who could then spend that time on teaching.

The Program Set Standard, in the way it is used in Program Review, is too simplistic to be useful. It only compares a program’s current numbers against that same program’s past performance. This seems to unnecessarily penalize a program which has been successful in the past. The idea that a program with a success rate of 50-55% is deemed acceptable, and another program with a success rate = 75-80% deemed unacceptable, is illogical. It’s very unclear to me how there is any connection between Program Review and anything else (eg, resource allocation). Does a superior Program Review lead to more funds? Does an inferior Program Review lead to diminished funds? Is there always a direct correlation between the quality of the Program Review and the quality of the program? Might there be a truly effective program that generates a poor Program Review (and thus sees a reduction in funding)? It would help to have very specific directions about what to include, and what not to include, in Program Review. https://goo.gl/1AefkX was a dead link (was supposed to link to the Educational Master Plan) Finally, when issues repeatedly appear in multiple Program Reviews (eg, unassigned time, facilities), which is very much the case in this Engineering Program Review, it is because this issue has not been resolved satisfactorily.

Please include sessions throughout the flex days where folks can actively work on things and actively discuss things with other department personnel. Please include the activities and sessions where I can actually create something, and I leave that session (or activity) with something useful that I can have created for my classes or for my program. Examples include – getting to learn, create and implement something in Canvas, or getting to work on the program review report with other department personnel, or getting to work on and discuss SLO/eLumen data with other department personnel present. Please consider 2 hour work sessions in such cases, and please consider allowing these sessions to be scheduled during whatever times work for the adjunct faculty (e.g., at the times when they would have been in class.

This process seems to cover everything important and the process is simple. Thank you Program Review Committee.

Keep the form similar to this! This format will easily upload into a Google Doc, and the entire department can contribute to one version simultaneously instead of having multiple versions floating around in emails or on Canvas. This was greatly beneficial to our large department :)

None. The “no significant changes” option was quite helpful this year!

More opportunities for appropriate responses for programs that are service-oriented only, and that don’t have an educational component per se. These programs are essential for student success, but their connections to the Education Master Plan and other types of reports may be less visible or apparent in a report such as the program review as it is currently understood.

Still too many questions