**Program Review and Planning Committee Meeting Notes**

**November 11, 2022 | 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.**

Location: MS Teams Meeting ID: 285 589 919 460 | Passcode: b6yp7V

**Participants**

*Co-Chairs:* Doug Eisner, Bridget Kominek (not present); *Faculty Representatives:* Barry McCarthy, Deborah Paige, Monique Delatte, Luciano Rodriguez, Yolanda Duron, Rachel Nevarez, Calvin Young, Nick Arman, Todd Smith; *Classified Representatives:* David Sarabia (not present); *Management Representatives:* David Grossman, Bridget Salzameda; *Resource Members:* Daniel Berumen, Megan Harris

Ruben Lopez (wasn’t sure what department he was representing)

**Guests**

**Order of Business**

1. Call to order
2. Review 10/27/22 notes
   1. Notes approved
3. Public comments
   1. No public comments
4. Co-Chair Reports
   1. Notetaker for today’s meeting (Rachel Nevarez)
   2. Faculty information to VPI’s office to create Professional Expert contracts for spring: [Is your information complete?](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lZFVm-ace4FsiQuH8xytVW2XvR5Ltb_eS4_MnjeZiZk/edit?usp=sharing) It’s going to the VPI’s office this week.
   3. Update on Administrative/Operational Program Review Self-Study training on 11/4 and [participant feedback](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1uOe1aAeHS6P7DIPbJI47_BmqLt_NVoh4-I9WcdJfHXY/edit?usp=sharing)
   4. Recruiting for committee
      1. Two managers: awaiting Dr. Perez’s approval of Kristine Nikkhoo and Jessica Johnson
      2. Faculty from Social Sciences and Fine Art (Todd Smith filling the seat until a Fine Arts replacement is found)
      3. Two Classified professionals
      4. New members: Nick Arman (SSS/Coun)
      5. Invite members Todd Smith, Nick Arman, and Yolanda Duran to teams (I think Bridget sent invites during meeting?)
5. Instructional Annual Updates
   1. Ongoing issue: It’s unlikely that good quality ISLOA data will be available for the Instructional Annual Updates even with the deadline pushed back to mid-Spring. IIC voted to remove that question from the update form just for this round to give time for SLOAC and OIE to work to get good quality data and for programs to assess CSLOs
      1. Management would like updated memo sent to deans to distribute to departments
   2. Proposal: Vote to support IIC’s recommendation and remove the ISLOA question from the Instructional Annual Update **just for this year**. Keep the March 8 deadline to avoid confusion and respect the workload of program faculty. The temporary hiatus of this question can be explained in the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) to maintain adherence to ACCJC standards.
      1. Vote APPROVED
6. [Enrollment & Re-Engagement Proposal Draft](https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:2871353f-2d8c-3eae-98ac-72ebc3a67da5) feedback
   1. Read draft of feedback and suggest/make changes
   2. Finalized feedback is due to PBSC by 11/16--Bridget will synthesize feedback and complete draft
      1. Document can be given to Daniel
   3. Questions/Comments from committee members:
      1. STEM includes 3 departments, where does the money go and who manages it?
      2. STEM should be STEAM and include Arts
      3. Many comments about vague wording, abstract items, what is the proposal process?
      4. Comments made from PRPC members about engagement and enrollment efforts already in place (example: athletics and CTE). Any recommendations to implement what is working? Why aren’t those departments (like athletics) included in the proposal process?
      5. PRPC should be more involved
7. [Strategic Plan draft of college-wide strategic goals and objectives](https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:7566eb82-dd9b-3a7e-a23e-daea2d27d33e) feedback: Daniel
   1. Daniel shared a presentation
      1. Nov 15 associated students will review
      2. Nov 30th second read and vote at PAC
      3. TBD: NOCCCD board review
   2. Up next: goals, objectives, and strategic action plans rewritten
      1. IIC and OIE developed drafts
      2. Email was sent to all faculty for review and open forum scheduled for end of November
      3. Goal is to submit to Senate Faculty by February
   3. Questions/Comments from committee members:
      1. Program review’s job is to respond to whatever objectives the college has yet the 4th goal seems to be directly connected to what we do.
      2. Setting a clear set of objectives becomes easier for people who are doing program review to align the objectives with what they are trying to do.
         1. The easier we make it for our faculty to find which objectives fit, the better off we are.
      3. Suggestion to start a conversation on teams directly related to feedback on objectives and goals
      4. Are objectives too specific? (Ex: adding COVID-19)
         1. Response: these are two-year goals. A cycle was skipped, and goals have not been updated since 2019, the goals don’t change but the objectives do. Before we do the next 4-year review cycle, we sit down, rewrite, and evaluate. Everyone does program reviews after those are rewritten.
8. Review [ASC recommendation to PBSC/PRPC/IIC](https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:5fbc8544-1274-311c-94e0-b0672d72615c)
   1. Chairs of PBSC, PRPC, and IIC meet 11/28 to discuss the recommendation
      1. Doug gives context to this topic
   2. Thoughts? Questions/Comments from committee members:
      1. The role PR plays in budgeting is not clear. We support it but it does not go anywhere. Bullet point of problems.
      2. One suggestion is to add/group the funding sources in the template.
      3. There are avenues of funding that people don’t know about (grants)
      4. The PRPC chair carries to the Faculty Senate the themes (pulled from self-studies) having a rubric ahead of time would help
      5. It doesn’t sound like it’s us, it’s them (funding). All the extra work and resources are mute if it doesn’t change how it’s handled on the other end or explain how and why it’s sourced.
      6. Information is helpful and explains how the process works
      7. PRPC talks to Rod about how the funding process works
   3. Bridget: I think the problem lies mostly with planning and resource allocation. Program review happens regularly and is a thorough and transparent process, but the role of program review in planning and resource allocation is less consistent and clear. Solutions: PBSC being a dual reporting committee? Regular cross-work between PRPC and PBSC?
9. Update rubric for non-instructional self-studies
   1. Meeting ended promptly at 4:30pm and we did not get to this topic

**Upcoming meeting: 12/8** (tentative agenda: update on ASC recommendation meeting on 11/28, address any ongoing membership issues, discuss Faculty Allocation Committee use of program review self-studies, continue updating rubrics for self-studies and annual updates)