SAN DIEGO CONTINUING EDUCATION | SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

**Mission** San Diego Continuing Education commits to student success and community enrichment by providing accessible, equitable, and innovative quality education and support services to diverse adult learners in pursuit of lifelong learning, training, career advancement, and pathways to college.

## Program Review Committee

**MINUTES** for Monday, February 25, 2019      3:30 – 5:00 PM      ECC room 121

| | |
|---|---|
| **Members Present:** | Marne Foster (co-chair), Jessica Luedtke (co-chair), John Bromma, David Holden, Tim Pawlak, Jesus Rivas, Cassandra Storey (for Michelle Fischthal) |
| **Members not Present:** | Desiree Payne, Maureen Rubalcaba, Jackie Sabanos, Carol Wilkinson, Leroy Williams |
| **Recorder:** | Debi King |

| AGENDA |
|---|

| **1. Call to Order 3:38 PM** |
|---|

| **2. Review Agenda, Approval of Minutes** |
|---|

| **2.1 Approval of Agenda – agenda approved by committee** |
|---|

| **2.2 Approval of January 24, 2019 Meeting Minutes – minutes approved by committee** |
|---|

| **3. Information/Discussion Item(s)** |
|---|

| **3.1 Update on the 2018/19 integrated planning processes (program review, strategic planning, & resource allocation)** |
|---|

| **3.1.1 Final Form A Feedback Report to be sent to PR Writers** | |
|---|---|
| INFORMATION | ▪ Jesus updated the report and provided committee members with draft to review - only changes from the last version were the introduction and footnote at the end. |

| **3.1.2 Presentation of final Prioritization List to EGC** | |
|---|---|
| DISCUSSION | ▪ Program review informs resource request process to a small degree- the score of what's reviewed goes into the resource request.<br>▪ Grant managers should be involved in this process – they need to be informed.<br>▪ The committees were asked to prioritize and/or make recommendations and provide comments to the prioritization lists and then Jessica brought the finalized list/spreadsheet to EGC on February 13th. |

| **3.1.3 2018/19 PR/AR Writer Feedback Results** | |
|---|---|
| DISCUSSION | ▪ Only the PRC, respondents, and VP's of the departments they oversee will get final report.<br>▪ It should be stressed that the report is about program improvement and not reflective of the individual writer – this will be stressed in the email in which the report will be sent in. |

| **3.2 Changes/Revisions to Program Review** | |
|---|---|
| DISCUSSION | PIE committee recommended that PR committee allow move of resource requests to PIE and to be linked to strategic planning in a build-out in Campus Labs – noting that all are parts of integrated planning and all link to each other |
| MOTION | Motion by Jessica to approve move of resource request oversight to PIE committee and approve a build-out of request forms in Campus Labs planning, seconded by Marne - motion passed |

| **3.3 Program Review System & Resource Request** | |
|---|---|
| DISCUSSION | ▪ We are unique in that we do program review every year, unlike other colleges – feels like overload<br>▪ Question: What is the purpose of rating program review responses? It shouldn't be "rating", it should be feedback/recommendations on how to improve your process<br>▪ Question: what is there to improve? We are not saying that the content is good or bad, or whether or not your program is doing well – we can give feedback as to how they can add depth to their program review or how you can present it in a way that would make more sense |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul><li>Question that comes up frequently: "what do they want to know?" Or "what are they looking for?" – pleasing the evaluators shouldn't have anything to do with the program review – we need to create a culture where an individual's responses matter</li><li>Faculty wants to feel free to respond without criticism by other parties</li><li>Most people that write program review are throwing everything on the wall to see what sticks</li></ul> |
| Action Item<br>David | David will give Marne a few lines that would succinctly articulate this to other faculty members which will help her with the email she sends out – she will incorporate that in her message |
| DISCUSSION | <ul><li>Perhaps we could do PR less frequently, but more in depth</li><li>Need to reduce the level of confusion – maybe the writers can have committee member review their PR, prior to submission, to offer suggestions, questions, and feedback</li><li>Create a culture of trust so the writers don't feel as though they're being graded or having to justify things on their PR</li><li>There are a lot of new people and a lot of new programs –provide training? Train the trainers?</li><li>Invite program chairs –payment consideration?</li></ul> |

**3.4 Spring Communications (Feedback Survey, Form A Feedback Reports, SP Reminder)**

| | |
|---|---|
| INFORMATION<br>and<br>DISCUSSION | Jesus informed committee that PRIE did two surveys in December - 30 respondents<ul><li>A lot of positive feedback – improvements from last year</li><li>Some people worked alone to do their PR</li><li>In the open-ended questions there are comments about people not wanting to participate and/or not having enough time to participate in the process</li><li>The majority of the respondents indicated they had enough time, but due to having to learn Campus Labs they needed more time</li><li>Some comments that fall is not a good time to have the PR process<ul><li>group discussed that Miramar does theirs in March and that changing the cycle could be quite impactful; yet Miramar's data is from two cycles ago, so data is not as current. It should align with the grants and management of the grants – which is why they changed some of the timelines – some colleges are pulling reports twice a year, but not necessarily doing PR twice.</li></ul></li><li>Many open-ended comments about people not understanding the questions<ul><li>Example: regarding the question about the mission, some people entered SDCE's mission</li><li>We tried to make it better than last year, so the feedback can help to refine it more</li><li>Some people used a different form than the one provided – they used an old form</li></ul></li><li>Challenging using data – they are struggling with this</li><li>Some people didn't like using Campus Labs<ul><li>First time using it and it was challenging</li></ul></li><li>Some people struggled with having to put prices/costs<ul><li>Perhaps Business Services could help with that</li></ul></li><li>Recommendations:<ul><li>Having workshops would be beneficial</li><li>Group support for PR writers</li><li>Use spreadsheets instead of Word files</li><li>Timing – separating PR from SP</li><li>Reduce the frequency of PR cycle</li></ul></li></ul> |

**4. Adjournment** Meeting adjourned at 5:18 PM

**Next Meeting:** Monday, March 18, 2019 at 3:30-5:00 PM - ECC Rm 121

**Minutes submitted by:**     Debi King          **Minutes approved:**     By Committee 3/18/19