AGENDA

Items

• Discussion of minutes of September 5 meeting

• Integrating last year’s and this year’s program review and assessment into our current planning and budgeting process: Integrated Planning Model Analysis and Link from Program Review to Planning (see below)

• Have Division Chairs/Program Directors involved in the year’s program reviews: How?

• Finalize timeline of Instructional and Non-instructional Program Reviews

• Review Role of PRC
• We agreed to add Roxanne Metz to the PRC membership.
• We agreed to look at including the division chairs/program directors in the program review process by asking them to provide a summary page for his/her area of responsibility. For example: Dave Bazard would provide a sheet summarizing the overall needs of the program reviews in MSE. Attached is a draft summary sheet.
• We discussed the role of the PRC: 1) The high number of program reviews submitted prevents the PRC form summarizing the individual reviews; 2) The PRC ensures that the program review documents are clear and address the information called for.
• We reviewed the refined integrated planning model and found that clarification of processes is needed.
• We found that the Retention and faculty load data is unreliable.

Question for the group: Should we require a division chair/program director summary document for the program reviews submitted next fall and not this fall? I am concerned that all the program reviewees have been primed to expect a certain process and timeline and introducing different element in the process and disrupting the timeline will cause some discomfort. What this means is that the programs reviews will go from the PRC to the CPC. What do you think?

Agenda for the September 12, 2009 meeting

Finalization of the timeline of the Instructional and Student Services Program Reviews

Review of the Instructional and Student Services Program Review documents

Final Review of the Role of the PRC
Integrated Planning Model Analysis and Link from Program Review to Planning

Issue Description:

The program review “interviews” with division chairs, and the associated database, did not allow for easy flow through various decision trees (e.g. loops or feedback/feedforward communication) including the need for the ability to change requests as they evolved and became better informed. Division chairs and functional planning teams had incomplete information in some cases, largely because program review information was unclear or incomplete.

Suggested Activities for Using Program Review Information to Inform Planning and Budget Development:

The following can be done using either last year’s or this year’s program review:

I. Program reviews (and/or their summaries) can be (and in some cases already have been) collated and specific information routed to various planning teams (can use either the current model developed last year or the proposed model) to inform planning discussions in the following areas: 1) Budget resources, 2) FT Faculty, 3) Staff, 4) Facilities/Classroom Technology, 5) Equipment, 6) Equipment Repair, and 7) Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs)/Goals and Plans. Although the information may be imperfect, in many cases it’s good enough to inform some planning decisions.

II. The CPC (and/or a subcommittee) could and should analyze the Goals & Plans and QIPs from last year. Through collaboration with Division Chairs and/or program review coordinators, QIPs and Goals and Plans can either be coded as: 1) Done; 2) Ongoing but no resources out of the direct control of the cost center manager are needed; 3) Additional Resources required. For those requiring additional resources, a resource planning request process (draft document and process is discussed in a separate document) could be used.

III. CPC can analyze the enrollment/success/graduation trends from last year’s program reviews and categorize each discipline as either being in a steady state, growing (may indicate a need to increase base budget allocation), or declining (could indicate a need to increase base budget to support a program, or an opportunity to reduce base budget).