Draft informal notes PG Planning Committee Meeting April 22, 2013 – by Kim Ginther-Webster

Introduced new Director of Research Dr. Chuen-Rong Chan.

1) Meeting notes from last meeting not yet available.

2) Fostering dialog about data and assessments:
   a) The Program Review SLO Impacts document is from the program reviews themselves. 
      [http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/About_CCSF/outcomes_assessment/support/ProgramReviewSummaryReport.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/About_CCSF/outcomes_assessment/support/ProgramReviewSummaryReport.pdf). This report is based on the final response to Question 4 in program review; however, a significant amount of SLO activity took place after the program review deadline of December 7. Those completing program review were not aware that this report would be assembled, so they may have provided a minimal response rather than giving a full response. In the future, each program review will need to include what is desired in this summary report, we have to consider whether the question being asked is gleaning the planning data we want. In some cases it is, in others it is not.
      - Question to pursue: How do we tie the budget allocations back to the improvements identified in this document? SLOs are only one piece of what drives budget allocations.
      - We should look at the common themes in this document and pull this into planning and budgeting. Who identifies and determines the common themes? Who links the themes to the Board Priorities?
      - To foster dialog, the report has to be embedded in the planning process. We need a consumer of the report (in addition to individual departments), such as the PG Planning Committee.
      - It was suggested we ask about the usefulness of this report in the Program Review Survey currently being prepared.

   b) Scorecard ([http://scorecard.cccco.edu](http://scorecard.cccco.edu)) and data document
      - data for these come from MIS upload and are looked at by various individuals and groups (e.g. Tom Boegel, Matriculation) for consistency in data types. These are uploaded approximately 6 weeks into each semester and annually.
      - Lots of discussion about data accuracy and integrity. The PG Planning Committee can flag issues – we won’t use data that isn’t solid and will advocate for corrections.
      - Need to help people understand the process of how data gets into the scorecard. Research and Planning website under MIS project has flow charts.
      - Concerns expressed about how errors creep into data at the very beginning if people responsible for entering information have not been adequately trained in coding, don’t have the necessary procedures.
      - Argos implementation will make it easier to identify some of the errors before they go into MIS.
      - There’s still time to correct some data and it is worth the effort.
      - Student Success Scorecard was formerly known as ARCC. It is one set of indicators for our planning/budgeting cycle.
      - Non-credit is under Career Development and College Prep. The number is terrible, but it is bad data. It uses certificates, but these are not granted in programs such as non-credit ESL, although there has long been tracking of progress and completion within the department. Various efforts to get the data into the system and counted have been attempted over the years but disagreements and staffing shortages have stalled implementation. Awarding and recording these certificate is the first priority on the VCAA list from program review.
      - Compared to the previous scorecord, the state redefined how the non-credit metric is done, so the numbers dropped drastically.
      - There is a statewide committee looking at non-credit to improve consistency throughout the state.
• We need a definition of “certificate” for non-credit ESL, also need numbers such as persistence, transition from non-credit to credit so we have better data on student progress. It is not known who will decide what certificates count for this report.
• On the Scorecard overall, we’re above the statewide average in most measures.
• Looked at some breakdowns of cohorts – CTE shows some interesting differences in subgroup achievements compared to overall.
• Question about whether it is the goal of this committee to look at data and determine whether we need to do something about various trends, the answer was yes.
• Question: is there a statewide effort to factor in economic trends and other external factors to add to scorecard numbers? Some individuals are working on this but no broad effort we know about.
• Research and Planning is still seriously understaffed compared to the other CCCs used as benchmarks in the FCMAT report.

3) Interim Evaluation of Assessment Planning and Budgeting system – Survey about program review
   a) Send comments to Pam offline
   b) Question about data integrity will be asked along with Argos rollout
   c) Email transition is a concern, so we will wait until week of May 6 to do this survey

4) Prog. Rev. Planning and Resource Allocation Process
   a) VCs have met 4 times. We looked at the Facilities and Capital outlay Tier 1 priorities. Health and Safety was the first criterion for moving things to the top. These are not posted yet. Some repair items on the list cannot wait, so a request is going to the Board to release $500,000 of the budget before July 1. Some of the items on the list (e.g. Electricians) will be ongoing costs that will remain in future budgets.
   b) Chancellor has not yet made decisions on the lists, these are the VC recommendations.
   c) Discussion about faculty and other constituent involvement in advising on the prioritizing of budget requests. This cycle, the VCs met with Pam Mery, but others were not involved directly in prioritizing. Most other CCCs have faculty, classified and student involvement. Models such as the one DeAnza presented should be reviewed. Accreditation requires participation, the College needs to figure out how to do this.
   d) Work on improving the rubric or criteria for prioritizing requests (definitions, additions, who uses it, consistency in application) needs to commence ASAP to improve the next cycle, along with other evaluation efforts. We want to be positive about how far we’ve come, but not complacent about how much work we still need to do to have a fully-developed, effective planning and budgeting process.

5) Technology Plan update
   a) The FIT committee of the Board had asked for cost numbers to attach to the plan. Need to inform the Board that the request to add cost numbers is unrealistic for the type of plan it is, which is strategic, not action-specific. Most administrators are in agreement on this.
   b) Although this is a reversal of the way program review should relate to the college-wide plans, for this cycle we need to review the Draft 2013-15 Technology Plan to make sure it encompasses all the technology-related program review requests. Possibly the Tech Plan Steering Committee could be asked to do this review, which should be straightforward. The draft plan already should be sufficiently broad to cover existing requests.

6) Education Master Plan RFP is not on the Board agenda for this month. The implications for the timeline for creating a new plan are significant.