



PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (PEPC) MEETING MINUTES

Present: Dr. Erika Endrijonas (*co-chair*), Robert Cabral (*co-chair*), Yong Ma, Andrew Cawelti, Jonas Crawford, Carolyn Inouye, Paul Houdeshell, Lisa Hopper, Gail Warner, Jim Merrill, Mati Sanchez, Patricia Mendez, Chris Horrock, Christina Tafoya, Bret Black, Maria Pinto-Casillas

Guests: Dr. Duran

Meeting Date: **03/22/2011** Minutes Approved: **02/22/2011** Recorded By: Darlene Inda

AN = Action Needed AT = Action Taken D = Discussion I = Information Only

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

- I. Call to Order I The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.
- II. Approval of Minutes AT The Committee reviewed the minutes of January 25, 2011 meeting. A. Cawelti moved to approve the minutes from January 25, 2011. P. Houdeshell seconded, and *the motion carried unanimously.*
- III. Discussion: Accreditation I E. Endrijonas stated that two budget forums will be held to discuss the Budget and Accreditation as well as CQI. The first forum will be February 23rd from 2:00-4:00pm and another on February 24th from 9:00-11:00am. The first half of the forum will concentrate on Budget and the second half will be Accreditation.
- I E. Endrijonas stated that PEPC will play a key role in regards to Accreditation. She added that we have to conduct ourselves as a viable organization and would like to introduce the idea of metrics because we currently don't have it and are not assessing and measuring ourselves overall as an institution.
- AN E. Endrijonas stated that the Committee needs to devote some time from the remaining meetings to look at the format for next year and engage in dialogue regarding information provided and establish a multi-year process. Annual planning will be done with some programs doing 3 year plans. The long form will be for multi-year and the short form will be from year to year. She is also hoping to get it automated.

- D E. Endrijonas stated that the Accreditation Team noted that we were not providing data and numbers which is what they want to see. They want a much more strenuous evaluation of programs. He stated that we need to link our planning over future years and suggested finding an institution who is already doing 3 and 5 year planning and see how they're doing it. He added that he feels 5 years is too long for a multi-year review and feels it should be done every 3 years.
- IV. Discussion: Mid-year Committee Evaluation and Feedback
- I R. Cabral suggested that the mid-year evaluation be more of a conversation piece to evaluate behavior and how the meeting is run.
- D R. Cabral opened up the discussion with the first question being "What are our strengths?"
- Y. Ma – passing the word to everyone as well as faculty communication.
 - P. Houdeshell – Was very impressed how the group came together and made a decision within a meeting on hiring faculty.
 - M. Pinto-Casillas – we all have a genuine interest in improving the process and respect each other's opinions.
 - J. Merrill – we all get along with one another.
 - C. Horrock – we have a consistency where everyone has understood what was being asked and it has created a behavior culture.
- R. Cabral asked "What are our limitations"?
- C. Inouye – we are not discussing and interacting on our own programs and are doing our own thing. She doesn't feel she knows enough about other departments to make decisions.
 - J. Merrill – he doesn't really know where PEPC is going forward and feels we need to keep working throughout the year.
 - C. Tafoya stated that she would like to have more "report-outs".
 - R. Cabral stated that we're using a more standardized process, which may not serve everyone the same way.

- D E. Endrijonas asked C. Inouye regarding her comment on improving the process and making things more efficient; how can this issue be fixed? She stated that last year people were so worn out with the process by the end of the year, no one attended. She added that she and Robert had these one on one sessions, and Robert setup a group, uploaded all the PEPRs and when it came time to review them, no one had read them.

The Committee then came up with the following comments/suggestions regarding Feedback:

- C. Inouye – let every area provide a brief summary of the PEPC process – what they learned, strengths, etc...
- R. Cabral - one our limitations is our calendar because we spend too much time on the organizational side of PEPC during Aug. & Sept., so to become more efficient, we start the report gathering in Aug. and Sept. and have 3 months of report-out feedback with the members.
- E. Endrijonas – it will get better when we go into the multi-year process because we won't have every department up for deep analysis every year. It will be divided up and her suggestion would be to do it by lottery to be fair to everyone.
- C. Tafoya – written reports don't capture everything and a lot of people write these reports and don't know what they're looking for. The best way to get people the information is to make them come and tell them, rather than email or a rep.
- C. Inouye – we need to come up with a list of open-ended questions.
- C. Horrock – if there were feedback mechanisms, it would create a give and take and breakthrough just updating them because we're reflecting a lot but not really coming up with outcomes.
- M. Pinto-Casillas – a template/final document would make it easier document and take back.

- AN C. Horrock recommended coming up with a one-page summary of feedbacks with generalized comments, which he thinks would help improve quality over time.

- D M. Pinto-Casillas stated in regards to C. Horrock's suggestion that this would be used with the long form every three years and wouldn't expect it every year. C. Inouye added that if there are some programs that stand out, to point out best practices and some things that might be modified in the future.

- AN R. Cabral made a recommendation when reviewing the minutes at the next meeting, to move out these comments and use them as part of the annual evaluation. He would like to start publishing the comments.
- V. Discussion on PBC standard: Campus-wide Resource Request Form
- I R. Cabral stated all refinements and suggestions were taken back and incorporated into the current revised Resource Request Form. The form was filtered out to Student Services and Business Services which was then brought back as an action item to PBC and accepted. He reiterated that it is just a form and does not take the place of planning. He added that it is now available electronically as well as on the portal. Once the forms are turned into him, he will re-upload the form along with the PEPR.
- I E. Endrijonas stated that the old form assumed that the PEPRs were reviewed. This is a stand-alone form that goes back to PEPC on its own. This form is to help with the ranking process and communicates from PEPC to PBC.
- AN The Committee requested and noted the following changes:
- “FY12 Resource Request Form” is changed to read “FY 2011-12 Resource Request Form”.
 - The Fund Source legend has (2) GF codes: one for General Fund and one for Grant Funds.
- I Regarding the process of the form, E. Endrijonas stated:
- Fill out the form, type in your name and date at the bottom, save it and email it to the Dean who will review it, fill out the Fund Source Code, digitally sign and will then forward it to Erika/Robert.
- AN E. Endrijonas stated that the Resource Request Form is due to your Dean by March 11, 2011.
- VI. Discussion: PEP Reports, Feedback, and Resource Prioritization, Completing the Annual Cycle
- I This item was discussed in Item IV.
- VII. Adjournment 4:00 p.m.
- VIII. Future PEPC Meetings
- I
 - March 22, 2011
 - April 26, 2011