Opening comments:
• When Ohlone provides an accreditation update report in March, need to use rubric for program review. Browning & Wright to review rubric to see if the Task Force needs to apply it for program review assessment similar to the way it was used to assess planning.
• Review of Goal Implementation graphic that shows how the annual planning process cycles within the strategic planning process.

Strategic Planning Cycle
• Working on front end, beginning with environmental scan.
• Environmental scan update (Mike Bowman):
  - Composed of ~4 different documents in progress. Prioritizing. When complete, will have one document that resembles WASC self-study re: demographics. Will have summary of distilled points to understand and react to. List of questions that could be provoked as you look at data.
  - Last document will consist of publishable summary of external environment, comparison of internal data to external information, etc.
  - Hoping to have snapshot done in ~2 weeks. This type of project is never complete, as data is ongoing. Will have "finished enough" piece for publication.
  - Time to consider format for electronic "fact book", to include graphics to make it look like a book. A great tool to have a data book in user friendly format.
  - Once we have data, important to be able to share with outside community for feedback and input. Opportunities to respond and/or educate community we serve. Connection to community. Same thing needs to happen within the district. This could serve as a means to get feedback. Collect information in a way that does not influence outcome.
  - Analysis / Once data gathered, consider "how we're doing". Determine future directions. Underpinning the need for environmental scan.
  - Review of Mission, Vision, Values, & Goals. Especially with changes in economy, need to reconsider and shape them in response to impacts.
  - Electronic format allows for easy updates and continuous review and analysis. Opportunity to create great resource for the community. Ohlone's research website could become known as community resource. A way to solicit opinions and needs. Survey section of environmental scanning website, a possibility.
  - All program review efforts ought to know about data resource to see how it might relate to their program(s). Budget information as part of e-scan site. Robust electronic resource.
• Webteam responsible or someone else? So far, Bowman providing information to Webteam and it's being handled without challenges. Jon Degallier's class works on surveys and volunteered their help.
• Research website will also prove valuable when we begin serious consideration of another bond measure. Public opinion surveys prior to bond to help inform. Ohlone input regarding survey questions, to use more broadly than just "will the bond pass?"
• Will assist with next self-study as well. Many documents and data could be available via link(s).
• E-scan will also help new programs as they consider what's appropriate for which area. Another benefit will be data available for grants consideration.
• Comparison between ourselves and the Bay 10. We can see how we're doing with other colleges in our same geographic area. Relatively speaking, for example, our faculty are younger than the Bay 10.
• Goal setting as next piece. Need mechanism for reviewing goals in response to economic situation.

• Annual Planning

• Discussion of “Approximation Concept”.
• Practicing our ideal. This task force has already helped make key concepts gel. We want to make program review central to planning process. Link between budget and program review -- at top of rubric. Ohlone poised to create model that could set trend for other institutions dealing with this issue. Very little budget flexibility. Getting in front of issue to have discernable impact. Make program review ongoing (yearly) in an easy manner to feed into planning process.
• New Curricunet module will help. What can we do now to approximate for '09/10 budget? Every program to come up with one improvement. College Council to consider way to prioritize. In new module, people can identify program improvement objectives, an action plan, and what resources they'll need to achieve them.
• At this time, request one program improvement outcome, what goal it relates to, determine action steps, resource needs, and how to assess success.
• Criteria by which we make decisions. Notion that we want to prioritize college goals each year. Tell people before they begin writing their objectives, how they'll be judged.
• Some goals, some programs relate to much better. Some areas may feel slighted if their area does not relate as closely to the goal that's considered a priority for any given year.
• Soliciting program review objectives: please be aware of "x". We should be able to plan each year, regardless of if we have resources. Opportunity to brainstorm about creative solutions to achieve goals.
• Budget consideration deadline? Budget process usually by 15th of June (for tentative budget). Budget usually to College Council by May 15. Preliminary budget in February/March, but this will be too early for any prioritization to occur.
• Follow-up accreditation report to WASC on other recommendations due March 15. Helpful to be implementing approximation process so it could become part of evidence for 3/15 report. Want to have one objective submitted from all 80 programs. Criteria may be driven by what's submitted, as well as how we achieve goals (with economic constraint caveat).
• If every program participates, encourages buy-in to process. Tool developed to do approximation will be used for CurricuNet module. Need quickly if we want input before the end of the semester. Survey monkey? MS Word document? Critique of input at some point?

• Program review pilot group for consideration:
  - Basic Skills
  - A/P
  - Psychology
  - Philosophy
  - Athletics
  - Research
  - PE
- Kinesology
- Foundation
- Computer Science
- Facilities

- Outcomes that would improve each program -- and how they relate to student learning outcomes. Concerned that we could get 80 program improvement outcomes that aren't connected to SLOs.
- Zero-based thinking in terms of resources. Ask yourself: What do I need to get by? Should be part of Program Review. This will make the process useable in times of budget increases and declines.
- Review at next meeting. Encourage alternate ways to achieve outcomes.
• If next meeting is Wed., November 5 (1:00 - 2:30) / Outcomes due 10/31
  - Interim Planning for Urgent Needs
  - Goal Review & Prioritization

• Reconsideration of goals with economic situation in mind. After environmental scan, look at goals to see if they're a reflection. As part of accreditation, need to develop institutional process for review.

• Define cycle, participants, etc. In current strategic plan, each goal had task force that defined measurable objectives. Good idea to review those objectives again.

• Consider goals in terms of a 3-year / 5-year timeline. Assessment and updating current objectives. College Council is the strategic planning entity.
  - Program Improvement Objectives
  - Prioritization Process
  - Baseline Resource Analysis

• Confirming next meeting (Wednesday, November 5 / 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.) / Room 1407
  - Critique program improvement objectives
  - Develop glossary of terms