# Ed Cap Program Planning Workgroup – Notes from OCT 16, 2017 meeting

**GOAL**: Make a recommendation to Ed Cap regarding the program planning (PP) process. More specifically, make a recommendation regarding program plan meeting frequency. *Workgroup team present*: Nathan Bowen, John Loprieno, Rolland Petrello, Sydney Sims, and Phil Abramoff, Jenifer Kalfsbeek-Goetz.

**Key points** made by members of the group regarding the importance of the PP process:

* What is contained in Program Plans carries a great deal of weight in terms of resource request decisions and allocations. “If it’s not in the program plan, it will not be funded.” For this reason, the PP has become a “high stakes” aspect of every program, and is viewed as essential if a program wishes to be successful and perceived favorably (or accurately) by leadership, etc.
* The current PP meeting process allows people to be heard. This is particularly valuable for:
  + Smaller programs
  + Programs with new Chairs who are learning the PP process
  + Programs that could face being cut or cut-backs in a budget crisis
  + “Support” programs
  + Programs that may be less familiar to the leadership team.
* PP meetings give programs the opportunity to put forward pressing needs that may otherwise be overlooked.
* Program plans are internally beneficial to the programs and the campus, regardless of accreditation. The process may benefit from change, but programs have come to value the planning process.
* Program plans serve programs … but what is considered a program? If these PP sessions serve programs, do we need to more clearly define or operationally define what a program is?

**Recommendations** to the process:

* We need to re-assess the purpose and goal of program planning and the PP meetings. A more relevant recommendation can be made once we are all on the same page regarding the goal and purpose of the Moorpark PP process. Accreditation? Resource allocation? Interval review of successes and areas of concern? Other?
* Faculty are spending significant amounts of time researching, formulation and writing PPs, and many are still unsure for what purpose exactly. It seems to be a moving target and groups have varying interpretations regarding the purpose.
* Operationalize what is meant by a “program” at MC. Those not considered “programs” do not get put in the process for resource allocation and thus feel they must 'beg' from administration to fund their 'programs'. There needs to be clarity on what qualifies as a program other than an academic discipline.
* Regardless of the final purpose, this workgroup recommends that there be an annual training on writing PPs (Fall Flex?).

In the interim …

* Given the fact that the PP meetings require a great deal of time on the part of the VP’s, the Academic Senate President, and Institutional Research, we recommend that all program have PP meetings as they have had in the past, but that they be spread out across the semesters.
* Some programs may need to be discussed earlier in the year because, for example, they intend to seek categorical funding (CTE) or they may be up for curriculum review or seeking to build new curriculum. In those cases, Deans request that they be reviewed in the earlier months of program reviews (Fall) and the other be reviewed later (Spring).

**Future** Considerations:

* Clarification for why we do the PP process is needed – or maybe the purpose has changed and we need to change with it? Does the process exist to fulfill an accreditation standard (program review), or does the process exist to allow programs to make resource requests, or both? Maybe there are other reasons for this
* A written response from the administrative team that outlines what the PP requests are, and describes an overview of the PP would be ideal for feedback to the programs, especially if we were to go to a model in which programs to not meet each year. As well, it is recommended that the leadership team outline which requests and outcomes are good or problematic, realistic or unrealistic, recommended for funding, etc.
* Ideally, a model for what is expected for the PPs is desired. Faculty and Chairs are unsure what we need in terms format, information (length and depth), etc. It is recommended that 3-5 exemplary Program Plans be provided to the faculty so the community knows what the leadership is looking for in this process.