

## **Program Review Committee Minutes**

February 24, 2015 12:30 - 2:00 PM MB 350A video w/KRVPL5, MAM228, BIS 197

<u>Present:</u> Suzie Ama, Christine Abbott, Lisa Fuller, Kim Kelly, Karee Hamilton, Sylvia Sotomayor, David Villacana <u>Absent:</u> Corey Marvin, Laura Vasquez

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	0	C
1. Call to order	S. Ama	12:30 PM		x
2. Approval of Agenda	S. Ama	Approved with no changes		x
3. Human Resources – 1 <sup>st</sup> Review	R. Hess	<ul> <li>This was approved for a first review, pending the following requests:</li> <li>Executive Summary <ul> <li>Provide the full name for the acronym HRIS.</li> <li>Seems concise and clear</li> <li>The acronyms used in the Executive Summary need to be defined. For example the HRIS system and EEO.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	×	
		<ul> <li>Part 1 – Relevance:</li> <li>First paragraph typo "higest" should be "highest"</li> <li>1. 1. highest – working environment conducive of effective student learning?</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Doesn't sound right</li> <li>1.3. each new all new</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	0	C
		<ul> <li>How is the department mission related to strategic goals?</li> <li>Section 2.7:         <ul> <li>"Human Resources is centralized at the District Office, semicolon therefore all HR related budget costs fall under District expenses and do not impact the College HR Department."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Parts 2 - Appropriateness / Part 3 - Currency:</li> <li>2.6. The adjunct hiring process is not addressed, and I know this to be a significant issue for Faculty Chairs. A survey may not have been conducted yet, but this hiring process should be thoroughly described, and it should be identified as an area needing assessment.</li> <li>Elaborate on on-boarding process</li> <li>Data seems complete, descriptions are developed, it is easier when many of the services are housed at the district level – how are the district services reviewed?</li> <li>How does District and campus work together and support each other.</li> <li>Footnote indicators without footnotes</li> <li>Claims that 1 FT clerical position is not enough, but does not back up that assertion with evidence.</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Indicate "See above" for 2-3 so that it is clear that those sections were not merely skipped. HR is not engaged in instruction of students, so 4-6 can persistently be N/A.</li> <li>Why weren't these developed as part of the program review process?</li> <li>Sections 2-6 are not addressed. Are these sections irrelevant to HR? If so, I recommend indicated N/A because otherwise it seems as though these sections have been overlooked.</li> <li>Gaps identified, could the survey be addressed in this section?</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	ACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	0	C
TOPIC		SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP         / - Planning         5.3. obstacle         5.5.1 think some of the goals could be more specific, or perhaps broken down – for example, what does it mean to improve customer service with departments and public?         More footnote indicators without footnotes.         Since there are no existing AUOs, the discussion of the 3 & 6 year goals should perhaps have more depth – explain how these goals will help HR do its job better as well as pointing out how they align with college goals.         Three and six-year goals were unclear to me. The bullet points suggest the action plan for achieving the goals, but under the bullet points it lists         Strategic Plan #2, HR Manager, etc. without a definition on what role these play in achieving the goals.         Section 5.3:         "There are several concerns with the current Human Resources Information Systems module. While major projects have been implemented, there have been some system functionality problems in the module not caused by HR staff human error. The implementation of Web Time Entry has eliminated manual tracking and has been cost effective with the elimination paper time sheets and printing, semicolon however there are elements of the system that are not user friendly or meet our specific needs. For example, the system allows for a person to be a 'reviewer' or 'approver', semicolon however if a person is put in as a 'reviewer' it does not go through the proper approval sequence. While the terminology is specific to our needs, we cannot utilize each as needed and have therefore had to conform to the system. The next obsticle is with the implementation of FLAC (Faculty Load and Compensation). FLAC allows for the system to upload and automatically build adjunct posi	0	C

ΤΟΡΙϹ	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	0	0 C
		<ul> <li>Overall Impression</li> <li>Good first draft with section 2.6 and 5 needing further development.</li> <li>Somehow seems incomplete, perhaps because there isn't information about how the onboarding programs are going – it seems that there are issues with new faculty orientation, for example, that aren't addressed. I'm also wondering how this meshes with the district services – how are the district services evaluated/reviewed?</li> <li>Typos throughout. There is room for improvement, but I feel that it is a great first draft.</li> <li>Spell out acronyms first time used such as EEO. I know this means equal employment opportunity but someone else may not. What does ACHRO mean? What does FMLA mean?</li> </ul>		
4. Liberal Arts Math and Science	J. Stenger- Smith	The committee confirmed that all requested changes have been made and approved it for a second and final review.	х	
5. Adjournment	S. Ama	1:50 PM		
Meeting Chair: S. Ama	Record	der: S. Ama O Open/C Closed	•	· · · · ·