<div align="center">

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, February 22, 2013

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, College Center, Building 10, Room 468

</div>

Members attending: Alexis Alexander, James Carranza (co-chair), Juanita Celaya, Michael Claire, Susan Estes, Fauzi Hamadeh, John Kilic, Maggie Ko, Paige Kupperberg, David Laderman, Deborah Laulusa, David Locke, Beverley Madden, Kathy McEachron, Teresa Morris, Henry Villareal, Andreas Wolf

Summary: James Carranza

<div align="center">

Meeting Summary

</div>

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with one change.

1. "Program Director" was changed to "Project Director."

Summary Notes from February 1, 2013 Meeting

The summary notes were approved noting the change in title.

Project Director Request from Kathy Ross – Decision

After reviewing the request and clarifying the title as Project Director, the IPC members voted unanimously to approve and forward the request to the Budget Planning committee.

Update on Orientation Session for IPC Task Forces

James Carranza shared the Orientation Meeting Summary. And he summarized some of the key points he and Jennifer Hughes made clear to the task force members. One is that their participation on our IPC task force is to be a learning experience. We do not expect them to be experts in other fields. This is an opportunity for them to learn about the college. Also, James highlighted the importance of the committee not feeling rushed to make recommendations by the end of the semester. He explained that he and Jennifer encouraged the task forces that if they need more time, perhaps well into Fall 2013, to take it; we are supportive.

Develop Approach for Reviewing Program Review Themes and Trends (Order switched with Rubric for discussion)

IPC considered the program review outline. James provided an overview of the PR sections. The proposed process and timeline follow:

1. April: Divisions meet to identify themes and trends from their program reviews submitted March 25. These themes/trends are submitted to IPC by the end of April. (We

could consider developing a short form to be completed by the division.)

2. Early May: IPC meets and breaks up into small groups to review the Program Reviews (submitted by departments) by divisions and reviews the themes the division has submitted. Each small group should familiarize themselves with the program reviews of the departments within the division that they are reviewing and the themes and trends of the division. We then have a report out by each of the small groups from IPC (as we did at the planning session) and determine if there are common themes/trends that cross divisions. It's important that as a body, IPC has reviewed all the program reviews, but that we do so by breaking into small groups responsible for reviewing X number of the PRs. Deliver: Rubric back to department, acknowledge division themes, develop institutional themes based on division ones. Consider initiatives/actions in planning.

3. We may then wish to determine if there are any themes/trends that might result in a plan of action/initiative for IPC to pursue in the following year, along with other initiatives that are developed as a result of our review of the EMP and other planning documents that is conducted in the fall of each year.

The group agreed that the process is reasonable. Departments complete PR. Divisions identify themes, and these come to IPC, where IPC acknowledges them, perhaps refining them and incorporating them into "IPC themes," and in the process reviews all program reviews and completes a feedback rubric for each.

Andreas raised the question of funding cycles and if something is requested in program review how might it be possible for it to be funded or implemented in fall. We have a year lag time between PR and implementation. Mike suggested that we might be able to accommodate fairly straightforward requests, particularly if IPC feels these demonstrate clear need based on college planning and research. The group acknowledged we would need to consider PR in the context of the funding cycle. Henry pointed out that we'll need to make sure that we do a thorough job of reading the PR documents and themes in the context of college data. There will be a lot of information to process. The group agreed. James and Jennifer will need to consider the agenda and plan accordingly. Before the end of the semester, we also need to consider setting our College Index targets. Kathy McEeachron inquired about the process for starting new programs since the program review only focuses on existing programs. Susan Estes acknowledged how important this is to moving the college forward. The group shared various ideas, acknowledging that IPC might need to consider a process for bringing forward new programs in the near future.

Rubric for IPC Feedback on Program Review

To follow up on the discussion of process, IPC members considered the rubric faculty have requested. In ASGC discussions, faculty (and others) have requested some sort of substantive but not overwhelming feedback. The group reviewed the PR outline template and determined which sections are essential to institutional planning. Divisions will forward themes per section and IPC will process them and read department PRs providing feedback. IPC might comment on any section, but the identified sections will be the ones we use to identify themes to inform institutional planning and the ones which will be essential in the feedback rubric.

Bev Madden inquired about adding E. Website Review to the rubric list, but acknowledged that it might not be something IPC would really need—that only she's interested in for her role in Web design and maintenance. Various groups on campus will be interested in certain sections. But the ones IPC needs to focus on and are most essential to college planning have been identified. IPC members might still read any section of PR and use it however best suits their area.

James will take the notes here about process and the rubric back to ASGC for further discussion, finalizing, and approval. Governing Council will draft a rubric for IPC to review and provide feedback on before finalizing.

See the end for the highlighted program review outline for Division Theme sections: (Note: This outline is for Instruction, but Learning Support Centers and Student Services PR follow the same basic template.)

- Other Items
  None.

- Next Meeting: Friday, March 15, 2013, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. College Heights Conference Room, College Center, Building 10, Room 468

Program Review Outline (Instruction)

I. Description of Program

II. Summary of Student and Program Data

A. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

B. Student Success Indicators

1. Student success and demographic variables

2. Course delivery mode

C. Program Efficiency Indicators

D. Course Outline Updates

E. Website Review

F. Additional Career Technical Education Data

III. Student Learning Outcomes Scheduling and Alignment

A. Course SLO Assessment

B. Program SLO Assessment

C. SLO Alignment

IV. Additional Factors

V. Institutional Planning

A. Results of Previous Plans and Initiatives

B. Program Vision

1. Future faculty and staff development initiatives and professional enrichment

2. Future collaboration across student services, learning support centers, and instructional programs

3. Long-range planning, categorized by resources (i.e. faculty, equipment and

technology, instructional materials, etc.)

C. Plans and Actions to Improve Student Success

VI. Resource Requests

A. Itemized Resource Requests

B. Cost for Prioritized Plans