

## Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, May 4, 2013

8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

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

Members Attending: James Carranza (co-chair), Juanita Celaya, Michael Claire, Susan Estes, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Alicia Kinert, Deborah Laulusa, David Locke, Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, John Sewart, Hayley Sharpe, Henry Villareal

### Meeting Summary

#### Review Program Reviews

The committee began its work by sharing general observations of the program reviews.

The following observations were noted:

- **Lack of Connection to Institutional Documents:** Many program reviews did not make the connection or identify the relationship of their programs to the Mission Statement, Diversity Statement, Institutional Priorities or other institutional research. We need to assist departments in starting to see how they “fit” into the bigger picture of institutional planning.
- **Data Analysis:** Many program reviews did not adequately analyze or interpret the data provided nor did they make a connection between the analysis of the data and what the department planned to do as a result. Some reviews seemed to ignore or misinterpret the data (e.g., indicating that everything in the department is fine, yet data reported low loads.) In other cases, some departments simply restated the data, but did not draw any conclusions (e.g., differences in success/retention rates based on age, gender, and ethnicity.) The short and long term plans often had no connect to the data analysis.
- **SLO Assessment:** Departments indicated that they had completed their SLO assessment, but failed to report what was to happen next as a result of the assessment. Also, departments are not reporting trends that might be emerging from the assessment.
- **Connection to Support Services:** Several program reviews mentioned the importance of referring students to support services (e.g. Learning Center, Counseling), but did not discuss this in any detail or adequately describe the integration of student services and instruction.

- **Compliance Document:** Some program reviews seemed to have been developed from a “compliance/deadline” perspective or only to justify a request for resources. In addition, program review has historically focused on advocating for one’s department and the faculty positions needed. As a result, there has been a missed opportunity in seeing how program review relates to institutional planning or how the results of SLO assessment can be used to improve student learning. It was also noted that some program reviews seemed to be responding to the previous program review format.

### **Suggestions Going Forward**

Based on the general observations reported, the following ideas were suggested:

- Provide additional workshops/flex day trainings in completing program review. In doing so, explore ways to shift “culture” from viewing program review as a compliance document only to one that helps inform institutional planning and improve student success.
- Continue to make modifications to program review form based on feedback from faculty and staff.
- Continue to make connection between program review and ACCJC standards but do so in a way that emphasizes student success as the goal.

### **Small Group Review**

The members of IPC then met in their small groups to discuss the program reviews to which they were assigned. Using the feedback rubric form developed, each program review was assessed. The committee then reconvened and discussed their observations of the program reviews in order to ensure that all groups were rating the program reviews against common standards.

### **Next Steps:**

**The committee developed a legend for coding the program reviews as follows:**

1 - Program Review is acceptable; no additional action needed.

2 – Program Review is missing SLO information or CTE information (if it is a CTE program.) Program reviews with this code will be returned to the department with instructions to complete this information and resubmit **by the end of the semester.**

3 – Program Review is missing other information or has been rejected. These will be returned to the department with instructions to resubmit the program review **by September 15.**

Some program reviews will receive codes 2 and 3.

At the next instructional and student services administrators' meeting, scheduled for Tuesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, Jennifer Hughes, Susan Estes and James Carranza will inform the deans of the status of the program reviews in their division. The deans will be responsible for working with the faculty whose program reviews have received codes of 2 and/or 3 to ensure that they are resubmitted by the established dates.

### **Themes and Trends**

The primary focus of the meeting was to complete the review of the program reviews. As a result, there was not adequate time to devote to an extensive review of the division themes and trends. Each small group will find a time to meet before the May 17<sup>th</sup> meeting to have a discussion about themes and trends. Time has also been set aside at the May 17<sup>th</sup> IPC meeting for further discussion.

### **Other Items**

#### **Classified Position Requests**

Jennifer Hughes and Milla McConnell-Tuite will work with PRIE to extract and compile all the classified position requests from IPC so that these can be reviewed and prioritized.

Summary notes provided by Jennifer Hughes, co-chair IPC.