

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, April 18, 2014

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, College Center, Room 468

Members Attending: Stephanie Alexander, Ron Andrade, Kathy Blackwood, Juanita Celaya, Michael Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Fauzi Hamadeh, Hanna Haddad, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Maggie Ko, David Laderman (co-chair), Deborah Laulusa, David Locke, Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, John Sewart, Hayley Sharpe, Laura Skaff, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal, Andreas Wolf

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome

Marissa Pienaar, Reading instructor, was welcomed to the committee. Marissa is serving as the new BSI Coordinator.

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with the addition of one item, “Online Withdrawal Survey” requested by Jennifer. (Given the time spent on other agenda items, we did not get to this item.)

Review Summary Notes from March 21, 2014 meeting

The summary notes were approved.

Program Review Process

In preparation for the Saturday, April 26, IPC meeting, the committee walked through one program review together in order to establish consistency in our review process. In reviewing each section of the program review document, committee members shared their observations. It was agreed that the feedback form will be used by group members for the purpose of recording their observations; the form will not be returned to the departments as it was last year. Instead, each group will provide a summary paragraph of the program review which will be shared with the department. Jennifer and David will collect all the summary reports from the group members, review them for consistency, and then return them to the departments. This process will “close the loop” by making sure departments know that IPC has reviewed their program review, noted any highlights, and offered possible suggestions for strengthening the department’s program review in the future. We want to make sure that the feedback to departments is constructive and positive. As the group conducted this exercise, several items were noted that might be included in a future “helpful tips/strategies for program review” document. We will continue to compile these helpful tips during the course of our review session on Saturday and then provide this document to the departments as we start the next program review cycle.

The committee also talked about the current program review process, which requires an annual submission. In the past, CSM had a comprehensive three year program review and an annual update. Subsequently, the annual program review was strengthened and the comprehensive was discontinued. The question arose as to whether program reviews should still be submitted annually or if we should return

to the three year cycle. There is some concern that the annual review does not allow for sufficient reflection on the impact of changes a department has made as a result of their SLO assessment and other data analysis. At the same time, it was expressed that there is need for an annual review in order to tie program review to the resource requests, which occur annually, and for maintaining the connection of program review to the integrated planning cycle. There was a suggestion that modifications to the program review form might also help. For example, if we continue with an annual program review process, it might be possible to only require departments to provide updates to sections of the program review form to reflect any changes. This topic merits further discussion by IPC and the task force of the Academic Senate that has been reviewing and modifying the program review form and process.

Next Meeting: April 26, 2014, 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. Building 18, Room 206