

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, October 7, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Juanita Celaya, Michael Claire, Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, Fauzi Hamadeh, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, Ludmila Prisecar, Erica Reynolds, Stephanie Roach, James Roe, Jan Roecks, John Sewart, Jeremiah Sims, Katarina Stein, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal, Mary Vogt, Andreas Wolf

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Review Summary Notes from September 16, 2016 Meeting

The summary notes from the September 16 meeting were approved.

Norming Session for Program Reviews

The committee spent time reviewing the process by which they will review the program reviews. Milla McConnell-Tuite and David Laderman provided the context for the norming process and how it is used in other settings (e.g. English faculty engage in norming sessions in order to create consistency when grading essays.) Because IPC is such a diverse group, it was thought that this norming activity would help ensure that the committee is consistent when reviewing the program reviews and in providing feedback to the program review authors. David distributed a document which served to provide some questions/prompts the small groups could ask when reviewing the program reviews. Together the group reviewed two sample program reviews and provided their perspective on the quality of the content included in the program review. This discussion helped committee members gain better understanding of what to look for and how to evaluate the program reviews. Members should make sure that program reviews address each of the questions asked in each section. It is important that clear connections are made to the College Mission and Strategic goals. In addition, while we are not to “judge” the conclusions that are drawn from the author’s review of the data provided by PRIE, it is important that a thoughtful analysis of these data have taken place, conclusions drawn, and changes, as appropriate made as a result of the examination of these data. It is also important for programs to note any student populations that are disproportionately impacted and how the program/department may be addressing this disparity. It was noted that such information might, if noted in many program reviews, become an identified institutional “theme.” As we review the program reviews, other items might emerge as “themes.” Jennifer Hughes mentioned that she recently attended ACCJC site team training and participated in a site visit. The importance of using program review as a means for examining SLO and other data and then making programmatic changes, as appropriate, is critically important. Colleges are no

longer getting “free passes” if they don’t have established SLOs or are not continuously using the results of the SLO assessment and program review to improve student success and institutional effectiveness.

The program review feedback form is currently being revised and will be sent to members soon. In addition, it was suggested that “model” program reviews from the last cycle be posted to the Program Review and Academic Senate websites so that authors can refer to them when completing their program reviews. Program review authors are also encouraged to review their program reviews with their dean/supervisor prior to submission.

Committee members may begin reviewing their assigned program reviews soon. Members can access the online submissions via the Program Review website (Jennifer will send information next week). Members should only read those with a “submitted” rather than “draft” status. In addition, if members find any program reviews that appear to be deficient (i.e. incomplete, have not analyzed data, etc.) they should notify Jennifer and David who will alert the appropriate dean and program review author that the program review needs to be revised and resubmitted.

Discuss Process for IPC Review of Program Review – Assign Small Groups

Jennifer Hughes shared the latest draft of the Program Review timeline which includes dates for IPC to review the program reviews in small groups. These review sessions will take place on November 4 and November 18. If groups wish to work together before these dates and finish their work, they do not need to attend the November meetings. Jennifer mentioned that final changes were being made to the program review assignments and she will send those out early next week.

SSSP Structure/Committee; Integration of SSSP/Student Equity/Basic Skills

Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza mentioned that conversations are already taking place regarding the integration of the Student Equity (DIAG) and Basic Skills plans. She and Jeremiah Sims, our new Director of Student Equity, are engaging the members of these committees in discussions. In addition, the State Chancellor’s Office recently held a joint Student Equity and SSSP meeting at which there was some mention of integrating SSSP and Student Equity plans and possibly merging budget reporting. We expect to learn more in the near future.

Other Items

The committee was reminded that the next IPC meeting is scheduled for October 21. The second hour of that meeting, from 2-3 p.m. will be devoted to an all college Budget meeting, at which Kathy Blackwood, Mike Claire, Jan Roecks and Ludmila Prisecar will provide updates.

Next Meeting: Friday, October 21, 2016