Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Wednesday, March 20, 2019

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Room 18-206

Members: Emily Barrick, John Burright, Tarana Chapple, Michael Claire (ex-officio), Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Tabitha Conaway, Laura Demsetz, Heidi Diamond, Krystal Duncan, Georgia Giari, Fauzi Hamadeh (co-chair), Kim Lopez (co-chair), Madeleine Murphy, Luis Padilla, Erica Reynolds, Jose Rocha, Richard Rojo, Elizabeth Schuler, Arielle Smith, Jeramy Wallace (co-chair)

Members Absent: Mondana Bathai, Alicia Frangos, Sarah Mangin-Hinkley, David Laderman, Paola Mora Paredes, Teresa Morris, Elnora Kelly-Tayag,

Guests: Jia Chung, Mike Holtzclaw, Jeremiah Sims, Mary Vogt, Lizette Bricker

MEETING AGENDA

Review of the Agenda

Hilary Goodkind is not able to attend so her presentation will be moved to a future meeting.

Review Summary Notes from the February 20, 2019 meeting

No changes were requested for the summary notes.

Discuss Academic Senate and Student Services Council 2018-19 Program Cycle

Concerns and trends from Program Review 2018: Jeramy reported that the feedback from the Academic Senate reflected that many felt the available data was limited; there is a big demand for more research support and more help from PRIE in general, to collect and analyze data, especially for student success, of which he gave some examples. He personally feels the research department is too small to provide what is needed in addition to all of the planning work that PRIE does, and that more research resources are needed to support faculty's needs. There was also a big discussion on equity themes; he felt that the data and equity research trends were important. The third trend is outdated technology, including online technology. Some equipment is out of date. Out of date software was also a concern/emerging trend. Mike asked for more specific information regarding software incompatibility, which may be fairly easy to fix. Another theme addressed was accessibility to professional development.

Mike discussed how we are making changes in PRIE and research in general in response to the concerns about research availability.

Jeramy also reported that an emerging theme was high school dual enrollment, and ways to get into the high schools to create pathways. In addition, scheduling class cancellations, including capstone classes, were a concern. There are also concerns about communication regarding feedback on resource requests, and the need for some sort of automation in that regard. A further concern was that access to data on equity may be limited.

Review Trends and Themes Quantitative Measures and Target Setting Review 2018-19 Program Review Process

Student Services Council Program Review: Kim mentioned that Student Services does not read all of the program reviews, but she'd like that to happen in the future. They discussed what could be done better. Krystal added that they focused on the redesign and she'd like to see more changes with more focus on assessment, rather than proving they are doing a good job. Emily felt like the repetition had been removed which she felt was an improvement. Kim agreed that some questions had been redundant so they tried to make it less repetitious. Kim felt the template wasn't really fitting student services – so she created a draft that addresses assessment and planning (see handout). She shared the document with the committee.

Lizette and Kim walked the committee through the new template and asked for feedback, explaining each section in detail.

Kim talked about the survey development project with PRIE.

Kim asked for input on what worked and what didn't work for program review in 2018-2019.

Laura said better than in the past was IPC's review process but thinks there could be tweaking of the rubric – that we as a group need better calibration.

Arielle said it would be helpful to see the rubric before they wrote the program review. Since this was her first time doing it, she was blindsided by the resource requests and not prepared to have to create another document. It wasn't as clear as could be that resource requests were a separate process than program review, especially to a new employee.

Jeremiah thought that the process had improved from prior years.

Tarana thought the confusing part was confusion between ASLT and Learning Centers.

Many agreed that Novi Survey was clunky, and that a better submission program is needed for the next cycle.

Madeleine suggested that the responses reflected that people might not quite understand the purpose of program review given the varied responses to the same type of questions.

Some of the adjuncts weren't able to attend the flex day training meetings.

Many agreed there should be more training opportunities or sessions for Program Review.

Instruction videos were suggested.

There should be a deadline where no more editing on the Program Review template is allowed – perhaps more than 2 months or so before it's due.

It was pointed out that this time around, the College was in the middle of a new mission and vision statement approval process, which should not be a problem for the next cycle.

Separate uploaded documents (required by the Novi Survey method) also made it clunky. It was suggested that perhaps more guidance on the actual writing might be provided.

Faculty should get a timeline for getting feedback. Also, it was requested that there be a place to upload documents that serve as evidence in case someone leaves; basically, a repository for documents. Kim referred to the discussion at the last meeting about a document management system, which Hilary said she would be looking into, for sharing research that has been completed.

Announcements

Mike shared highlights from the Board retreat last weekend. The Promise program is now expanded to 3 years if students need it and colleges will be getting additional funding for more staff as well. The Board also is addressing the food and housing challenges for students in need.

Next Meeting: March 27, 2019