INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW
Wednesday, March 26, 2014

MINUTES

Attendees: Teri Henson, Jill Carbone, Catherine Suarez, Jason Morris, Tina Inzerilla, Angella VenJohn, Karin Spirn, Nadiyah Taylor, Robin Roy

Note Taker arrived at 2:40 pm.

Jill: PURR might be too long – maybe change to the update form.

Teri: It's important to get those words in there. Let's call the meeting to order now even though the rest of the committee isn't here. Jill and I went to the IPC meeting. There was a lot of talk that IPC doesn't know what to do - no experience. What is the college's priority? Is it broad, real detailed?   It probably falls in the middle. The goal for this semester is to recommend planning priorities to President.   Mission vision/values; Program Review Dean's Summaries; and, condensed Master Plans. We are going to try to determine what planning priorities look like. We are going to look at other plans. We discussed at the meeting about Program Review and their feedback. We emailed Rajinder/IPC and talked about the gap year.

Teri: Phase in 3 years between updates - not starting this Spring, but in the Fall. Orange Coast document was sent to Rajinder as an example. It showed a full calendar year cycle process. The IPC seems interested in working w/ us.

Angella: Did you see Orange Coast Program Review?

Teri: I found their website almost impenetrable. I didn't find their Program Review forms.

Angella: In their accreditation report they speak to a Program Review process.

Catherine: I'm interested in how it might be used and how it works

Teri: Orange Coast has a good cycle and I'd like to know how they do it. I do have a question about one-time funding and ARR.   Orange Coast has a 60 page document which I sent to Rajinder. A Guide to Planning and Governance.

Angella: Would Jan have anything?

Teri: The IPC is getting started and we are hopeful for help moving forward. With regard to spring tasks . . . Rajinder asks what kinds of data is needed. Probably Fall and Spring rather than a 5 year rolling average. How is that used?   What's the process for review and validation? We were given an accreditation standard form and Jill and I are still working on it. In doing it we

received the Guide to Evaluating Institutions. It's clear we're not doing what is expected. Moving forward we are looking at a standard as an example. I don't want to talk a lot more about this today. We'll cover it more at the next meeting. If we are not meeting these standards, it's time to change now.

Angella: If we don't meet the standards . . . how about designing the template on what we are doing then stick the guide standards in?

Nadiyah: It can bridge the reflection and planning portion.

Teri: How can it be used and by whom?   We need an established time line, then we'll need to start on the conversion including the Student Services template, then the pre accreditation reports need to be done. There are 77 action terms that need to be addressed. The Program Review committee only got 2 of them.

Angella: We created this monster!

Teri: We have one mostly done.

Jill: It requires evidence . . . we've worked for hours.

Karen: Can't you delegate some of this to us?

Teri: I'm going to send out what we're looking for. We've blue bulleted what we need according to the guide. All of this needs to be collated and sent to Jeff Sperry for archive.

Karen: Is the accreditation team really looking at all of this?

Angella: The action/Improvement plan is where we got the 77 items.

Teri: The planning agendas are not looked at. Maureen O'Herin will assist with this. The Senate asked us to reconfigure our membership. Combine or deactivate committees. Can we reduce our memberships? Your opinion? We could probably decrease. Do we want another classified as Julie is very busy taking notes? Perhaps the IPC can come together w/ us to read program reviews.

Jill: We want them to be involved so we would agree to decrease membership.

Teri: We need to create a template. This is only for instruction. To Student Services - I already emailed the Deans and Frances. I need you input and program analysis. We can broadly customize the program analysis for different program needs areas. Program Planning and resource requests: The outcomes of Program Review and plans for next year and what resources needed. This seemed to come out of our discussions. Maybe the IPC would only need parts 2 and 3. This is a general model. We used the notes to create this.

Angella: We wouldn't have curriculum or data management.

Teri: Rajinder says we'll include 2013/14 data. Any thoughts?

Jill: We are trying to find middle ground yet keep it familiar.

Karin: Is this annual?

Jill:	This isn't the triennial.
Teri:	Jan had a good idea – call it a unit plan. Minimize work overload.
Nadiyah:	It's helpful to say you don't need full analysis? What you are really asking for is a bullet point.
Teri:	Summarize changes maybe.
_____:	Sounds good.
Jill:	Teri and I present to Town Hall in April. Recap discussion: Where is it now, hoping Jan and Barry discuss it, and we'll roll out the update form for purposes of planning. Don't think of it as Program Review. This is for planning purposes.
Angella:	Good idea.
Catherine:	This may confuse people w/ all the different names.
Jill:	I like Program Review update.
Angella:	Let's bring this up @ Town Meeting.
Teri:	The Deans suggested we use the same template. It didn't work well … why use it again?
Catherine:	To tell the truth, I felt like it was a lot longer.
_____:	I felt that too.
Karin:	Does everyone have to answer? Can we use yes/no questions about changes?
Nadiyah:	We laughed about this. Can we skip the first part and go right to program planning? Do we have to have all of this?
Teri:	We use analysis of data to support the planning piece. Do we need all of them? Maybe not. There are 5 areas to look at.
Angella:	HR, Technology?
Teri:	We could probably do yes/no questions. The FA, Enrollment Management, CEMC and Administrators talked the Chancellor out of holding FTEF.
Jason:	I'm nervous about the growth on the table, however, grab it!
Teri:	If we want to offer new courses, where exactly is that request placed?
Jason:	I would audit discipline plans and check the schedule. I'd check expenditures. If under – go for it. If over – cut back.
Nadiyah:	It depends on the Deans.
Teri:	We need to give reasons why you'd want a new section or course. There has to be a rationale.
Jason:	The PE Department didn't like cuts. The Faculty came to the meeting to complain and request.

Angella:	What is the process?
Nadiyah:	We need enrollment management in Program Review. How do you get that data – waitlist, student data, etc.?
Teri:	You can get all kinds of reports.
Angella:	I didn't know that.
Catherine:	The rationale for FTEF needs documentation per Deans. It might be short for Summer. I specifically plan for our students not outsiders.
_____:	No we don't know about this.
Teri:	Take out enrollment management?
Tina:	Are we just taking it out?
Teri:	This is for the update.
Tina:	Oh, OK.
Jill:	Have to update course outlines every year. Is the language too vague?
Nadiyah:	Need language about relevancy – can we have just if appropriate? Describe any internal or external impacts which will affect your curriculum plans for 2015-16.
Tina:	Why are there SLOs twice?
Teri:	Section 1 – Program Review reviews itself and section 2 is the common outcome for everyone. We need to keep the focus on the student.
Nadiyah:	Section 2 – general planning. How do we accomplish things? It may lead to resource requests or not. Example: Retire outside the cycle but really will it impact the program? Is that planning?
Teri:	Things happen so it can't be included in Program Review. It's not realistic in a planning way. How do we deal with issues that pop up? It comes back to who is the audience. Deans, the Planning committee? Planning is more like Math offering Math Jam in June 2016 - here's the plan . . .
Jill:	Where do you see the program going?
Angella:	Why include initiatives not accomplished?
Teri:	Written in 2011/12 so we need to capture 2012/13 and 2013/14.
Tina:	Include the SLO information in 2012/13 and 2013/14 as well?
Teri:	Yes. On to Resource Requests
Jason:	People used to write rationales. Isn't there a need for it? Maybe put it in Program Review? If no new FTEF, nothing needs to be done. If the goal is to make it simple, Faculty would simply go to the meeting.
Teri:	Ideally you would work w/ the Deans.

Nadiyah:	This might allow for some equity as there are different levels of understanding, The Deans do things differently.
Karin:	There needs to be a better process so would we put it in Program Review?
Jason:	Take a broad approach. What are your FTEF plans for the next 3 years?
Teri:	Let's leave it in for now.
Jill:	Let's think about it. Section 3 – Technology. Software only.
Nadiyah:	Supplies – can we say we're running out of white board markers?
Teri:	There is a "new supplies" section. There was lots of confusion last year.
Nadiyah:	One of the Deans said cost it out.
Teri:	Do it through RAC. I don't think we should ask people to do this on this document.
Teri:	Any other thoughts? It doesn't look shorter.
Tina:	No.
Nad	Program Planning. In the last Program Review, there were a lot of conversations about objectives. Do we need to provide directions? Internal, control?
Teri:	I'll send out for review. Thoughts?
_____:	Yes.
Teri:	Thank you all. Next meeting we'll talk about Student Services input and how it changes the form. I'll send out a copy of "Guide Standards."

Meeting adjourned at 4:18 pm.

Minutes submitted by Julie Thornburg.