



## INSTRUCTION PLANNING COUNCIL

Friday, March 20, 2009

10:00 am - 11:30 am

Building 17, Room 105

### MEETING MINUTES – 3/20/2009

**Present:** Jenny Castello, Patty Dilko (Faculty Co-Chair), Denise Erickson, Salumeh Eslamieh, Sharon Finn, Linda Hayes, Martin Partlan, Joanna Pounds, Rita Sabbadini, Ben Smith, Janet Stringer (Administrative Co-Chair), Greg Stoup.

**Absent:** Byron Ramey, Carol Rhodes, Joan Rosario.

---

#### 1. Approval Agenda – Approved

#### 2. Approval of Minutes – March 06, 2009

#### 3. Business

##### I. Program Review

1. Discussed whether the biannual program reviews provide sufficient information to determine equipment, personnel, and facilities needs for instruction programs or if another assessment tool is necessary.

- Include section level metrics
- Include action plan for next cycle
- Need for more reflection/information on data
- Ask for a two-year curriculum plan
- Change the name to Program Planning to emphasize forward planning

2. Provide feedback to the Academic Senate committee working on the program review forms about the process used this year to complete the biannual reviews.

- Consistent data needs to be provided and presented
- Deans and Managers review data and include a few questions related to the data to induce more reflection; data comes with questions already prepared by Deans and Managers
- Instructions on how to reflect on data could be included in drop down boxes
- Provide training on how to “cut and paste”

3. Provide feedback to the Academic Senate committee working on the program review forms and how they might be reformatted to obtain better information needed.

- Add columns for numbers of sections, IGETC, day and evening, enrollments
- Automatically populated forms
- Separate new curriculum from banked and deleted
- Faculty list for the department
- Data packet for each department with tables and graphs
- Names of authors of report
- #3.A indicates minimum of 2 years – change to 5 years
- Form should be the annual equipment request with links to item and cost
- Drop down boxes with comments, instructions, and sample language
- Instruction to answer all questions
- Include justification for new position, if requested

Targeted questions to address after studying the biannual reviews.

1. Who gives feedback?

- Division faculty committee to review the program review with Deans
- Martin will take this idea to Academic Senate

2. How do we keep this process of program review positive and supportive?

- Focus on forward planning emphasis
- Positive language in scope and purpose language at the beginning of the document
- Program review is not the forum to complain

3. Should these program reviews be made public?

- Only college wide
- District probably wants only abstract from the comprehensive not bi-annuals

During the discussion, a question came up whether a department that is already doing their comprehensive for the current year also needs to do the biannual.

**4. New Business**

The next meeting will be 4/3/09.