# Instructional Program Review Committee

## Minutes

Date: 03/28/14

Location: Board Meeting Room

**Joint Meeting of the Instructional Program Review Committee, Non-Instructional**

**Program Review Committee and the Finance, Budget and Planning Committee**

**IPRC Members in attendance: Jessica Gibbs, Karen Tomlin, Ed Burg, Deborah Chesser**

<u>**Proposed Discussion Items from IPRC**</u>

- ➢ Current status of this cycle? Ip due Dec

- ➢ Reports
  - o NIPRC: tier 1 currently being finalized, waiting for Stem, rumor false concerning incomplete reports.
    - ▪ Where we are with tech review? Last year a technical review was performed on NI comprehensive PRAISE. Little participation from the NIPRC. Created a shortened process that merely showed completed/"sustainable continuous quality progress" (results an summary on the VVC on website). Discussion on the purpose of technical reviews:
      - Make sure the product is meaningful. Rubric for NI addresses educational master plan, progress made on ACCJC standards/recommendations, etc.
      - These reviews are important. Allow the respective committees to evaluate the process of program review. Both IPRC and NIPRC have technical reviews built into our timelines
      - The Handbook is on SP as well as on the VVC website under program review. It is time to do a revision. Update the process

based on surveys and technical reivews. For IPR, there are two processes involved: comprehensive PRAISE and Annual Update. Templates are being revised.  PR Coordinator and OIER will be offering workshops including connecting program planning to EMP. The IPRC Technical Review has a Rubric  that includes requirements set in ACCJC standards, etc.

- o IPRC: Instructional program review reports were due December 1, 2013. 47/48 have been turned in; missing Ed tech.
- o FBPC : Deans currently working on tier 1 summaries. Discussion of the first cycle of AP 6200: FBPC met and prioritized requests based on Tier 2 summaries and prioritization lists, as well as reference to other levels of reports (see above under NIPRC)

- ➢ Timeline-
  - o Current Status? We are month ahead of what were at this time last year (improvement).
  - o Future timeline: IPR has Oct 1 deadline, reconvene for committee to perfom technical review. Faculty will start preparing for the 2014 cycle (Budget Year 2015-2016): Trac B on comprehensive cycle.
    - ▪ What areas in regards to the timeline have been problematic?
    - ▪ Instructional programs get our research data in Sept. Last year was a challenge for Hass to get drafts in for technical review due to later than expected availability of data. Got 13/26 reports to review. Need a solution for that backup of data availability. Two possible solutions: 1) have the data set leader changed from fall term to summer term. 2) move the timeline dates so that IPR reports are due in Feb after the holiday break. Potential problem: if we push the timeline back it effects committee work: summer vacation, conferences, etc, where members, particularly faculty, may not be able to meet.  Some dates are set in concrete and will affect the change of the timeline (that last date Aug 25). IPRC proposes extend date for IPR to mid feb. March 30 for tier 1 (the date for the Tier 1 summaries

was postponed both in the first cycle as well as this year anyways. We need identify the problem. Ex: enrollment, deans take long time? There is a long time between deadlines for IPR due date and Tier 1 due date.

- The issue for late availability of data last year was that it was the first time that disaggregated data for DE was generated. Other factors that may affect availability of data: we have to assume faculty have turned in grades. Can't pull too early.

- Suggestion: try to identify those factors that impact the data, timelines, process. Create plan. Put pressure put on those who are lagging. Why that length of a gap with timelines? College closed for the winter holiday. Faculty are on break and not working. At the joint chair meeting it was discussed to kick back that date. Make due date before break. May 19 the FBPC must have budget prioritization list to the President/Superintendent. June 10 it goes to the board. Need to better enforce the due dates. Seems like instructional deans don't do a good job. It was noted that 9 instructional programs did not submit by the deadline. First date is faculty driven. The IPRC or the PR coordinator has zero power to enforce; can only support, assist, remind and encourage. Also, the December 1 final due date coincides with end of term/holiday.

- Deans did not have a good understanding of the process in the past; it is now better. The length of the gap (for Tier 1 summaries) should not happen again. Lack of leadership, exclusion of faculty are both concerns for IPRC. We have no system in place, no procedure, for enforcement of the timelines and process outlined in the handbook. The system appears to be the problem, not the people. Signature pages to confirm inclusion of those that should be involved in planning for programs need to be included. Examples for some NI programs and Tier summaries where signature pages were discussed, as well as how those areas approach "robust" discussion for development of prioritized requests. The process must be self –driven. Encourage faculty to want to participate, or require their involvement. Dean should be with chairs within the division, etc.

- Feedback is important. Why were requests prioritized or not? Managers' fault. Every level should have feedback. Result of praise reports example: CIS problems not getting request #1for 8 yrs. Availability of funds affects outcome of the prioritization recommendations. The story: may not have a robust disc at dean's level. People never get what they request, issue: we don't have sufficient funds. Purpose of reports is not the funds. It is to look at how healthy your program is. Don't mix the two. Better effective use of resources needs to happen.  Ex. (facilities) Academic Commons. Disciplines are scattered all over campus without logical planning.  Make better sense: CIS with Electronics. One IA shared for several labs. (that assumes we have a process for it).
- Repurposing these requests? We will do that. Many go to the foundation. Should not have that. IPR templates will generate reports to committees. Problem: when recommendations go to cabinet, why isn't FBPC seeing that? Process where rec's from all committees is addressed. We often leave out the planning part in FBPC. Odell moon is now chairing that subcommittee. Template for NIPRC asks "who else can benefit from this?" ex: English requesting doc cameras. Was put under Instructional Media dept. PRAISE and now all can benefit. Let's not build silos. Adjust the request forms so we can pull reports. List of requests for IT, etc. when we plan, we look at what we have in front of us. Different this time. Cross-program impacts and it is helpful when deans have that conversation. Planning decisions should be made by committee and at program level.
- A bigger view is needed. In senate discussions, plans for forum-style meetings, such as during convocation, are being planned. We don't want silos. AP 6200 process is working, we are getting there.  Peter a: schedule it! Problem in past: spur of moment decisions. Have to stick with planning.  Guilty of planning math lab. Maybe not the right place.

➢ Budget worksheet revisions- IPRC discussion: faculty needs to identify when revising the worksheet. Costs, budget codes, etc all need considered. This draft (handout) has had robust discussion in committee.

  o Current status?

  o Instructional Program Needs: need to "tease out" requests with object codes. Need to identify what is being requested separately, not lumped together. Example discussed: technology committee not to list expenditures, but rather provide a guideline of needs through evaluation. Feeds Frank Smith an overview. His experts determine what it requires to fulfill.

  o Example from instruction: Top 5 requests are faculty hire. FBPC does not look at personnel…..but we do. In 1992 there were 91 fulltime faculty, now 117. Increase due to the Partnership for excellence fund, but money was pulled. Same happening now, bumping budgets. Prop 30 discussion: Apportionment money? Divided up two ways. If prop 30 goes away they have earmarked what goes away. Prop 30 sunsets in '16 and '18. Economy is not improving. Not growing that fast. General fund money is being replaced with earmarked funds.

  o Worksheet needs to be functional for user and also end user for analysis. If it is light on quantitative will have problems. Need both qualitative and quantitative. IPRC has already discussed the idea of instructional programs receiving the last 3 years of  budget history so can see what spent. Complication: who provides it? IPRC wants it so that our chairs can see past, current data when making decisions over budget requests. What the IPRC is asking for: object codes and other info incorporated. Need faculty necessities in the final product, be it a supplemental worksheet tethered to end product, or in the official product. Problem with initial proposals of revision to the worksheet from the OIER was the workflow issue. Can work to re-design so works with budget codes, data transfer, etc. FBPC will review these. Faculty will begin next cycle in May. Will need end product by end of this term.

➢ Program Review Handbook

- o Combined or Separate Instructional and Non-Instructional? Need to discuss in joint meeting before end of term. It has been 2 years since the adoption of the handbook. Need to discuss workflow in the handbook. Revisions to be done this year.

➢ Other
- o Peter Allan: would like to see this discussion again, beneficial!