



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, April 6th, 2018
9:00 am – 12:00 pm, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: James Carranza, Loretta Davis-Rascon, Valeria Estrada, Tracy Huang, Matt Lee, Susan Mahoney, Sandra Mendez, Katie Osborne, Katie Schertle, Christopher Silva-Lucero (ASCC), Rebekah Sidman-Taveau

Members Absent: Nick DeMello, Jessica Kaven

Guests: Michelle Marquez, Dayo Diggs

1) Adoption of [Agenda](#)

Motion – Approve agenda with change of Program Review Resource Request Prioritization to be moved before the Continuation of Program Review.

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes – [March 16th, 2018](#)

Motion – Approve draft minutes from the March 16th IPC meeting

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

3) Business

A. Program Review Resource Request Prioritization

Vice President of Administrative Services, Michelle Marquez, attended the meeting to answer any questions regarding the new program review resource request prioritization process. IPC members were given resource request information for all instructional programs to review prior to the meeting. This information was put together in order to help members complete the resource request prioritization rubric. The original copy of the rubric can be found [here](#). Originally, there were 83 requests for IPC to review and prioritize but Kinesiology, Athletics and Dance made some adjustments prior to the IPC meeting and the total number was reduced and this was noted on the rubric the was completed during the IPC meeting. It was noted that, although the rubric was made available prior to Program Review SPOL entry deadline, this is a new process and some programs

do a better job of tying their requests into their program reviews than others. Because of this fact, we need to be forgiving because in the past we had not facilitated the tying together of our resource requests to our program reviews. Additionally, SPOL is not very intuitive and it is not very clear as to “what goes where”.

Prior to starting the process, there was a question as to whether or not it would be helpful to have someone from each program as part of the groups discussing the resource requests. An issue in the past has been not having all of the information needed in order to make informed decisions. It is important to note that if we are going to make this a practice, we need to be sure we have representatives from ALL departments at this meeting in order to be fair. It was decided that if there is no information provided on a certain rubric area, the Planning Council could choose not to score that rubric item and then bring it back to the programs for additional information.

IPC members worked on one resource request together and then split into small groups to review different resource requests and input their scores on the rubric. These were sent to Chrissy Kincer, Executive Assistant to the VP of Instruction, who will compile all information in a master rubric that will then be sent on to the VP of Administrative Services.

After the process was completed, IPC members provided their feedback on the process as follows:

- i. A lot of time has been spent putting information into SPOL, but it is evident that the Planning Council still may not have all of the information that would be needed in order to complete the rubric.
- ii. The rubric should be organized by department, as that is how the additional information is provided to the Planning Council. It is currently organized by type (I, e. supplies, subscriptions, etc.).
- iii. There was some confusion about the rubric’s areas of interest. In particular, Safety, Accreditation, and General Need should become separate categories. Additionally, Safety and/or Health issues should rise to the surface and be flagged so as to not get lost in the prioritization process.
- iv. It might be beneficial to simplify the rubric scoring into “satisfactory” and “not satisfactory” instead of a Likert scale.
- v. Include a comments or notes section at the bottom of each request.
- vi. If the rubric includes scoring on how requests are tied to our Strategic Plan, Mission and Operational plans, it would be beneficial to include links to these plans within the rubric.
- vii. The IPC members found it hard to assess fiscal responsibility.
- viii. It was suggested that we should have had the Dean’s prioritize their department’s requests prior to the requests going to the Planning Councils. Before requests are submitted in SPOL, Deans should be having conversations with their programs to make sure they are not asking for things that are already in the budget. An example of things that might already be included in the budget are ongoing requests for subscriptions. At a Dean’s meeting, the Deans should then prioritize the submitted requests and then their prioritization should go to the Planning Councils (IPC, APC and SSPC). Each set of Planning Councils should then approve or deny the Dean’s prioritizations and send their recommendations to PBC who will send their prioritized list to the President.
- ix. There was a consensus that SPOL is not the best tool for program review and we should look into a different process or program. SPOL is not user friendly and it is currently not

providing us with the data that is needed for resource requests. Within SPOL, program review and budgeting functions are not linked in a useful way.

1. It was noted that some other colleges use Curriconet or other internal systems for both their program review and resource request. College of San Mateo developed an in-house system which is an online form/survey that is online and searchable.
- x. The categories from the rubric should be included in the resource request section in SPOL. It would also be beneficial to provide an example of a superb request that Faculty/Staff can refer to. There is a difference between describing what equipment does and why it is needed and how it is tied to Student Learning Outcomes and Program Review.

Michelle Marquez observed the IPC members as they worked through the new program review resource request prioritization process. Her observations are as follows:

- xi. There were items included in the resource requests that did not need to be sent through to this level as well as reoccurring items and items not aligned with district policies.
- xii. It was a struggle to start the process of prioritizing resource requests and this may have to do with it being a completely new process as well as a lack of intuitiveness in gathering information from SPOL. It took about 45minutes from when the IPC members started reviewing to get the first item scored but then only took 30minutes to get the remaining items scored by breaking into small groups.
- xiii. In the future, it would be useful to have a more concise and thoughtful orientation of rubric as well as provide clear definition of the health, safety and liability categories.
- xiv. The rubric section pertaining to the Mission was difficult because it is vague.
- xv. Learning outcomes were hard to grade.
- xvi. This is a big change from how things have been done in the past and a big step towards transparency and having governance involvement in resource requests. There were a lot of thoughtful, positive conversations during this meeting.

B. Continue Program Review

Co-Chairs James Carranza and Katie Schertle followed last year's process assigning members and participants into small groups to evaluate the instructional program review applications. The groups completed the program review rubrics for those instructional program reviews that were not completed at the March 16th meeting.

4) Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm