

Instructional Program Review Committee

Minutes

Date: 09/27/13

Location: AC 5

IPRC Member Name	Present/ Absent	IPRC Member Name	Present/ Absent
Jessica Gibbs (Chair)	P	Marsha (DeeDee) Cole	P
Deborah Chesser	P	Ed Heaberlin	A
Ed Burg	P	Donnell Thomas	A
Claude Oliver	A	John Reid	A
Patricia Wagner	P	Jennifer West	A
Karen Tomlin	P	Eartha Johnson	A
Theresa Shellcroft	P	Guest:	

Action Items

- Approve minutes 9/13/13.- Approved.
- Decide on a date for the retreat to peer review 2013 Comprehensive PRAISE for Track A
 - The IPRC will convene on October 18 for Peer Technical Review.
- Compile 2011 PRAISE report and 2012 Annual Update assessment rubric scores- all rubric scores have now been received. JG will compile and write a report of the results and send to the committee for discussion and approval.
- Official committee vote for IPRC Chair for the 2013-2014 year- the faculty present unanimously voted for Jessica Gibbs as IPRC Chair for this academic year.

Discussion Items

- Joint Chair meeting between IPRC, NIPRC and FB&PC along with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness 9/19/13- Tim Isbell, Jessica Gibbs, Mark Clair and Virginia Moran met to discuss the accomplishments for program review and its relation to budget planning. Processes that worked well were identified and areas for improvement were also identified. A memo will be officially presented to College Council for discussion. See the Memo [here](#).
- IPRC Annual Update survey results: the survey was sent to division deans as well as chairpersons of Shared Governance committees and administrative advocates for those committees. The results will be included in the IPRC Chair Report to the Academic Senate Executive Team. The results are as follows:
 - 71.5% of respondents answered “satisfied” to “strongly agreed” that the reports were made available on SharePoint in a timely manner

- 85.7% of respondents answered “satisfied” to “strongly agreed” that a specific timeline was provided for the completion of division summaries
- 57.2% of respondents answered “satisfied” to “strongly agreed” that the raw data provided by the research office was provided with or within the Annual Update reports
- 42.9% of respondents answered “satisfied” to “strongly agreed” that the Annual Update reports included data analyses that facilitated planning and resource allocation recommendations/decisions
- 71.4% of respondents answered “satisfied” to “strongly agreed” that the Annual Update reports included SLO/PLO assessment dialog that facilitated planning and resource allocation recommendations/decisions
- 14.3% of respondents answered “satisfied” to “strongly agreed” that the Division Summaries included evidence of dialog between the Dean and the Department chairpersons
- 71.5% of respondents answered “satisfied” to “strongly agreed” that the Budget Worksheets provided clear information regarding augmentation versus roll-over requests.
- Finally, the following are responses where respondents answered “satisfied” to “strongly agreed” that the Annual Update format provided organized information regarding information that facilitated planning and resource allocation recommendations/decisions in the following areas: Curriculum = 71.4%; Facilities = 66.7%; Technology = 71.4%; Staffing Structure = 66.7%.

Written responses to the survey include:

- Files and resources on SharePoint could be listed better.
- The resources were included in the Annual Update were new items such as facilities requests. Perhaps it will facilitate planning if faculty are briefed on the importance of including their ideas, requests and stuff they need.
- It would be much appreciated if the committees that are supposed to make decisions regarding the proposals from the program reviews communicate back to the disciplines regarding decisions made, how or why proposals were/were not funded and most important feedback regarding ways to improve the information provided to the committees/deans for future use. There is no reciprocal feedback once the reports are turned in.

- Discuss IPRC Chair report draft- team members submitted comments for the report. JG will incorporate the comments as well as the survey results above and send out to committee members for further review.
- Upcoming ACCJC visit (by Jessica Gibbs):
 - Steering committee activity- the Steering Committee is wrapping up the writing of Follow Up Report #3. The report will be mailed to ACCJC on October 14. Recommendations 2 & 3 are looking very good. The Recommendation 2 section of the report shows evidence that VVC has reached the SCQI level of the ACCJC rubric for the standard. Recommendation 3 is also looking good. Final data about SLO and PLO are being generated. The SLOAC is also drafting the Annual Assessment Report for assessment progress. This will be presented as additional evidence for the visiting team. Recommendation 6 is also being further edited and revised.

- Other