

ACC Meeting Name: Institutional Planning Council

D R A F T Minutes

Meeting Date: March 23, 2007

Time: 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

Location: HBC Room 201

Chair: Soon Merz

Co-Chair: Richard Smith

Members Present: Soon Merz, Ron Johns, Sharon Frederick-King, Terry Bazan, Mike Midgley, Stephanie Diina-Dempsey, Donetta Goodall, Richard Griffiths, Judy Van Cleve, David Borden, Eileen Klein, Gary Hampton, Kathy Judge, Charles Quinn, Richard Smith, Jim Nelson, Patty Scogin, Marilyn Lee Taylor, Terry Bazan, Gaye Lynn Scott., Luanne Preston, Julie Todaro, Roslyn Wallace, Mary Harris, Mary Hensley, Linda Smarzik, Maggie de la Teja, Linda Kluck, Bill Mullane and Virginia Murillo.

Guests: Ron Johns, Chair of General Ed/Core Curriculum Committee and Dan Dydek, Chair of Instructional Program Review Committee.

Absent: Yolanda Chapa, Louella Tate, Richard Armenta, Lisa Buck, Kathleen Christensen, David Fonken, Sandy Gaskin, Mary Kohls, George Reyes, Mariano Diaz-Miranda, Mary Gilmer, Lynn Persyn, Ben Ferrell, Gary Weseman, Linda Young, Imad Mouchayleh, Anastaysia Travina, Mark Goodrich, Lyman Grant, Amber Kelley, Gerry Tucker, Voncille Wright, Kathy Walton, Hazel Ward, Linda Welsh, Neil Vickers, and Cynthia Farias.

Agenda Item A: Welcome

Discussion: Soon welcomed everyone to the IPC Meeting.

Agenda Item B: Review of Minutes

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

IPC members reviewed minutes from the February 16, 2007 meeting.

Decisions:

Mary Harris made a motion to approve the minutes, and Sharon Frederick-King seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Agenda Item C: Program Review Discussion

Presenter: Roslyn

Discussion:

The purpose of the Program Review Process is completing a real assessment of program quality and using the results to plan improvements.

Soon said that the Program Review Process is too prescriptive.

Soon, Donetta, Mike and Roslyn have met to discuss revisions to the Board policy. Revisions to the current Board of Trustee policy are awaiting Board approval. If changes to the Board Policy are approved departments will be able to do a simpler and more meaningful review of their programs.

Question: Is the Program Review form being revised?

Answer: The form has been revised and is ready for use in the fall.

Dan said that the Instructional Program Review Committee has accomplished a lot in the past 14 months.

- Revised the IPR summary document.
- Proposed a five year interval for Intensive Reviews.

The Instructional Program Review summary form has been revised by the IPR Committee and revisions approved by Academic and Campus Affairs Council.

- OIEA will provide data and enter it into the Program Review form.
- The department will then have to evaluate the program data. Dan suggested substituting the term evaluate with interpretation.

Roslyn suggested that we may want to think of alternative methods to conduct Program Reviews other than filling out a form. We may need to identify minimum standards for program viability and quality. Dan noted that given the process is faculty driven the faculty would need to identify the standards.

- Roslyn asked members to email suggestions to her.

Roslyn provided a draft schedule of Instructional Program Review

- The tan programs were reviewed in 02-03.
- The yellow programs were reviewed in 03-04.
- The purple programs were reviewed in 04-05.
- The blue programs were reviewed in 05-06.
- OIEA has no documentation for programs in red.
- The green programs have never been scheduled for Program Review.

Question: Is Business Administration a program?

Answer: As far as SACS is concerned anything a student can obtain a degree in is considered a program. Our catalog states that we offer a degree in Business Administration.

Soon mentioned that some schools have a multidisciplinary programs. Liberal Arts and General Studies may require a cross-discipline team to conduct the Program Review.

IPC discussed the recent resolution that Health Sciences Programs be allowed to substitute their accreditation documentation for the IPR Summary Report.

- Members discussed the possibility that other programs be allowed to replace their accreditation documentation for the IPR Report, especially those whose accreditation self-studies occur on a similar cycle to the IPR's.
- Mike pointed out that if the external accreditation process results in a rigorous assessment of a program then why would we want to do it twice. Gary suggested aligning the date of Program Review with those of external accreditation.
- Soon mentioned that if we just went with accrediting agencies then we would end up with multiple criteria. The form was an attempt to standardize the criteria. We need to go back to thinking about what we really want out of Program Review.
- Gaye Lynn Scott said part of the problem is that people do not see anything valuable coming out of Program Review in the budget.
- Roslyn said that she needs the Deans to provide a list of dates of external accreditation.

Soon's perception of what people think that Program Review is used to acquire additional funding but it really is a self-assessment tool. We need to look at Program Review as a process separate from the budget. Then we need to consider how to tie Program Review into the Master Plan and Budgeting Process. One idea is to devote one of the President's goals and priorities to Program Review.

Soon may send an email for your vote on various options tying the Program Review Process to the Master Plan. If a vote is not completed via email, we will vote at the next meeting. Results will be forwarded to the President as a recommendation.

Agenda Item D: Presentation: General Education Update

Presenter: Donetta Goodall/Ron Johns

Discussion:

There needs to be a single, comprehensive strategy for programs to use to assess General Ed outcomes. As one strategy for doing so, this semester we are piloting a Measurement of Academic Proficiency and Progress test. This is a skills-based test to evaluate whether students have acquired the reading, writing, math, and critical thinking skills we think they should have. A list of 1500 students who had completed at least 60 hours of coursework at ACC was compiled by Linda Kluck, and 600 of these students were asked to voluntarily participate in the pilot test. Students could register for one of several sessions. To date, however, only 16 students had done so, demonstrating the need to require students to participate in such testing in the future. There needs to be some sufficiently motivating incentive.

Question: How long is the test?

Response: Two hours.

The General Education/Core Curriculum Committee is in the process of trying to develop, or at least investigate, assessment strategies in preparation for upcoming reports to SACS and the Coordinating Board. As we delved into this topic, though, we realized we also needed to address the issue of “what is an educated person.”

Departments need to choose the strategy or strategies to assess individual courses. Any such strategies need to be 1) practical, 2) non-punitive, and 3) meaningful.

Donetta, Roslyn, and Ron are planning an “education summit” to bring these topics before department chairs and faculty in order to make them aware of these issues. The first summit will be for department chairs only.

- Soon asked if faculty know whether their students know the things they need to know to succeed at another institution?
- Colleges need to be able to demonstrate that graduates have met the General Ed standards.
- The group discussed funding issues in General Ed.

Agenda Item E: Presentation: Update on FY 2007 Progress Towards College-wide Goals – Credit Instruction

Presenter: Mike Midgley/Donetta Goodall

Discussion:

Mike and Donetta reviewed various budget issues for credit instruction.

- A number of things that were in the Master Plan as funded were not in the budget.

- There were 30 full time faculty funded which included librarians and counselors. In workforce areas the candidate pools are very limited typically two to four candidates. We hope to do more outreach and marketing and a faculty recruiter position is possible.
- Professional development seminars did not get funded.
- We did get travel funds for faculty applicants.
- Program Review expenses received some funds.
- Expanded Nursing and Paramedic programs.
- Auto repair will be able to use AISD's new facility at Crocket when it is finished.
- The credit departments have accomplished a lot with grants.
 - Clean Technology
 - Biotech
- College Connection rate of transition from GED to College has doubled.

If an item is in the Master Plan and approved it should become a budget item.

Agenda Item C. Effectiveness Measures related to Credit Instruction will be postponed to the next IPC meeting due to lack of time.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40

Next Meeting Date: April 20, 2007

Time: 1:30 – 3:30

Location: HBC 201.0