

De Anza College  
IPBT

Notes  October 18, 2005

Present: Alves de Lima, Bradshaw, Campbell, Espinosa-Pieb, Hearn, Jenkins, Kubo, LaManque, Mowrey, Sherman, Woodward

Chair: LaManque

Absent: Griffin, Harral, Kline, McCarthy, Miner, Swensson

□□

I. Instructional Equipment Spending Requests:

Christina proposed setting aside \$112,000+ from Instructional Equipment funding each year on an “on-going” basis—as a 4-year plan to replace faculty computers. She figured that approximately 66 computers would be replaced each year; however, projections for Counseling computers need to be added to the total. After a discussion, the IPBT group **approved** the proposal. Christina stated that the proposal would next go to the Budget Committee and then to College Council for approval. (The Instructional Deans had approved the proposal on October 14, 2005. It was suggested that in addition to the other committees’ inspection, the proposal should go to the Technology Task Force; however, Christina explained that the Tech Task Force covered college-wide technology requests—while the funds that she was proposing to use were for strictly instructional tech needs. It was stated that the Division Dean or ETS would make the determination as to who would received the computers.

Christina’s second proposal was to set aside \$75,000 from the instructional equipment funds for “up-grading and maintaining” “Smart” classrooms. It was agreed that this funding proposal should be implemented because of a lack of resources, some of the deans have had to use their “B” funds to maintain these classrooms. The IPBT group **approved** this proposal.

II. New Program Review Guidelines, 2005-06:

The focus of this meeting was to discuss and develop the questions in preparation for the program review process. A handout, *Program Review Guidelines, 2005-06 Draft*, was developed to assist with this exercise. The IPBT members examined the document and made the following recommendations:

- Under the “objective” bullet “*Increase enrollment and success of life-long learners,*” it was suggested to include the word, “*retention,*” and to define “*life-long learners.*” There was a discussion regarding the recommendation, and members shared their opinions. Some members stated that the word “*success*” implied “*retention,*” and “*retention*” alone did not automatically mean that “*success*” was achieved. It was expressed that “*life-long learners*” could be defined differently within the context of the discipline.
- A concern was expressed that it would be difficult to make an assessment if some of the terminology in the objectives were not clearly defined.
- In order to track student learning outcomes, getting data such as, “What was the base-line from the previous years,” and a head-count by ethnicity—not just grades--within the departments would be desired.

- “Staffing” was another topic some of the members would like to see included in the draft.

Andrew will take the suggestions from IPBT and convey them to Judy Miner.