Present: Alves de Lima, Bradshaw, Bryant, Doan, Englen, Espinosa-Pieb, Hearn, Irvin, Kubo, Lee-Klawender, Mowrey, Schroeder, Tomaneng, Woodward, Takeuchi, Zhong, Singh

I. Program Review Process Discussion: Flash drives containing all of the program review information were distributed. Documents included on the flash drive were:
(1) Program Narratives; (2) Program Budgets; (3) Program Data Sheets; (4) Criteria Scoring Guides; (5) Criteria Grid Data Sheet Summary; and (6) Program Tracking Sheet.

L. Hearn described the process of using the data located on the file titled, xCriteria Grids for Departments — Alternate, and explained how the placement was determined—referring to the document titled, Data Sheet (draft 09-04-07.xls. It was noted that the missing budget pages will be sent electronically as they are turned in. The Program Reviews were assigned to the following team members for assessing:

- Academic Services—Donna Bradshaw and Duane Kubo
- Applied Technologies—Judy Mowrey and (new faculty)
- Biological and Health Sciences—Rowena Tomaneng, Howard Irvin and Nga Doan
- Business/Computer Systems—Rich Schroeder and Cheryl Woodward
- Creative Arts—Cheryl Woodward and Rowena Tomaneng
- Intercultural/International Studies—Rich Schroeder, Diana Alves-de-Lima and (new faculty or Randy Bryant)
- Language Arts—Nga Doan, Howard Irvin, and (new faculty or Randy Bryant)
- Learning Resources—Cynthia Lee-Klawender, and (new faculty or Randy Bryant)
- Physical Education—Diana Alves-de-Lima, and (new faculty or Randy Bryant)
- Physical Sciences/Math/Engr—Judy Mowrey, Lydia Hearn, and Yoshie Takeuchi
- Social Sciences/Humanities—Lydia Hearn, Donna Bradshaw, Judy Mowrey, and Michelle Zong.

Regarding the scoring process, the team members were asked to mark as, “SCORED” including reviewer’s initials, when finished with each department within the division. The team members agreed to create a “new page” in a Word format for their comments.

Direction was given to read the reviews with “an appreciative eye”—respecting the work performed by the writers.

The following were the steps agreed upon for processing the Program Reviews:

- Read your assigned program reviews individually by April 14 and meet with the group at 4:00 PM to connect with your “reading partner,” and to assess how the process is going;
- Complete your assessment assignment (scoring guide) by April 21 and meet at 3 – 5:00 PM to review your questions and to discuss recommendations. (Bring your laptop, if possible.) (Email questions to Christina by April 21.)
- Dependent upon the number of questions accumulated, some instructional deans will be invited to present during this time—April 28, 3 – 5:00 PM.
• Instructional deans are invited to present on May 1 (Friday) from 12:30 – 5:00 PM
• IPBT meets to finalize their recommendations—May 5—3 – 5:00 PM
• Date held as “Back Up” to the recommendation meeting—May 12—4 – 5:00 PM
• Final recommendations will be forwarded to College Council

The question was asked if it would be productive to meet with the other PBT’s? C. Espinosa-Pieb will speak to R. Griffin regarding this inquiry.

It was announced that the program reviews will be placed on the IPBT Website.

II. IPBT Calendar Timeline—ADM 109

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>Read Program Reviews</td>
<td>3 – 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14</td>
<td>Read Program Reviews</td>
<td>4 – 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21</td>
<td>Complete Reading</td>
<td>3 – 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28</td>
<td>Deans invited to Present</td>
<td>3 – 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>Deans invited to Present</td>
<td>12:30 - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>3 – 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>Hold as “Back Up” to Recommendations</td>
<td>4 – 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>