



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, May 19, 2017
9:30 am – 11:30 pm, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: Gregory Anderson, Danielle Behonick, Nick DeMello, Heidi Diamond, Chialin Hsieh, Jamie Hui, Maria Huning, Jessica Kaven, Nicholas Martin, Anniqua Rana

Members Absent: Valeria Estrada, Michael Hoffman, Katie Osborne, Luis Mendez (ASCC), Lorena Silva (ASCC)

Guests: Allison Hughes, Jamillah Moore, Joan Murphy, Lezlee Ware

1. Adoption of [Agenda](#)

Motion – Approve as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

2. Approval of Minutes – [April 21, 2017](#)

Motion – Approve minutes as presented

Discussion – Members suggested the changes to items:

3. B. Opportunities/Challenges: 2nd, 3rd and 4th bullets, and;

3. C. “adult school visits” instead of “high school visits.”

Amended Motion - To approve the amended minutes as discussed

Discussion on amendment - None

Opposed on amendment - None

Abstentions on amendment - None

Approval of amendment - Approved unanimously

3. Business

A. [Draft Policy for Employee Office Technology Devices](#) - Discussion

Dean Heidi Diamond gave a copy of the March 2017 draft policy for Employee Office Technology Devices to the committee to review and provide input. She commented that this document is being embedded in all the participant governance meetings. It was brought to the attention of

the technology planning committee because there is no standard process for new-hire employees or replacement and/or upgrade of devices are requested. Dean Diamond stated that funding currently available through a bond has enabled us to have the devices we use. This funding will cease at the end of 2018. Going forward, the Technology Planning Committee would like to insure a process is in place for fairness regarding the type of technology devices people will be using. Maria Huning commented that the process needs to be transparent; in the process of choosing, determining that it is not the only option, and is the one the district will be using. The District proposal is to replace current laptops with the SMCCCD Laptop Standard - Dell Latitude 14-inch E7470 Ultrabook and the Docking Option for Dell Latitude.

Concerns and questions from the IPC committee and guests

- Departments have no money budgeted for this purpose
- Options to quickly replace devices is needed instead of the 6 weeks option
- Most faculty employees prefer using Mac computers and there are also Mac labs
- With Distance/Online Teaching as the current focus, faculty should have a choice of what device will work better for them
- Standardize budget/dollar amount rather than a specific product so employees can spend on the purchase of a device of their choice (in combination with their own money). This option is to benefit students because faculty will be working more effectively
- Plans are to invite an ITS representative to participate at district meetings so our college needs, such as usage of Mac computer, is communicated/clear to the District

Heidi and Maria emphasized that this is only a draft which will continue to be revised throughout the Fall 2017 semester. Feedback should be sent by email to Nathan Staples, the Technology Committee chairperson, Heidi Diamond, and/or Maria Huning.

B. [IPC & Accreditation](#) – Discussion

Co-chair Kaven introduced this topic by reminding members that one of IPC collaborations to the college is to assist with Accreditation. At this task, Chialin Hsieh said she was going to provide members with 54 out of 128 different sub standards and asked them where the evidence could be found in our college. Co-chair Kaven explained that some of the areas to be considered

could be addressed through the Department, Committee or Subcommittee, Classified or Academic Senate levels, etc. She also commented that evidence could potentially be found through program review or connected to our ILO. Chialin added that members might identify standards that is/was or could be possibly related to IPC's role. Committee was separated in 4 groups with about 3 or 4 people and each group looked at 8 sub standards. Refer to this google document to see this group's work.

IPC members and guests' Comments

- Co-chair Kaven expressed appreciation for the fact that Chialin was involving the committee early in the process, rather than at the last minute or even not even including the committee.
- It was hard to understand what was being asked because of the lack of quality and poor English sentences. One of the questions read as a PLO but it was really ILO that they were talking about. Other members pointed out how poorly worded, redundant, and awkward the sub standards were.
- VPI Anderson commented that speaking of the lack of quality, he saw similar frustration when talking about Accreditation at the Consultation Council which is a representative group that advises the Chancellor and the Board of Governors of the Community Colleges. People were grateful that there had been significant changes in the leadership of the accreditation commission, but two of the faculty unions and the academic senate made it very clear that they are still hoping for a dramatic change, probably going in the ACCJC because of the lack of deep structural change. He said that just having more pleasant and humble people to serve us is not really solving it – the frustration around how poorly worded, redundant and awkward these are, is a reminder that it is not good yet. He thanked Chialin and the committee for have continued taking this on as is because he understands that we are 2 years from being accredited and we have to continue working on it no matter what the quality is.

Chialin asked members to add any other thoughts and ideas to this googledoc. This agenda item will be brought back in the Fall semester since we are starting to get ready for the accreditation preparation.

C. Participatory Governance Survey Results – Information

Dean Chialin Hsieh presented this item by reading the Accreditation Standard IV which clearly explains why these surveys are being done.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

“Leadership roles and the institution’s governance and decision-making policies, procedures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.”

Dean Hsieh gave the committee the background regarding at which times the two surveys are to be sent out to employees to evaluate the college governance process. The decision of when to send these surveys was made 2 or 3 years ago at the PBC meeting. The long survey, (50 – 60 questions) is sent twice: just 1 year before our Accreditation visit, (3rd year) and 1 year before the midterm report is due, (6th year). The short survey, (10-15 questions) is sent out in between the times of the long survey. She also said that these surveys are done to evaluate the impact of our processes on planning annually, to meet accreditation standards and to make changes. Based on the Accreditation team feedback, Cañada needs to get better on making changes.

The results of the short survey, (16 questions) was sent out in April 2017. On the Participants’ Demographics slide, she pointed out that the total participation is low compared to other semesters and the long survey – 57 participants on this short survey and/rather than about 120 participants on the last long survey.

4 Participants' Demographics

Employment Status	#	%	Membership	#	%	Gender	#	%
Full-time Classified	15	28%	Participatory Governance Members	28	51%	Male	18	35%
Part-time Classified	2	4%	Non Participatory Governance Members	27	49%	Female	34	65%
Full-time Faculty	16	30%	Total	55	100%	Total	52	100%
Part-time Faculty	7	13%						
Student	5	9%	Committee (multiple)	#		Ethnicity	#	%
Administrator/Supervisor	9	17%	Planning & Budgeting Council	5		African American	2	4%
Total	54	100%	Instructional Planning Council	6		Asian	3	6%
			Student Services Planning Council	11		Hispanic	9	18%
			Administrative Planning Council	2		White	22	43%
			Academic Senate	7		Other	15	29%
			Classified Senate	4		Total	51	100%
			Associated Students of Cañada College	3				

IPC Members **suggestions** for the PRIE office

- Include a clear explanation as to what survey participants will fill out, (the short or long one), why they are doing it, and when and how participants' responses will be utilized
- Send survey at about the same time every year and do more follow up to get higher return/ more responses
- Target shared governance and division meetings with either paper/check the boxes or electronic kinds/types of surveys - at these meetings, most people have access to electronic devices
- Wire 1 or 2 questions in WebSmart and/or on pages employees visit often
- Collect data and disseminate the results to the whole community - write a very short article, summarizing the data, and plug it in all over the press. This press document can be used as proof that this information is being shared with community

Strengths shown below are the top 3 ratings (higher mean because much more people selected strongly agree)

Summary of Questions (1 of 2)

5

Strengths

- ▶ **I am satisfied with the amount of opportunity I have to participate in college-wide planning.** (mean: 3.05; agree or strongly agree: 73.7%)
- ▶ **I see how assessment can inform decisions about curriculum, resource allocation, etc.** (mean: 3.04; agree or strongly agree: 66.6%)
- ▶ **I use assessment results to inform subsequent plans.** (mean: 3.00; agree or strongly agree 61.4%)

4-point Likert Scale: 1=strongly disagree and 4= strongly agree

Dean Hsieh invited the Assessment Coordinator, Jessica Kaven, to share what her team focus was because the improvement is truly apparent this time. Kaven shared that they worked on having representation across the divisions to work on the perception related to assessment culture. The next piece will be how to perform assessment better and more effectively. She also commented that the better collaboration with the PRIE Office, the Instructional Technologist, Allison Hughes, along with the experienced Assessment Coaches, were the reasons for this success. Kaven said that the same team wants to continue working on it this coming semester. That is demonstrative of their motivation and how effectively they got the work done.

VPI Anderson said that this is a perfect example of what we are being asked to do by the standards - hear feedback, respond to the feedback effectively, and then make it sustainable. He commended Kaven's leadership. She got high quality faculty leadership around an issue and then made it sustainable.

Dean Hsieh showed appreciation for the initial Equity funding which allowed this project to launch. She also appreciated the president's office/accreditation funding. That will give the support needed so the effort will go through the proper process. Consequently there will be continuity to the improvement and the planning and resources will be integrated.

Challenges shown below are the bottom 3 ratings (higher mean because much more people selected strongly agree)

Summary of Questions (2 of 2)

6

Challenges

- **Employees have adequate opportunities to participate in the development of financial plans and budgets.** (Mean=2.57, Agree or Strongly Agree=49.1%)
- **There are clear divisions of authority and responsibility between and among the District Office, the Board of Trustees, and Cañada College.** (Mean=2.69, Agree or Strongly Agree=51.8%)
- **The program review process helps to promote positive change on campus.** (Mean=2.74, Agree or Strongly Agree=49.2%)

4-point Likert Scale: 1=strongly disagree and 4= strongly agree

Co-chair Kaven asked if it would be possible to add recommendations to address the challenges that are outside of the PBC purview.

D. Resource Requests on Program Review – Information/Discussion

On behalf of VPA Michelle Marquez, VPI Anderson shared the spreadsheet with the status of the resource requests report. He said that the feedback of the request via SPOL should be completed by the end of this semester so employees can go back into SPOL and access the comments. The committee was informed that their department's Dean should have the details of these requests to provide to them on 05/25 - Thursday evening or 05/26 - Friday morning. He said that VPA Marquez will bring this item back during the Fall 2017 semester to discuss the details with members.

E. Summary of IPC's Goals & Accomplishments – Information

Co-chair Kaven provided the committee with this year's goals below and said that these were identified at the beginning of this Fiscal year 2016-2017. Members agreed that the items that are not highlighted are the ones in progress and should be added to next year's goals.

GOALS FOR IPC, 2016-2017 (9/30/16)

- Provide recommendations to Academic Senate regarding Instructional Program Review (IPR) questions and process
- Revise IPR's rubric, if needed
- Create exemplary list of IPR sections for program review authors – provide examples of well written IPR documents, examples of how disciplines have used the program review process to improve programs, etc.
- Examine how IPR can strengthen current programs (feedback)
- Examine and discuss IPR's role in program migration and revitalization, as well as opportunities to create new programs (feedback; draft via AS)
- Provide IPR training and/or documents to faculty regarding IPR expectations
- Review Request for Reassignment Proposal (RRP) process and make any necessary recommendations to AS
- Provide IPC members with overview of training on planning processes. This training can include how to coordinate the planning process and the different kinds of data that can help inform the planning process (e.g., institutional – and program-level data provided by PRIE, interdepartmental data, Equity Gaps data)
- Examine professional development as it relates to instruction and leadership; share findings and/or provide feedback to PD committee

The committee glanced at the Summary of 2016 - 17 IPC work and the only suggestion is highlighted below: to invite the Academic Senate to participate on the program review presentations next time.

Summary of IPC work, 2016-17

Set IPC goals for 2016-2017

Provided recommendations to Academic Senate regarding Instructional Program Review's (IPR) questions and process

Revised the Program Review rubric to correspond with the new program review questions with the goal of encouraging useful comments from reviewers

Applied [SPOL Program Review Guide](#) for IPC to the Program Review Process

Provided timely feedback on Program Reviews via SPOL

Reviewed 24 Instructional Program Reviews and provided feedback using the rubric(s). Invited campus community to participate in the review process; PT faculty received a stipend for participating

Select programs presented a summary of their program reviews, which included responses to IPC's feedback, to the committee instead of to curriculum (2nd year) (ask AS participate)

Provided feedback on Instructional Program Review process

Provided feedback on Academic Senate's proposed process for developing new instructional programs

Reviewed and commented on reports, plans and/or programs: College Governance Survey and Results, Professional Development Framework, ACCJC Mid-Term Report, ACCEL: Adult-ed Students at Cañada, Strong Workforce Funding, Neurodiagnostic Technology Program, Canvas (Distance Education), and EMP Initiatives

Provided a space for discussions pertaining to campus-wide concerns/challenges (e.g., Arts [Taskforce](#) update, Athletics Department update, Academic Senate's Proposed Process for Developing New Instructional Programs, Draft Policy for Employee Office Technology Devices)

Provided feedback on reassigned time proposals (3rd year). Reviewed 13 requests and provided VPI Anderson with written feedback

Evaluated IPC performance, including participatory governance process, for 2016-2017 academic year.

F. Membership – Discussion

Co-chair Kaven introduced this topic by informing members that she will not continue to be the IPC Co-chair nor the Honors Coordinator next year and asked who would continue serving on the IPC committee. The changes in the membership are reflected below and the vacancies are highlighted.

Fall 2017 - Spring 2018

- **IPC Co-Chair - vacant**
- **IPC representative at PBC** - will be appointed in the beginning of next year - Maria Huning is interested in continuing in this role
- ACES - Rebekah Taveau (new)
- **Counseling - vacant** (Nicholas Martin will inform who will be the new member)
- Curriculum Committee Chair - Katherine Schertle (new)
- Librarian - Valeria Estrada (continuing)
- Honors Coordinator - Susan Mahoney (new)
- 2 Faculty (preferably 1 adjunct and 1 faculty from CTE) - Nick DeMello and Katie Osborne (continuing)
- 2 Classified Members - Maria Huning and Jamie Hui (continuing)
- **2 Students** - will be appointed by the Student Body in the beginning of the Fall 2017 semester (new)
- **2 Instructional Deans** - invite David Johnson and Janet Stringer (new)
- Dean of PRIE - Tracy Huang
- Vice President of Instruction - Gregory Anderson (IPC Co-Chair)

Co-chair Kaven asked the committee to identify any missing positions and share it at the first meeting in the Fall 2017 semester. Dean Hsieh, Co-chair Kaven, and VPI Anderson agree that the Faculty Assessment Coordinator needs to be part of this committee.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 am.