



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, April 21, 2017  
9:30 am – 11:30 pm, Building 2, Room 10**

**Members Present:** Gregory Anderson, Danielle Behonick, Heidi Diamond, Chialin Hsieh, Jamie Hui, Maria Huning, Jessica Kaven, Nicholas Martin, Anniqua Rana, Lorena Silva (ASCC)

**Members Absent:** Nick DeMello, Valeria Estrada, Michael Hoffman, Luis Mendez (ASCC), Katie Osborne

**Guests:** Diana Alvarado, Caroline Ouyang

---

---

**1. Adoption of [Agenda](#)**

**Motion** – Approve as presented

**Discussion** – None

**Abstentions** – None

**Approval** - Approved unanimously

**2. Approval of [Minutes – March 17, 2017](#)**

**Motion** - Approve the minutes as presented

**Discussion** – Chairperson Jessica Kaven and co-chair Gregory Anderson suggested the addition of:

- i. The link to the rubric and guide documents to - item 3. Business – A. SPOL Review - to indicate that the committee was informed on how to operate in SPOL
- ii. The IPR process description to - item 3. Business - B. Instructional Program Reviews - to emphasize that the same process stipulated in the governance manual is followed every year.

**Amended motion** - Approve the minutes as amended

**Discussion on amendment:** None

**Abstentions** – None

**Approval** - Approved unanimously

**3. Business**

**A. Proposed Process for Developing New Instructional Programs**

Chairperson Kaven asked IPC to review the Proposed Process for Developing the New Instructional Programs document provided by the Academic Senate President. Once the document has been reviewed, Kaven instructed IPC to get into small groups to identify strengths and areas of needed improvements. Because this document will be shared across campus, Kaven asked members to share their ideas as they relate to instructional planning.

Overall, although there were several strengths identified, which mainly focused on the newest CTE program created and creating a process for proposing new programs, there were far more areas of concern identified. One major area of concern is that the language states that deans can propose new programs. It was agreed that this should be a faculty driven process, which should include input from deans, students, community members, etc.

All feedback and proposed language changes were documented on the google.doc as can be seen [here](#).

## **B. Review [Program Review Process](#)**

Chairperson Kaven asked the committee to share their feedback as reviewers of the program review process this year.

Benefits:

- Rubric and SPOL guide handouts - much better this time - streamlined the process
- Documents provided in advance was valuable
- 1 hour per program review per group was enough time to provide feedback
- Other institutions don't share their feedback on possible improvements after doing the program review and this committee should continue doing it

Opportunities/Challenges:

- Clicking and approving documents in SPOL was challenging because it would still lock / broken up in too many pieces.
- Next time committee should not be asked to approve each section and it would be ideal to cut down the clicking
- Encourage department members to attend the program review meeting so reviewers can ask them questions when needed
- Data/research results training is needed so department members can understand it before they prepare their program review

Suggestions:

- SPOL training is needed and best to identify ideal venue to do it during flex day and/or division meetings
- Encourage academic senate to take action on the rating results given at the end of each program review
- Other schools had committees formed to give academic directions which helps with increasing enrollment
- CIETL coordinator can also assist with these duties
- Academic Senate should encourage all members of each department's programs to collaborate and participate when preparing their own program review to make it seamless.

## **C. [ACCEL: Adult-Ed Students at Canada College](#)**

Caroline Ouyang, Canada College ACCEL Transition Coordinator, and Dean Anniqua Rana presented on this item by explaining the ACCEL program. She also shared the effectiveness of their Adult School visits and venues of recruitment. They involved the committee by asking them to brainstorm on other

external entities, other fields, disciplines, and work opportunities that could be used as outreach options and to expand their current partnerships.

#### **D. Results for Reassigned Time Proposal Process and Overall Reflection**

Co-chair and VPI Anderson informed the committee that a step for getting the president's feedback was added to the Request of the Reassigned Time Proposal Process; the results will be announced in the next IPC meeting.

#### **E. Announcements:**

- Instructional Program Review Presentations at the next IPC meeting on 5/5:
  - Cooperative Education, ECE, Earth Science, Engineering, Fashion Design, Human Services, & Interior Design

#### **4. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 am.