



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING
COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF
May 21, 2021
9:30 am – 11:30am, Zoom**

Members Present: Jessica Kaven, Lisa Palmer, Allison Hughes, Alex Claxton, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Chris Burns, Tammy Robinson, Jessica Boyle, James Carranza, Karen Engel, Joan Murphy, Katie Perkins

Members Absent: Pisith Keo, Sakol Bun, Jill Sumstad, Susan Mahoney

Guests: Jamie Hui

1) Adoption and Approval of Agenda

Motion – To adopt agenda: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Joan Murphy

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes

Motion – To approve minutes of May 7, 2021: M/S: Chris Burns, Alex Claxton

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Katie Perkins (was not present for 5/7 meeting)

Approval – approved

3) Reassigned Time: New Application and Feedback on Process

Jessica reminded the committee they had suggested in a previous meeting to have IPC members and representatives bring the reassigned time application to their various divisions to seek feedback on the application and the process. Jamie Hui shared that the faculty in BDW felt as though the process was not equitable, and did not provide specific reasons or solutions. In terms of the application itself, faculty preferred that a drop down box with a range of time requested for reassigned time would be helpful, for example, one semester, one year, etc. Overall, this division reported a lack of clarity in the process. Joan stated that when she reviewed the feedback, it was challenging to note that they felt the process was inequitable without providing specific examples. Jamie elaborated that the faculty felt strongly regarding one coordination role that was not approved, and the appeal process was not further explored by the faculty nor submitted to IPC. Tammy appreciated Jamie for listening to the division's needs, and agreed that inequitable was a significant word. Tammy provided background on the particular coordination role in question within the BDW division that was not approved, including that much of the application duties at that time

were D1 duties, and the application that was submitted was inclusive of work that was already completed. In addition, two new faculty members had recently been hired. These approval decisions were made with equity in mind. Additionally, Tammy shared that for long standing CTE programs, fashion and DAA, release time was doubled. Tammy shared that all positions are invited to appeal, and that year, only paralegal appealed, and did end up obtaining release time. Originally this paralegal position was denied as a full time faculty member had been recently hired, however, in the appeal process, the faculty described why release was still necessary, and Tammy found the appeal to provide additional information that was not clear in the original submission and release time was approved. For the other BDW position in question, the opportunity to appeal was presented, but declined by the faculty at the time.

Jessica Boyle shared that Counseling asked how counselors would use this as reassigned time historically has involved instructional faculty assignments. Tammy agreed that assignments for counselors are different than those of instructional faculty. Jessica elaborated that faculty questioned how they could apply to support other programs. Tammy shared that this will be something important to continue to discuss next year. James added that employees are hired into classifications as opposed to programs. Faculty or staff can be reassigned based on college and district need. Because counselors complete their load differently, there may be an opportunity to reassign faculty to hours that are part of a schedule, or to backfill hours. This process could be helpful in that way, and is something to further discuss in coming semesters.

Katie Perkins shared that her division provided more detailed feedback on the application, including having a term request as a drop down option to avoid confusion. The division asked if the document had to be completed in one sitting, or if it could be saved and the faculty could return to it at a later time. The division requested clarification on dates of the timeline, and a timeline was requested for follow ups, for example, decisions will be supplied in 2-4 weeks, etc. as this influences the schedules for future semesters.

Jessica Kaven noted that it does not appear there is any feedback on the actual application questions. No formal feedback from HSS, S&T or AST divisions were offered. Jessica provided feedback from the deans that was obtained at a recent iDeans meeting. Deans asked for clarity in a timeline that was followed across divisions. Clarity in IPC's involvement in the various forms of reassigned time was also sought. Deans also asked for a master list of all positions, number of units, term lengths of reassigned positions that will help with renewal processes. Deans preferred that this be a working document.

Allison Hughes shared that on the application, she will add a drop down box for the question of "which semester will the reassigned time begin?" The committee discussed which options they would like to be inclusive in the drop down. The committee discussed that if it is clear that faculty are applying in fall for the following fall, with decisions being made in the spring semesters, perhaps a dropdown is not necessary. Allison suggested adding text on the application clarifying when the term will begin. Allison asked if the committee would like a dropdown for number of semesters of reassigned time the faculty are seeking. James clarified that historically, positions have been approved for 2 years or 4 semesters. The committee discussed if they wanted to adjust this. James stated that he

agrees with the 2 year timeline. Jessica Kaven added that the committee may want to consider being flexible as there have been applications that have requested reassigned time for only one year or one semester. James mentioned that this is usually for an exceptional situation, and other programs may complete applications this way if they apply mid cycle, until they are able to return to the typical application cycle. Allison added that she could provide text clarifying that two years is most typical. James clarified that the coordination is not necessarily intended to be ongoing indefinitely, so at the two year point, faculty would have the opportunity to review and look at what adjustments may be necessary. Alex added that if a dropdown is included with a range from 2-6 semesters, and text is included that 4 semesters is typical, most faculty members will typically select this option. Joan mentioned that she feels the feedback can be addressed, and this updated version of the application could be used with the idea that future updates can be made as appropriate. Lisa agreed that most of the feedback can be taken care of, and agrees that moving forward is appropriate. James suggested not making any changes to the application for a certain amount of time may be useful to ensure processes remain, and suggestions can be kept and collected and assessed at the end of the cycle to committee agrees upon. Jessica Kaven reminded the committee that the task force did suggest that the committee create a group to manage the process, to help with communicating the process due dates, managing the master list process etc. Jessica added that the committee could entertain the approval of the application and the approval of putting together a work group at the start of fall to help facilitate the process.

Motion – To approve the application process as revised and to create a subcommittee to manage the reassigned time process that will begin in the fall. Substantial changes will not be made for three years, but feedback will continue to be collected and addressed at the next process review cycle, every three years: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Alex Claxton

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

4) **Timeline for Reassigned Time: 2021-2022**

Jessica projected the proposed Timeline for Reassigned Time for 2021/2022. The committee discussed their thoughts on the dates as follows:

- **Timeline for Reassigned Time: 2021-2022**
 - Based on this year's due dates, perhaps we can suggest the following dates for next year:
 - By November 12th: Faculty submit all new & renewal applications to deans
 - By November 19th: Deans review, sign & submit all application to the Office of Instruction
 - December 3rd: IPC reviews all new and renewal applications
 - By December 10th: VPI announces outcomes for applications informed by IPC's feedback
 - By February 18th: Faculty reassignments are determined

Motion – To approve above timeline dates for Reassigned Time 2021/2022 cycle: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Joan Murphy

Discussion – James mentioned that it would be helpful for the group to know when the announcement or communication to the campus is sent out. Perhaps the work group in fall can be responsible for establishing this communication plan timeline. Jessica added that the workgroup can help facilitate this, and that communication they may help draft can be sent by the VPI Office.

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

5) IPC Membership, Faculty Co-Chair &PBC Representative: 2021-2022

Jessica reviewed the membership and term ending dates for current committee members. Jessica updated the committee on new committee membership and terms for the next year as seen here: <https://www.canadacollege.edu/ipc/2021-2022.php> Jessica will update the committee as vacant positions are filled.

The committee discussed potential PBC representatives from IPC. Jessica added that the position can be shared. The committee discussed potential nominations for IPC faculty chair.

Motion – To appoint Allison Hughes as IPC representatives to PBC, and to confirm Jessica Kaven as IPC Faculty Chair for the 2021-2022 one year term: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Joan Murphy

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

6) IPC Summary: 2020-2021

Jessica projected the following to the committee:

Per IPC’s Bylaws, as part of the committee’s evaluation, a “yearly summary of progress and possible suggestions will be presented to PBC”

2020-2021 IPC Summary:

- Discussed the College-wide Program Review Improvement Task Force Update & Timeline
- Discussed the College’s Annual Strategic Plan
- Discussed the College’s Anti-Racist Framework

- Reviewed and discussed reassigned time applications and process
- Discussed Instructional Technology update
- Discussed Library update
- Discussed technology replacement cycle
- Discussed Committee Bylaw and Plan Templates for all College Committees
- Discussed revamped roles of reassignment for DE, ACES, and CIETL coordinators
- Discussed and approved Reassigned Time Application timeline
- Discussed and approved Updated Timeline for Position Requests
- Provided feedback on Instructional Program Review Process
- Revised and approved the IPC Bylaws
- Recommended renewals of CTE Liaison and DE Coordinator (emergency renewal) positions
- Discussed program review workgroup updates
- Discussed and provided feedback on the Program Improvement/Discontinuance Process to Academic Senate
- Discussed Early Alert process
- Discussed and approved Program Review Deferral and Extension process
- Discussed and approved Program Review Timeline for 2021-2022
- Discussed and approved the formation of an UMOJA Program
- Created Reassigned Time Workgroup to examine the application and overall process
- Discussed Reassigned Time application and process and made recommendations guided by feedback from the workgroup, divisions, and iDeans
- Recommended review of equity question in instructional program review
- Provided feedback on UMOJA's request for reassigned time (out of cycle)
- Discussed Cultural Center Focus Group updates
- Discussed New Employee Orientation draft Canvas course

The above information will be shared with PBC.

7) **Good of the Order**

Joan thanked Rebekah for being a representative on this committee and wished her well as she completes her long term professional development project next semester.

Lisa shared that she was asked to report to the Academic Senate about the work completed on the program improvement process. Lisa reported that the committee spent a lot of time reviewing and attempting to revise the process. Upon learning of the analysis provided by Academic Senate of other college's approaches, more time was spent reviewing our campus process. Lisa suggested that a subcommittee of people could review the analysis and compare our process prior to moving forward with further recommendations.

Lisa added that the English department is extremely dismayed that they were not able to obtain a replacement hire for their retired faculty member. Lisa added that our mission statement emphasizes teaching and assisting our students, and feels that the budgetary

decisions do not reflect this. Lisa added that the division is open to suggestions.

Rebekah acknowledged Lisa's statement. Rebekah added that this summer, several faculty members are taking a course on racial equity course design, and the plan is to process the material together and present what was learned at a flex day about implementing it into our own instruction.

Jamie Hui thanked the committee for being inclusive and assisting her in learning the process. Jamie informed the committee that she would be happy to assist in outreach to encourage other employees to attend IPC meetings in the future.

Jessica thanked Chris Burns for his service as his term is ending. Jessica thanked Jessica Boyle for her service in this term, and Jessica reported that she may return for another term but will confirm with Jessica soon.

8) Adjournment

Motion – To adjourn the meeting: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Rebekah Taveau

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

a) Meeting adjourned at 10:41 am.