Cañada College

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF

Friday, October 5th, 2018
9:30 am – 11:30 pm, Building 2, Room 10

Members Present: James Carranza, Karen Engel, Valeria Estrada, Jessica Kaven, Sherilyn Kuo (ASCC), Matt Lee, Susan Mahoney, Sandra Mendez, Joan Murphy, Katie Osborne, Katie Schertle, Rebekah Taveau
Members Absent: Nick DeMello, Tammy Robinson

Guests: Diva Ward, Leonor Cabrera, Char Perlas, Dave Meckler, Dayo Diggs

1) Adoption of Agenda
Motion – Approve agenda for 10/5/18 meeting
Discussion – none
Abstentions – none
Approval – approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes – *September 7th, 2018*
It was noted that Katie Schertle's name was not listed on the "members present" list on the Draft Minutes. It will be added to the final version of the minutes.
Motion – Approve September 7th, 2018 Minutes with addition of Katie Schertle in the "members present" list.
Discussion – none
Abstentions – none
Approval – approved unanimously

3) Business
A. Updated Meeting Schedule
Katie Schertle presented this agenda item. A revised IPC meeting schedule was presented to IPC members:

Fall 2018

Day	Date	Start Time	Room
* Friday	9/7/2018	9:30am	2-10
Friday	10/5/2018	9:30am	2-10
Friday	11/2/2018	9:30am *(Review Reassigned Time Applications)*	2-10
*Friday	11/16/2018	8:30am – 12:30pm *(Program Review Peer Review)*	2-10
Friday	12/7/2018	9:30am	2-10

Spring 2019

Day	Date	Start Time	Room

*Friday	2/1/2019	9:30am *(Program Review Presentations)*	2-10
Friday	3/1/2019	9:30am	2-10
Friday	4/19/2019	9:30am	2-10
*Friday	5/3/2019	9:30am	2-10

The meeting schedule is being updated in order to comply with the new program review schedule. A longer November 16th meeting has been added. During this meeting, IPC and the college community will complete the IPC peer review of program reviews. An all-call will go out to Faculty, Staff and Administrators to attend this meeting to help with peer reviews. Chrissy Molina will add all administrators to the IPC Meeting Outlook invitation for this meeting as well. It was also noted that all Faculty Coordinators should also be present at this meeting. It was noted that it is beneficial for all Faculty, Staff and Administrators to be present at this meeting to also learn about other programs on campus. The Office of Instruction will provide food and beverages for this long meeting to those in attendance.

The Committee also discussed when the program review presentations will take place. Programs present their program reviews at IPC on a 6 year cycle. A list of the cycle can be found [here](). Those programs that will be presenting for 18-19AY are: Career Courses, Digital Arts & Animation, Math, Medical Assisting, Paralegal, Physics, and Radiologic Technology. Previously, both program review peer review and the program review presentations would occur in the spring semester and the 5/3/2019 meeting was originally dedicated to these presentations. Since program review peer review will now occur in the fall semester, it was suggested that the presentations happen soon after the peer review is completed. The Committee discussed the possibility of holding presentations during the 12/7/18 IPC meeting but came to the conclusion that there was already a number of deadlines (program review, peer review, position proposals and reassigned time applications) that occur in the Fall and that the presentations should occur in the beginning of the spring semester, at the 2/1/19 IPC meeting. There was also discussion regarding programs that may not have fulltime Faculty to complete the presentations and what can be done? It was asked if the Dean can complete the presentations and what alternatives there may be.

IPC Members came up with the following list of justifications as to why IPC holds the program review presentations and why the presentations have been moved to earlier in the Spring semester:
- Why hold IPC program review presentations?
    - o   Give Faculty a medium to showcase information about their programs to the college community
    - o   Give Faculty a medium to respond to the IPC program review feedback they are given
    - o   Give members of the college community a chance to hear about the different programs on campus
- Why have the presentations been moved to earlier in the spring semester?
    - o   Accommodate new program review cycle
    - o   Accommodate revised IPC schedule (which is a direct result of the new program review cycle)
    - o   Accommodate busy fall schedule and multiple fall deadlines
    - o   Allow faculty time to respond to IPC feedback that will not happen until after 11/16 meeting.

Motion – Approve revised IPC meeting schedule with program review peer review on 11/16/18 and program review presentations on 2/1/19.
Discussion – none
Abstentions – none
Approval – approved unanimously

B. ISER Updates (Standard I and II)
Standard I – Dean of PRIE, Karen Engel, presented on Standard I. The co-chairs for this standard are Karen Engel and Carol Rhodes. Standard I had the opportunity for their work to be reviewed during the August FLEX Day and Standard I is about 85% complete.

Standard II – Vice President of Student Services, Char Perlas and Faculty member, Dave Meckler, presented an update on ISER Standard II. A copy of the Prezi presentation on these updates can be found [here](#).

Discussion – Karen Engel went over some of the key elements that Steve Reynolds (ACCJC) touched upon during his last visit. Under the evidence section, ACCJC is looking for bulleted lists of the evidence with a small link and a brief description of what the evidence is. No evidence should be included in the analysis section and the analysis should be succinct. You can restate the standard and say "Canada College does _____ by _____" but you should never say "we meet the standard". A Committee member asked about the timeline for updated their standard. It was noted that standard teams can keep updating the Google Docs until FLEX Day and will also have the opportunity to update their document on Flex Day, if needed.   During the 10/10/18 FLEX Day, there will be a 9:15am Accreditation session that all are encouraged to attend. If you chose to attend this session, please bring a laptop. Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, James Carranza noted that he is the co-chair for Standard IIA (Instructional Programs) and that it would be nice to have IPC members at flex day to help with this standard as everyone has different backgrounds and knowledge to help with evidence.

C. Program Review Feedback and Validation Templates –

Karen Engel presented this item. She started off her presentation noting that she feels our campus is very thoughtful when it comes to program review. The PRIE Office, along with Administrative Services and Interim Director of Operations, Dayo Diggs, have been working on accelerating the program review timeline. She presented the updated timeline that can be found in the PPT presentation [here](#). Karen also noted that the TracDat tool was now live and accessible and there will be a FELX Day session to support TracDat as our new Program Review tool for the year. With the use of TracDat, the Deans also have a way in the tool to provide real time feedback. Additionally, there is a place in TracDat to include position requests so they are also included in Program Review so everything is now bundled together.

Karen spoke with IPC members regarding the IPC feedback form that has been used in the past. The existing feedback form can be found on the forms page [here](#). It was noted that this form is lengthy and asks members to comment in depth on every question to every section of program review. Karen proposed an updated template which can be found on slide 7 of the above PPT presentation. This proposed updated form is more high level rather than requiring a response to every question in program review. Karen also noted that it was being proposed to roll the position review forums into program review rather than holding separate position forums as is our current process. She wanted feedback from IPC on the updated feedback form template as well as the possibility of positions requests being rolled into program review.

An IPC member noted that IPC spent the last two years revising and creating the current form. Although IPC members will be given PDF's with an entire program review report for each program, they will still need to look through the document and hunt for the pertinent information section by section when using the proposed new form. The current form is organized by question and it guides the reviewer through the program review. Another IPC member stated that this updated form could be more meaningful as we can look at the entire document and fill out the form at the very end. It was noted that, many times when program review peer review is done, a lot of the issues are the same throughout the document with similar feedback being given for each section and it can become very repetitive.

A question was posed to IPC members, what is the purpose of our review? Is it to give specific feedback or a general summation? It was noted that more detailed feedback might be more beneficial to the programs that completed their program reviews. IPC members want to be able to give detailed feedback as they are reviewing program reviews but they also want a summation that would be easy to read – how do we do both? With the proposed new form, reviewers could put the comments for each question in each review criteria comment box as they review each program review.

There was a discussion regarding the question, what is the ultimate consequence if a program "fails" program review, where is the accountability and how is that informing planning? It was noted that if you do not have a complete program review then you cannot ask for resources. Program Review is one of the most important things that Faculty do and program review guides department planning. If your program review is incomplete then you won't get your resources (including positions). Faculty need to make this their priority. The STEM center was used as an example of how program review informs planning. The STEM center is funded by multiple grants and we need to institutionalize some of their programs as the grant funding is ending. The STEM center needs to show data and evidence to justify institutionalizing their programs. By accelerating our program review timeline the hope is to respond to program needs by budget answers. The program review process will only be taken as seriously as we take it. If we are going to make program review meaningful then we need to make it transparent and people need to feel like they have an audience and they are being listened to. Additionally, programs also need specific useful feedback and an opportunity to respond. The goals that we find in program review are accumulated at top and serve to guide PBC. The college goals move along as the program goals continue to develop. Having clearly articulated program goals that include things that departments plan to do help everyone as the goals keep departments more focused and help with resources.

There was a discussion regarding programs that do not have the faculty/staff to get the program review completed. There are some programs and departments that have only part time faculty and no full time faculty. These programs and departments also struggle when it comes to meeting other deadlines and requirements such as Curriculum. What help is this body going to provide these departments with regarding to program review? It was also noted that this year is transitional with timelines pushed up and this can be difficult for those who had planned their schedules and timelines accordingly to submit their program reviews in February and this is very hard on one-person department. Karen Engel mentioned that the PRIE Office, Dayo Diggs and Admin services can help with transcribing program reviews (etc.) and sit in on meetings to help as they understand the accelerated timeline can be daunting.

The conclusion that was come to of the above discussion was that the new feedback form will be reconsidered next year since we already have several changes to Program Review this academic year. It was also decided that we could also possibly have more presentations that include positions at the same time.

D. Proposed Revisions to Resource Request Prioritization Rubric

The only body that will be prioritizing resource request is PBC – IPC will not be prioritizing resource requests this year. There is a new rubric for non-personnel resource requests that PBC will be using which can be found here.

4) Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:40am