



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, May 20, 2016
9:30 am – 11:30 am, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: Gregory Anderson, Danielle Behonick, Nick DeMello, Heidi Diamond, Max Hartman, Michael Hoffman, Chialin Hsieh, Jessica Kaven, Andee Liljegren (ASCC), Nicholas Martin, Katie Osborne, Anniqua Rana, Alexandra Wildman (ASCC)

Members Absent: Valeria Estrada, Maria Huning, Janet Stringer

Guests: Michelle Marquez, Margie Carrington

1) Adoption of Agenda

Motion – Approve to amend the agenda with a revised item C. name to be **Using the ‘Equity Lens’ to Analyze Data on Program Review.**

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Approval - Approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes – April 15, 2016

Motion – Approve minutes as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Approval - approved unanimously

3) Business

A. Resource Requests on Program Review - Information

VPA Michelle Marquez presented this summary of the Program Review Resource Requests process status. She commented that it was very beneficial to this program to have the requests done through SPOL and that extracting information was very efficient. She formatted it into a spreadsheet, made changes to some requests that were input into the incorrect categories, fixed information and some of general questions, and sent it back to the Deans for follow up with faculty to occur over the next couple of weeks. She took the requests to the Cabinet (Deans and VPs) to review and

prioritize the list in two sections – the first, a wave of approval for all of the straightforward requests that didn't require follow up; the second, a list that needed clarification from faculty/staff. Now, the approval process will start and it will be easier for one person to do all the approvals of each item rather than to teach the steps to every Dean. VPA Marquez will do the approvals in the next few days through SPOL and will send a general email for the Deans to check updated approvals; this way they will be aware of the items that were approved. This year, they have also accelerated their process so that before the end of the semester, they will get another notification with the details – items approved and funding to be used, so the faculty and division assistants can start ordering items over the summer for timely delivery before the FALL semester starts.

Summarizing, she gave the budget figures available this year which show there is not a shortage of money; items approved by Deans will certainly be purchased. She commented that some projects, such as painting walls, moving and buying furniture, will take a little longer, and she is happy those needs were communicated this year. Dean Hsieh asked clarification on items that were rejected. VPA Marquez said explanations will be provided so that the department can follow up for options with their Deans.

Chair Kaven asked if there will be training for next year so requests are entered into the categories correctly. VPA Marquez said she would rather train employees on how to effectively justify their requests, tailoring it to each department's needs, which would make it is easier for her to plan the approvals and purchases. Professor Behonick asked if this information could be shared during Flex day; she would appreciate dialogue regarding the overall process, one that would include employees who went through the process, to gather thoughts and suggestions that would make the process even better. Chair Kaven agreed with Professor Behonick and added that it would also be helpful to include the administration's expectations so that employees can deliver them. VPA Marquez responded that it would be useful to provide some guidance on how much detail is needed for each item description – whether a very thorough description is necessary or only the item number. VPA Marquez could clarify another necessary item during that conversation: how to do a better job defining needs; they differ for every department.

Program Review Resource Request Process and Timeline 2016

February 28, 2016	March 2016	April	May	June
Program Review Due	Dean review the resource requests and provide comments	VPAS reviews all the requests— equipment, technology, and facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VPAS brings the organized requests to the Cabinet (Deans and VPs, including IT expert and facility manager) to review and prioritize the list. If there is any questions, deans will bring back to faculty/staff for clarification. 	VPAS notifies Deans and VPs for the funding availability.

B. Using the 'Equity Lens' to Analyze Data on Program Review - Discussion

Dean Rana introduced the topic by giving the background on “Using an ‘Equity Lens’ to Analyze Data to Program Review.” She said this type of analysis can introduce high impact intervention that will have a really strong impact on the students that need to transition – giving us ideas of the kind of support we need to provide. She said the ACES committee realized that the section they have to look at is the data packet. This includes valuable disaggregated data around student groups and their performance levels. She commented that she understands how challenging it is to look at our own programs and find out how to use this valuable data to benefit and add to the department’s plans. For this reason, she encouraged members to discuss ways the ACES committee can provide guidance and support. ACES Coordinator Hoffman showed detailed and thorough presentation on: “Bringing an ‘Equity Lens’ to Program Review” and informed members on how the campus can address equity gaps; explained the meaning of ‘Connection and Entry’ aka Access; demonstrated data packet with Equitable Access based on comparison between College and Community; Program Review: Progress and Completion; Data Packet: Equitable Course Completion compared to total or highest performing group; how to calculate Gap analysis; Equity Plan Gap Analysis; and made the recommendations below.

Recommendations

- Modify data-packets:
 - align categories with Equity plan
 - Provide p-index for Access and Gap analysis for Course Completion
 - Produce graphs to chart time-series, Access comparisons
- Clarify language in Program Review process
 - prompt specific Language Re: Equity Gaps
 - Timeline: Summer meeting to reflect on PR process.
 -
- Provide training “[Making sense of your program’s equity data](#)”
 - Flex Sessions
 - Division Meetings
- Follow-up:
 - Compare Gaps pre/post Common Assessment Initiative
 - Engage Community groups w/discussions of needs, curriculum discussions etc.

C. BOG & Common Assessment Implementation – Information

Director of Financial Aid Services, Margie Carrington, said that the Common Assessment Implementation is out of her area of expertise and that she was going to focus on the [Board of Governors Fee Waiver - Loss of Eligibility Regulatory Changes](#). She stated that, for the first time, starting the Fall 2016, almost 4000 students districtwide will run the risk of losing their fee waiver if they are identified in one of the 2 probation types defined below:

1. A student fails to meet the academic requirement of a minimum 2.0 GPA.
2. A student fails to meet the successful completion rate, district-wide of at least 50% of the cumulative units they sign up for over time; each semester they must successfully complete 50% of course for which they registered.

The new rule states that if a student is on probation for (2) consecutive semesters (Spring and Fall), they will be at risk of losing their BOG waiver. She confirmed that notices have been sent to students advising of them of the new rules. Director Carrington stated that the College has implemented a number of support services to assist affected students. She asked members to assist incentivizing students to formally appeal if they lose their BOG waiver, rather than walking away from Canada and applying for the waiver in another district, like Foothill. The formal process requires that students fill out the [appeal form](#); the completed form will be directed to the Admissions & Records department. Director Carrington asked faculty to help students by educating them about the [available services](#) designed to support student success on our campus. Students affiliated with CalWORKs, EOPS, DRC, Veterans, and FFYSI may be exempt from the Loss of BOG. Director Carrington added that the objective is to keep these students enrolled and engaged in classes. It has yet to be determined which tools will accomplish this successfully.

D. PC Survey Results & Program Review Process - Discussion

Chair Kaven shared with members through email the results from the campus-wide Participatory Governance Survey processed. She asked them to bring their comments and thoughts on the program review, participatory governance, and assessment sections. She emphasized that IPC is the program review body and the importance for this discussion. A very short conversation took place with the thoughts below:

- Members commented that full time faculty and full time classified were the predominant respondents to this survey.
- Members suggested to break down the information by groups and perhaps by disciplines. Currently the results are divided by employee's category:
 - ❖ Full Time Faculty
 - ❖ Part Time Faculty
 - ❖ Full Time Classified
 - ❖ Part Time Classified
 - ❖ Students
 - ❖ Administrators/Supervisors

Dean Hsieh encouraged members to review this document in detail during the Fall semester; the staff and administration will also be encouraged to review and become familiar with this document. Her final comment was that the value of this information can have an incredible impact on our service to co-workers and students.

Co-Chair Anderson agrees with the many opportunities these results bring and assured committee members that this document will be brought back many times in the upcoming fiscal year.

E. College's Hiring Process (PBC) – Action item

Chair Kaven reminded committee members of last meeting's conversation about voting for the timing of hiring - one of two hiring processes to bring as a recommendation to PBC - Planning and Budget Council.

Motion - To have one process a year that is appropriately aligned and with full budgetary knowledge.

Discussion -

- Chair Kaven asked if anyone knew if the Classified Senate had been provided with a recommendation.
- Dean Rana said that fund 1 positions are the reason for the proposed revision of this process; other funding sources are often considered in order to fulfill department needs. Co-Chair Anderson added that a very small portion of hiring is fund 1; most of funding is other – tenure positions never go through the hiring process.
- Clarification for the revision of this process was requested by one of the members. Professor Behonick stated that the hiring budget figure is only identified and announced late in the Fall semester; in the current process efforts are put into presentations without knowing if there will be money available for any hiring. From the beginning, it has been crucial to use the budget as part of the decision making process.
- Co-chair Anderson said that another argument is the tremendous cost in employee's time. He noted the need to look at the many faculty members who showed up at the Board meeting, and how they talked about being overworked in the process of putting it together, particularly for the English department being rejected last year. There is no way going the whole year as a college develops... and that is what happened this time that no faculty was hired because there is a second term.
- Dean Rana said for the question of knowing or not knowing the budget, we need to have a written process for proposing classified positions in particular, and have those discussions with the managers to find possible funding.
 - ❖ It is important to include the classified employees considering that they might need to hire twice a year. If that is the case, then there must be discussion at a deeper level, considering that fund 1 wouldn't be considered as a funding source.

- Max Hartman commented that:
 - ❖ Budget is only one piece of information and should not drive the decision making.
 - ❖ Employees need to communicate their needs for the best interest of our college, and if there is no funding, have the opportunity to communicate their needs often.

Amendment

Motion – To highlight the understanding that all the other factors used in our decision are just as important as the Budget.

Discussion - None

In favor - All

Opposed - None

Abstentions– None

Approval - Approved unanimously

Original motion as amended

Motion – To have one hiring process a year that is appropriately aligned and with full budgetary knowledge and consider, just as important, all the other factors used in support of our decision.

Discussion - None

In favor - All

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

F. Summary of IPC's goals and accomplishments

Chair Kaven recognized the two ASCC students for their dedication throughout the year.

4) Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:39 am.