



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF

**Friday, September 02, 2016
9:30 am – 11:30 am, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: Gregory Anderson, Danielle Behonick, Nick DeMello, Heidi Diamond, Valeria Estrada, Chialin Hsieh, Maria Huning, Jessica Kaven, Nicholas Martin, Anniqua Rana, Cindy Streitenberger (ASCC)

Members Absent: Michael Hoffman, Katie Osborne

Guests: Max Hartman, Melinda Ramzel

1) Adoption of Agenda

Motion – Approve the agenda as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Approval - Approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes – May 06 and May 20, 2016

Motion – Approve both minutes as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – Danielle Behonick

Approval - approved unanimously

3) Business

A. Membership – *Discussion / Action*

Co-chair Kaven introduced this topic by asking members if they were going to continue serving on the IPC committee and everyone agreed they were. There was just one ASCC student and Kaven asked Cindy Streitenberger, the new ASCC representative, for another student. Cindy responded that she will be the only student attending at this time and will recruit another student shortly.

It was noted that there is a need for representation by a classified employee because Max Hartman is now an Administrator. Max offered to recruit at the SSPC committee meeting.

Motion – Approve the current membership with the classified representative position vacant to be approved and filled in in the near future.

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Approval - approved unanimously

B. Representative to PBC – Action

Co-chair Kaven presented this item by commenting that the IPC is the subcommittee to PBC. Co-chair Anderson asked if there was anyone who is not a PBC representative and would be able to represent IPC. Currently, Anniqua Rana represents IPC, votes at the PBC meetings, and expressed an interest in continue representing IPC at the PBC meetings. The response was that the preferable volunteer would be classified or a faculty member because it was noted in one of the PBC meetings that Administrators over-represent at PBC.

Motion – Approve to have Maria Huning representing the IPC at the PBC meetings

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Approval - approved unanimously

C. College Governance Survey Results & Program Review Process – Information/Discussion

Co-chair Kaven presented this item by reminding members of the work done last semester to improve the instructional program review process by revising the rubric, talking about the feedback and SPOL.

Co-chair Anderson showed the [Participatory Governance Survey](#) summary and commented on his observations and also said that these results are very helpful tools for decision making.

Summary of Comments

8

Strengths

- Great place to work
- Student first climate
- Good planning processes

Challenges

- Transparency of the processes on decision making related to hiring, participatory governance system, budget, and enrollment.
- Too much work, not meaningful, waste of time related to program review and assessment.

Participants' Demographics

Employment Status	#	%	Membership	#	%	Gender	#	%
Full-time Classified	28	26%	Participatory Governance Members	47	43%	Male	29	27%
Part-time Classified	4	4%	Non Participatory Governance Members	63	57%	Female	80	73%
Full-time Faculty	40	37%	<i>Total</i>	110	100%	<i>Total</i>	109	100%
Part-time Faculty	17	16%						
Student	6	6%	Committee	#	%	Ethnicity	#	%
Administrator/Supervisor	12	11%	Planning & Budgeting Council (19)	12	63%	African American	5	5%
<i>Total</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>100%</i>	Instructional Planning Council (15)	9	60%	Asian	8	8%
			Student Services Planning Council (23)	15	65%	Hispanic	18	18%
			Administrative Planning Council (11)	6	55%	White	56	57%
			Academic Senate (11)	9	82%	Other	12	12%
			Classified Senate (7)	6	86%	<i>Total</i>	99	100%
			Associated Students of Cañada College (8)	7	88%			

Report to PBC/IPC

8/29/2016

Members were encouraged to share ideas of how to improve college governance based on these results.

- lack of leadership development needs to be addressed
- mentorship is a very important part of developing leadership
- faculty participation in participatory government and other leadership activities is part of the regular duties of a tenure-track faculty member, though, according to some members of IPC, these duties can sometimes become a lower priority after tenure is achieved
- there is a perception of too much work and no time to participate
- successes and ways to improve must be considered when identifying challenges
- IPC meeting is the right place to expand on this conversation and important to make the topic inclusive to the entire college, not only for faculty but to classified as well

Program Review Process - Discussion

Co-chair Anderson introduced the topic by referring to the meeting with faculty and administrator leaders held during the Summer 2016. That group talked about programs and how this college needs to refine the system for creating new programs, helping struggling ones, and ensuring strategic support for growing programs.

The current Instructional Program Review system has many strengths and could work more efficiently to identify what we should be doing to better serve the community that relies upon us. We need to adjust resources, including both PT and FT faculty assignments based on needs.

Faculty need to work with their department Deans and the Office of Instruction to make decisions regarding program adjustments, including scheduling priorities. Examples were provided of how some programs had grown, and some parts of programs had fewer sections scheduled. This sort of enrollment and program management is working. The challenge is that these changes are not part of a strategic program and enrollment management plan to say that we as a college are shifting in a certain direction.

The purpose of the meeting was to talk about how this needs to be done more thoughtfully and with more input from faculty in IPC, examining our processes. An immediate result of that meeting was the acknowledgement that the program review structure needs to be adjusted. A big challenge that came out of the government survey and also came up at the meeting, was that the feedback loop is not being closed adequately at the program review level. Co-chair Anderson invited members to participate in the conversation and brainstorm ideas on improving the process. Co-chair Kaven reminded members of the steps of the program review:

Dept/program (author) --> IPR to SPOL --> Dean comments SPOL --> IPC rubric --> (attach - SPOL) (no email to the faculty - feedback ready to review) --> not an opportunity for faculty to write comments -> SEE YOU IN 2 YEARS

Professors Behonick and Co-chair Kaven commented that deans' feedback is not shared at an IPC meeting because that step is not part of the IPC rubric. The challenge is that IPC does not own the program review process and is only charged with the revision task by the Academic Senate Governing Council. Dean Rana commented that perhaps it should be part of the formal process that authors should return to their previous results, using them when writing their new program review. Co-chair Kaven reminded members that every year faculty can return to SPOL to do their financial, facility, and personnel requests, which should tie into the program review but the results are not reviewed. Co-chair Kaven and Co-chair Anderson asked IPC for feedback, ideas or comments. What follows is a brainstormed list of ideas, all of which will receive more thorough discussion and analysis:

- dean feedback and all program review comments need to be accounted for
- Academic Senate Governing Council should consider potential improvements for the process or consider its continued control of the process
- IPC may wish to provide recommendations to Academic Senate Governing Council rather than IPC having full control
- recommendations only get done if formalized and therefore a formal process is needed to follow up on actions
- IPC morale can be impacted if the entirety of effort and feedback work is overlooked. Encouraging participation in review of PR is challenging if it isn't perceived to be valued
- implement and make it required formal annual plans similar to the ones done by grant funded organizations employees
- clear communication of IPC expectations is important
 - IPC send out comments to writers
 - Deans follow up that they received it

- Communicate to IPC the results of the discussion, Deans and program review writers
 - Invite program writers, department employees, and deans to share their reactions to the feedback at IPC meetings
 - IPC get updated with written reaction to the feedback
- consider that feedback and motivation might not be positive and writers might not want to share their reactions
- consequences need to exist in case the formal process is not followed
- educate employees about the importance of their department and that participating in program review is a must
- Academic Senate Governing Council owns the process and IPC is only charged to give feedback
- financial, personnel, or resource request not granted if department is not reviewed
- formal annual update to encourage and instill the habit of departments referring to the program review feedback more often
- Have program review tied to funding, and every two years is too long to keep it going
- Administration will be the ones who will need to take charge of this task
- Because faculty own this process through Academic Senate Governing Council, at the next IPC meeting, a member suggest an agenda item to add a motion, to formalize a recommendation to the Academic Senate Governing Council, to add a formal step to the process - Deans and VPI sit down and follow up on the feedback with the program personnel/coordinator

D. Review Instructional Program Review Questions - *Discussion*

Co-chair Kaven stated that this conversation will continue after she contacts the new Assessment team and the ACES committee who will analyze how questions may be formulated with an equity lens to assure questions are clear for the program review readers. Members commented that:

- most program reviewers don't execute questions 7 and 8, which ask to identify the specific tables from the data packets; those get ignored and the possible reasons could be:
 - struggling because they don't have background on data analysis
 - the data packet has questions that do not align
 - time consuming
 - area that faculty/employees need support around

<p>7A. Connection & Entry—Observation: Describe trends in program and course enrollments, FTEs, LOAD and Fill Rates. Cite quantitative data and identify the specific tables from the data packets. If other sources of data are used, please upload these documents or provide URLs.</p>	<p>Provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Thorough description of trends in all identified areas <input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative evidence from data packets 	<p>Information needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Further description of trends in all identified areas <input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative evidence from data packets 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No recommendation or change needed Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>7B. Connection & Entry—Evaluation: What changes could be implemented, including changes to course scheduling (times/days/duration/delivery mode/number of sections), marketing, and articulation that may improve these trends in enrollment?</p>	<p>Identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Changes that could be implemented 	<p>Information needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Changes that could be implemented 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No recommendation or change needed <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>8A. Progress & Completion—Observation: Describe trends in student success and retention disaggregated by: ethnicity, gender, age, enrollment status, and day/evening. Cite quantitative data and specific tables from the data packets. If other sources of data are used, please upload these documents or provide URLs.</p>	<p>Provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Thorough description of trends in all identified areas <input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative evidence from data packets 	<p>Information needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Further description of trends in all identified areas <input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative evidence from data packets 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No recommendation or change needed Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>8B. Progress & Completion Online—Observation: For online courses describe any significant differences in the success and retention of students who are taking online courses compared to face-to-face (f2f) courses.</p>	<p>Provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Description of differences compared to f2f courses 	<p>Information needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Description of differences compared to f2f courses 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Click here to enter text.</p>

Co-chair Kaven asked members to turn in written feedback at the meeting or through email.

E. Setting Goals for 2016-2017

Item moved to the next IPC meeting.

4) Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:39 am.