



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, December 1, 2017
9:30 am – 11:30 pm, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: Loretta Davis Rascon, Nick DeMello, Valeria Estrada, David Johnson, Matt Lee, Susan Mahoney, Hongli “Bob” Zhao (ASCC), Sandra Mendez, Katie Osborne, Katie Schertle, Rebekah Taveau

Members Absent: James Carranza, Tracy Huang, Jessica Kaven

Guests: Dayo Diggs, Leonor Cabrera, Erin Moore, Jonathan Wex, Jai Kumar

1) Adoption of [Agenda](#)

Motion – Approve as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes – [November 17, 2017](#)

Motion – Approve as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

3) Business

A. RRP Final Review Document

The IPC members reviewed the final combined scores of the RRP Application Rubric which can also be found [here](#). Interim Vice President of Instruction, David Johnson stated that he wanted the IPC members to review the document and give recommendations for each RRP application as well as the duration of the amount of time that was requested. He noted that if the committee feels the amount of time requested is more than should be given, this can be noted in the recommendation as well. In scoring, the four considerations were weighted equally, but in the future the IPC may decide that some considerations are more important than others and we can weight our scores accordingly.

IVPI Johnson also noted that he would like to work on some kind of a rubric or assessment tool to qualify the success of the outcomes of the reassigned time that is being given. This assessment tool should also assess if the faculty being given the reassigned time are meeting their objectives that were outlined in their RRP applications and how they are doing so. He will draft a document and put this on the agenda for a future IPC meeting to be worked on within the IPC.

IVPI Johnson stated that IPC members should not base their decisions solely on how persuasive the argument is, but they should also address the need (for the college as well as department). In some instances, the need is mentioned but not focused on enough but that does not supersede that there is still a need. An IPC member suggested adding some conditions to the acceptance – like a conditional approval of the reassigned time to ensure the need is being met.

When looking at the RRP Application grand totals, Co-Chair Katie Schertle asked the question to the committee, does the way IPC members ranked the applications (in total) actually reflect what members thought of the proposals?

i. GE Pathways Coordinator

1. Continuing reassignment – in the past received 3 units (.2) of reassigned time. Requesting to continue with reassignment with the same number of units.
2. *Recommendation* – IPC strongly recommends this reassignment and is comfortable with the duration and amount of time being requested.

ii. Business Department Coordinator

1. New reassignment
2. An IPC member noted that the application made a good case for something beyond normal assigned duties - Building community partnerships and offering our educational services to bring more exposure for our campus.
 - a. Course development is within Faculty duties already, but if this position is going to be working with local businesses in the community to build professional education, then this would be outside of regular Faculty duties.
3. *Recommendation* – IPC recommends this reassignment as well as the duration and amount of time being requested.

iii. English Department Coordinator

1. Continuing reassignment – in the past received 1.5 units (.1) of reassigned time and is requesting an increase to 3 units.
2. An IPC member noted that, when looking at the scores, it appeared the highest scores were for consideration #2 and #4 and the lowest scores were for consideration #1. The member noted that for consideration #1, it is important to recognize that multiple measures requires a considerable amount of work as it is not just about placing students it also includes evaluation of multiple measures and providing a support system. The member also notes that English is a large department and is also a distinct and intensive discipline which includes professors reading thousands of pages.
3. There was some discussion regarding the hourly estimates listed for the reassignment duties in the proposal. It was noted that it is difficult to give hourly estimates and also be concise. It was recommended that for all reassigned time that is given, faculty should track their hours weekly

4. Historically, the level or reassignment for this coordinator has been 1.5 units. In contrast to Business, Accounting and CBOT which includes work being scaled up and might not require the same level of reassigned time once it gets going versus when it was initiated. The question was asked, if the level of reassignment has been 1.5 units, should we keep the reassignment the same, raise it or eliminate it for the English Department Coordinator?
5. The question was asked, will this coordination time be asked for every year and if the consensus is that there is the need; should it be institutionalized? It also poses the question about other large departments and if they also have the need for Faculty Coordination time so eventually would all departments have Faculty Coordinators? This then also leads to the question about smaller departments and their need for Faculty Coordinators as well.
6. The IPC members discussed the idea of standardizing the number of units for a Faculty Coordinator to 3 units which will create simplicity and efficiency. 3 units of coordination time = 7.5 hours per week. The idea was presented to include a baseline block of duties that any coordinator needs to complete which equates to a baseline number of units. If there are additional duties beyond those baseline duties then additional units can be requested. IVPI Johnson stated that this should be discussed further next semester to include in next year's RRP application process and rubric.
7. *Recommendation* – IPC recommends this reassignment but there is mixed consensus on the amount of units per semester.

iv. Social Science Coordinator

1. Continuing reassignment – in the past received 2 units (.13) of reassigned time and is requesting an increase to 3 units.
2. If you look at the number of sections in the Social Sciences (Anthropology, Communication, History, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology) to see if they are comparable to the number of sections in English, there are approximately 33% more sections in Social Sciences than in English. This does not take into account different units for different sections. Alternately, Social Sciences have a point person for each discipline which is not necessarily the case for English.
3. When looking at the final scores of the group, the scores suggested that this application did not make the case that this reassignment has duties beyond faculty duties as outline in Appendix D1. It was suggested that this application needs to argue the case better that the reassignment is needed.
4. There was a discussion regarding feedback and revision of applications. IVPI Johnson stated that he will be following up with individuals based on the IPC feedback that is given. For future applications, applicants can amend their submissions based on the feedback they are given.
5. In the future, it was suggested to amend question #9 on the RRP Application to include a question that states, "If you are requesting an increase in your current reassigned time, specifically address why".
6. *Recommendation* – IPC is mixed on their recommendation of this reassignment. It was stated that if this reassignment is approved that the number of units should remain at 2 units and should not be increased.

v. Fine & Performing Arts Coordinator

1. New reassignment – was not approved for reassignment for this current year (2017/18) when submitted RRP application in spring of 2017.
 2. This application is different than the other applications received as it shows the challenges of a small department with only four Full Time Faculty.
 3. It was the consensus of the IPC members that the application was not very descriptive and does not provide enough information. It does not list any specific outcomes or objectives.
 4. While the feeling amongst the group is that they would love everyone to have a coordinator, based on the information provided in this proposal it does not provide enough information to support the reassigned time.
 5. *Recommendation* – IPC does not recommend to approve this reassignment.
- vi. Next Steps are to bring the IPC recommendations, and final scores to PBC on December 6th and to Academic Senate on December 14th.

B. CIETL Applications

Interim Vice President of Instruction, David Johnson presented this agenda item. 3 units of reassigned time per semester for a CIETL Faculty Coordinator was approved via the IPC Reassigned Time Application Process for 2 years, starting in fall of 2017. For fall of 2017, Lezlee Ware and Jessica Kaven were splitting the 3 units of reassigned time for the CIETL Faculty Coordinator but there is a need for someone to assume the role for spring of 2018. An email was sent out asking for those Faculty members who were interested in the reassigned time to respond to David Johnson. David received emails from three interested Faculty members and followed up with some application questions. Only one of the interested Faculty members, David Meckler, responded to the follow up application questions. The application was viewed by the IPC Committee members and it was the recommendation of the IPC as well as IVPI Johnson to approve the applicant, David Meckler, for this reassigned time.

A committee member asked how this CIETL Faculty Coordinator position relates to the campus wide Professional Learning Committee as well as the Director of Professional Development. IVPI Johnson explained that when the RRP application for the CIETL coordinator was submitted, it was submitted to bolster Professional Development through the Center for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CIETL) in an effort for Faculty to exercise some control over what is of most value to them. At the same time, there was a state mandate to provide broad campus wide Professional Development in alignment with the dictates of accreditation. This brought about the role that Erin Moore assumed in leading the Professional Learning Committee and as the Director of Professional Development and Innovation, which was vetted through PBC and Academic Senate. The two roles should work in concert and there should be no conflict or duplication of efforts.

C. Online GE Courses

Interim Vice President of Instruction, David Johnson presented this agenda item. IVPI Johnson stated that enrollment at Cañada is an issue as our enrollment has decreased significantly. We are trying to find ways to provide greater access in a manner that makes sense and works for the students we serve. One area where there has been growth is online. In one of our very first IPC meetings the idea of online degrees (with CWA as an example) was discussed. In a conversation that IVPI Johnson had with Jessica Kaven, she suggested the idea that rather than trying to focus on a specific degree, what if we allowed students to just complete their General Education (GE) online which could help all students, regardless of their specific degree.

IVPI Johnson passed out the Draft Online GE Courses handout that can be found [here](#). The handout is based on a CSU GE pattern. He picked classes that are currently offered online that he thought students would find interesting and allowed the students to complete their GE requirements at the same time. He also presented the curriculum to the Deans who felt they could staff the classes listed in this draft GE pattern. He noted that these courses do not satisfy the AA requirement for Cañada which requires the one unit of Physical Fitness. He also did not want these courses to conflict with courses offered in CWA.

An IPC member posed the question, what would happen if the courses listed were full? IVPI Johnson suggested treating students who are taking these course as a cohort (specific program) and, like CWA, including a cohort restriction on the course offerings. He also suggested including a Counseling piece to this program to have a designated online counselor for students in this program/cohort. He did mention that some of the courses will not double count for major requirements (depending on the students' major), which some students like to do in order to graduate or transfer more quickly.

IVPI Johnson suggested that in order to appeal to students who want to complete their classes quickly the courses should be set up as follows: two 8 week classes and one 16 week class per semester when students need to take three classes in that semester. He noted that there are some courses that might lend themselves to be scheduled as a 16 week class versus an 8 week class (such as COM 110 or MATH).

IVPI Johnson will work with the Counselors to collect some sample Student Educational Plans based on different math levels that students may place into when they are first admitted to Cañada. There was also a discussion regarding the course to include for Area E and it was decided to include CRER 137 to fulfill the Area E requirement. This course is taught by a Counselor and there is the possibility of the Counselor who will be teaching this particular CRER 137 course to this cohort to also be the designated counselor for this program. This will provide consistency as well as wraparound services.

4) Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:15am