



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, April 15, 2016
9:30 am – 11:30 am, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: Gregory Anderson, Danielle Behonick, Nick DeMello, Valeria Estrada, Max Hartman, Michael Hoffman, Chialin Hsieh, Maria Huning, Jessica Kaven, Andee Liljegen (ASCC), Nicholas Martin, Katie Osborne, Anniqua Rana, Janet Stringer, Alexandra Wildman (ASCC)

Members Absent: Heidi Diamond

Guests: None

1. Adoption of Agenda

Motion – Approve as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Approval - Approved unanimously

2. Approval of Minutes – March 18, 2016

Motion: Approve the minutes as presented

Ayes – all

Abstentions – Andee Liljegen (ASCC), Nicholas Martin

Approval - Approved unanimously

3. Business

A. OEI Rubric – Information

Dean Janet Stringer presented the [Course Design Rubric for the Online Education Initiative](#) and informed this rubric has passed the state wide review, has been rewritten, shortened and focused to get to this final project. She said it was developed to assure all courses are in a certain standard to be used across the state. She emphasized that its score can be utilized in the decision process of adding courses to class schedules. [“A course that does not achieve the stated minimum scores will not be offered as part of the OEI.”](#) The District wants us to approve this rubric to be used at SMCCCD. With the approval we

would need to know how to use it and who would be responsible and approved to use it. She said this information has been presented at the Curriculum Committee and Classified Senate Committee meetings. Erin Moore, the Director of Professional Development and Dean Stringer have received training on how to use this rubric. She suggested that the categories scored, objectives, content presentation and learning engagement are really important for GE. She also said under interaction and collaboration, there is communications strategies, development, communication and interaction, assessment design and learning support (software technical support). She commented that the college might need an Accessibility Specialist employee to assist with accessing part of these courses.

Professor Kaven shared her experience with having her course accessed with this rubric. She commented it was easier to consider this opportunity with a professional development perspective other than feeling uncomfortable having an evaluator in her classroom. She emphasized that this is an evaluation to the online education and not to the faculty themselves. She suggested the production of a one page with best practices for professors to use as a guide and to serve them as a tool to a one stop shop to get tips. This guide could include recommendations for syllabus or useful feedback on how to structure courses and tips to move from Moodle to Canvas. It would serve faculty members as a great tool to serve as a one stop shop to get tips.

It was pointed out that the curriculum handbook has a rubric for member's consideration before approving this rubric. It was also agreed that the online information on the curriculum handbook might not be about how courses are organized and how courses should be taught but the framework and course outline for potential courses.

VPI Anderson stated that a comprehensive proposal is being prepared to support faculty and bring clarity and coherence to do a lot of this work. For that, he said the hiring of several positions are being considered to ensure faculty has the support they need especially in the transition to Canvas and because this is a faculty driven document, it will depend on faculty shared decisions.

Co-Chair Anderson expressed appreciation to this collaborative conversation and suggested to table this topic and bring it back to IPC once the proposal is completed and funding is decided on.

B. IEPI Goal Setting - Action

Dean Hsieh presented [the Institutional Effectiveness Program Indicator](#) document and asked the committee members to set a goal for course completion and course success rate. She said that this program was strongly recommended by PBC and that is the reason she has brought it to the IPC. She stated that after the goal is set at this committee, she will take it back to PBC for approval, send it to the Chancellor's Office and then Kathy Blackwood will submit it to the State. She said a group of students, from 6 years ago, was chosen with specific requirements of being registered in 6 units for the first 3 years, being first time registered in English and Math classes and graduated.

Dean Hsieh said the goal was not set last year and that the indicator shows that 47.6% of students graduated. She also showed the percentage from the year before as a way to set an average goal for this year. She also commented that members could instead increase the goal by 2 to 3%. She said the state wants a projection and will not expect the college to reach it. IPC members demonstrated uncertainty on setting this goal without an achievable plan in place and continue demonstrating their concern about the accuracy of the information presented because it is from 6 years ago.

Dean Hsieh commented that she has contacted VPSS Kim Lopez to identify ways to influence students based on retention and graduation. Dean Hsieh recognized the need of informing this committee earlier and accepted the suggestion to consult feedback from intervention groups and then share it with IPC before the end of May, when this goal needs to be set.

Motion – Approve to table this action item

Discussion – None

Abstentions – Andee Liljegren (ASCC)

Approval - Approved unanimously

C. ACCJC Midterm Report - Action

Dean Hsieh showed the [Accrediting Commission for Community and junior Colleges Western Association of Schools and Colleges Midterm Report](#). She informed the attendees that this same document has been written for almost a semester and that it has already been presented to the IPC committee in the past. She stated that the college was accredited three years ago and need to prove and meet the standards with this document demonstrating the continuous improvement towards the three recommendations received.

Motion – to approve the **ACCJC Midterm Report** as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Approval - Approved unanimously

D. Program Review Process - Discussion

Chairperson Kaven asked IPC attendees to form small groups to identify benefits and suggestions about the [program review process](#) this year.

Dean Rana commented that one of the program review process benefits was how collective it was and how it involved everybody. Having rubrics and discipline experts present at the day of the program revision was more helpful and beneficial than having presentations. It was also suggested that best practices based on the program review suggestions could serve departments as professional development and for improvement.

It was asked about what accountability looks like during the review process. For instance, what are the consequences of not completing part of the request or of turning it in late compared to the ones completed entirely and on time. VPI Anderson agreed with the need to better engage in identifying a process which assures completeness and timeliness of delivery of these requests and he said that consequences should be clearly communicated to faculty who is writing them.

Members said that some of the rubric questions with numbers were unclear and confused readers about its meaning. There was a need of clarity and guidance and bringing the strategic and equity plan data and how to access it to IPC meeting previously to the revision date would be helpful.

Having the program review documents disaggregated was challenging to readers and it was suggested to reconsider how these documents are being produced.

Members also asked for feedback on resources requested on program review and were interested in receiving training about resources request process. They commented that it would be more beneficial to train during the first day of Flex Day activities because of the number of faculty attendance.

It was suggested to consider quality control on the program review questions to identify the ones most reviewers completed poorly or that weren't filled out completely.

Chairperson Kaven and Co-chair Anderson expressed their gratitude for the remarkable discussion and said that other institutions don't have this cross functionality ability of sharing feedback on possible improvements as the IPC committee does.

E. Reassigned Time Results & Overall Reflection – *Information, Discussion*

Co-Chair Anderson presented the [Reassigned Time results](#) for Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 and its overall reflection. He reminded members that before results are announced, these applications go through an extensive and inclusive process to assure accuracy of the decisions made.

It was requested .40 FTE for the Athletic Director position and .25 FTE was granted to match the amount of work available in that department.

An increase of FTE to .20 was requested for the English and Reading Department Coordinator position but .10 FTE was granted. This decision was made to match similar assignments and give parity with other departments that don't have coordination as requested for this one.

The Entrepreneurship department wanted to continue with .20 FTE but it was not granted because the value of this department is still developing and no results has yet been identified to support this request and also aligns with the college's mission. VPI Anderson

said he is working with this department's faculty to identify possible outside sources to support their current needs and growth.

The Fine and Performing Arts Coordinator position was granted the .20 FTE requested. VPI Anderson emphasized that this department needed the support that the college hasn't given for a long time. He said there is now a taskforce to straighten this department's efforts.

The Honors Transfer Program Coordinator position requested and received .40 FTE and because this is the greater FTE granted, VPI Anderson explained many of the reasons to support the decision made. He said this is the only college wide program present in this college and that it needed to be in parity with other colleges which also granted .40 FTE. He emphasized that this is one of few programs focused on improving the number of students transferring which supports the current focus of our college. Another reason for this decision is that the IPC is co-led by this Honors faculty member which is appropriate but extensive amount of work for one person with reassignment time. VPI Anderson also said that the previous IPC co-leader used to get reassignment time to perform this IPC task.

It was requested to increase the Social Sciences Coordinator position to .20 FTE but it was decided to keep it with .13 FTE to give continuity to the successful work already being done at the college.

Co-chair Anderson invited members to share their overall comments and suggestions on the outcome or process.

It was highlighted the importance of finding funds to support the Entrepreneurship department because this project is found to be beneficial for the new generation of students this college currently has.

One of members remembered the driving factors of the reassigned time process was to try to get parity among departments around who gets coordinators and who doesn't. It was commented that it should be a better process to identify coordination needs to assure all departments are receiving the support they need to successfully serve our students. It was noted that not all departments are getting release time to help with their program plans effort. VPI Anderson said that coordination is currently granted to departments that are able to support their argument based on their needs.

Members emphasized that it has to be a breaking point where it would show that a department is in need of coordination. It was noted that departments distribute overall work and classes scheduling differently and there might be a need of more full time faculty because many adjunct faculty employees are overworked in several departments. It was also recognized that other departments work is distributed efficiently without a greater need of coordination.

Based on today's feedback, it was suggested to revise the [Reassigned time Frequently Asked Questions](#) to provide more clarity to college wide population. There is also the opportunity to review the RRP or [appeal the process](#) but faculty is encouraged to contact IPC Co-Chairs Kaven and Anderson to understand the reasons for the decision before deciding to take further action.

Co-Chair Anderson recognized attendee's contribution with questioning and suggesting improvements for the reassignment time process and commented how challenging it is to control cost without having control over enrollment.

F. Reminder - Information

Co-Chair Anderson announced the reminders below:

- Instructional Program Review presentations to IPC on 5/6:
Art, Athletics, Dance, Kinesiology, Music & Theatre Arts

E. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:33.