



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, August 25, 2017
9:30 am – 11:30 pm, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: James Carranza, Nick DeMello, Valeria Estrada, David Johnson, Matt Lee, Susan Mahoney, Luis Mendez, Sandra Mendez, Katie Osborne, Katie Schertle

Members Absent: Loretta Davis-Rascon, Tracy Huang, Jessica Kaven, Rebekah Taveau

Guests: Leonor Cabrera, Sarita Lopez

1) Adoption of [Agenda](#)

Motion – Approve as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes

A. [May 5, 2017](#)

B. [May 19, 2017](#)

Motion – Approve as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

3) Business

A. Membership – *Discussion/Action*

Co-Chair Johnson went over current membership as listed on our IPC webpage.

IPC Members, 2017-2018 (15 voting members)

Co-Chairs: Vice President, Instruction and one faculty member (from list below)

- ACES - Rebekah Taveau
- Counseling – Sandra Mendez
- Curriculum Committee Chair – Katie Schertle (IPC Co-Chair)

- Librarian - Valeria Estrada
- Honors Coordinator – Susan Mahoney
- Faculty Assessment Coordinator - Jessica Kaven
- 2 Classified Members – Matt Lee and Loretta Davis-Rascon
- 2 Students – Luis Mendez and Vacant
- 2 Faculty Members-at-large - Nick DeMello and Katie Osborne
- 1 Instructional Dean – James Carranza
- Dean of PRIE – Tracy Huang
- Interim Vice President of Instruction - David Johnson (IPC Co-Chair)

Co-Chair Johnson referenced the May 19th, 2017 minutes to confirm that the Faculty Assessment Coordinator should be added to IPC membership. The membership makeup has been revised and instead of two instructional Deans, there is now one instructional Dean serving. Instead of three Faculty members-at-large there should now be three.

Co-Chair Johnson indicated that a second co-chair was still needed. He explained the work of the co-chair as facilitating and guiding the work of the Committee, meeting with the IVPI, bringing the agenda into sharper focus and maintaining the energy and enthusiasm of the Committee. A committee member asked the clarifying question if the co-chair need to attend any additional meetings to IPC and Co-Chair Johnson indicated that no additional meetings were required. Katie Schertle agreed to serve as the IPC Co-Chair for the 17-18 Academic Year.

Motion – Update the bylaws based on the membership listed above including the Faculty Assessment Coordinator, one instructional dean and two faculty members-at-large

Discussion - None

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

B. Representative to PBC – Action

Co-Chair Johnson presented this item by commenting that the IPC is the subcommittee to PBC. IPC is looking for one representative to PBC to report to PBC what we have done at IPC and to report to IPC what has been done at PBC. PBC meetings occur every other Wednesday from 2pm to 4pm. Co-Chair Johnson asked the question if any IPC member already attend PBC. James Carranza (Interim Dean of Humanities) indicated that he will be present at PBC and will serve as the IPC representative for PBC.

C. Reassigned time process – Discussion

Co-Chair Johnson presented this item by passing out his [Draft Revision of Reassigned Time Process](#) to be discussed. Co-Chair Johnson would like to revise the process in a way that is more responsive, less obtrusive and more aligned with our other planning bodies. He indicated that based on Faculty feedback, there was some confusion and concerns about the timeliness of decisions for reassigned time. Faculty should be able to plan their own schedules and Deans should be able to plan their

classes and this cannot be done in a timely and effective manner when decisions for reassigned time are made late. The draft proposed is an attempt to bring the reassigned time process in sharper focus and to improve the procedure.

The request for reassigned time should come through the Administrative Planning Council or through Program Review. When the Office of Instruction goes to a Faculty member and asks them to take on reassigned time, it can put the Faculty member in an awkward position where they feel obligated to take on additional tasks. If reassigned time comes through APC, it will mitigate this.

The Draft Revision of Reassigned Time Process follows the guiding principle that feedback should be provided at more than one group (IPC, PBC and Academic Senate). Minutes from PBC, Academic Senate and IPC should reflect feedback discussions regarding Reassigned Time. This will ensure that the feeling among Faculty is not that the VPI is making decisions without consultations from other Participatory Governance groups. PBC has a role in assessing budget impact and Academic Senate has a role in assessing academic impact. A committee member did express their feeling that former VPI Anderson was transparent about how decisions on reassigned time were made.

TIMELINE – Revised timeline was presented by Co-Chair Johnson based on his Draft Revision of Reassigned Time Process document. By the end of September, PBC will provide an estimation of the total amount (expressed in FTEF) of funding that can be designated for reassigned time in the next academic year. It is best if IPC were making decisions with some idea of the financial environment of the college. This will give Faculty 6 weeks to complete applications (made available by September 1 – due on October 15).

- Questions/Comments/Concerns from Committee Members and Guests
 - o Committee member asked that since we have not yet reviewed/updated the application, will it still be available on September 1st since next IPC meeting is not until September 15th.
 - o Committee member asked if IPC receives applications by October 15th, this gives IPC two meetings to go through requests/applications – is this doable? Members agreed.
 - o Committee member asked if reassigned time is only evaluated once a year.
 - Co-Chair Johnson would like to follow a process but if extenuating circumstances come up (grant funding that needs to be spent, board requests or immediate college need) then exceptions can be made.

PROCESS – Applications for Reassigned Time come to IPC – IPC gives assessment to Academic Senate and PBC including any questions they may have. PBC and Academic Senate review applications and then give feedback to the Office of Instruction by the end of the fall semester. The final decision is made in time for Deans to schedule classes appropriately. The final decision is made by the VPI in consultation with the President

Co-Chair Johnson, in agreement with the Committee, made the decision that Faculty/guests will be allowed to attend the beginning of IPC meeting where reassigned time proposals are being reviewed to provide information about positions being proposed and the remainder of meeting will be closed. Any questions can be passed along to Academic Senate and PBC.

- Questions/Comments/Concerns from Committee Members and Guests:

- Committee member stated that IPC is an advisory group and it should be kept that way. IPC does not actually make the final decisions but gives insight on possible conflicts of proposals, etc.
- Guest stated that in the past, after the college was told who received reassigned time, CTE Faculty were asked to meet with former VPI Anderson to discuss decisions during an individual meeting. Will this continue?
 - Co-Chair Johnson stated that he will not be meeting with individual Faculty members before decisions are made. They will have the opportunity to answer questions or concerns during Academic Senate and PBC meetings.
- Guest stated that the past, professors have asked if they could be at the IPC meeting to answer questions regarding reassigned time and were told no, will this be the case in 17/18?
 - Co-Chair Johnson reiterated that reassigned time decisions should be about positions and not people.
 - Committee member stated that if you bring Faculty in to the reassigned time review meetings it may feel like they are campaigning.
 - Committee member stated that the reassigned time review meetings have been kept confidential to protect committee members. No names should be present in IPC minutes during reassigned time review.
 - Committee member stated that IPC is reviewing proposals and not the final decision maker. Suggested allowing Deans to give feedback and information, make suggestions and act as a liaison for their Divisions during reassigned time review.
 - Co-Chair Johnson suggested the possibility of including a confidentiality clause on the application.
 - Committee member stated that when a group of things are being evaluated, committee members can sometimes be reluctant to question something that is submitted by a colleague. Suggested allowing 10-15 minutes at the beginning of the reassigned time review meeting for guests.
 - Co-Chair Johnson senses Faculty feeling reluctant and wants to create a culture of understanding and trust and not being scared to be honest among colleagues. We are not doing anyone any favors if we are reticent of honesty and feedback.
 - Committee member stated that it is fair and equitable to allow Faculty at some point to come and present/answer questions regarding their reassigned time proposals.
 - Co-Chair Johnson put forth the idea that the Faculty would have the opportunity to answer questions at Academic Senate or PBC and to keep IPC closed during review meetings.

RRP APPLICATIONS – It was the consensus of the group that the current RRP Application should be reviewed by IPC. A Google Document will be created so IPC members can track suggested changes to the current RRP Application

- Questions/Comments/Concerns from Committee Members and Guests:
 - Committee member stated that IPC sometimes has questions because submissions are not clear or detailed. What was problematic was mostly due to the quality of the submission.

- Committee member stated that some submissions were like a worksheet without much information while other people build a proposal with background, examples and evidence.
- Committee member asked if we can provide examples of “good” proposals on our website that Faculty can refer to.
- Committee member suggested that however we format the application, it should in sequential order of what may be pertinent to Academic Senate or PBC.

APPEALS – The current appeals process can be found on the IPC website [here](#). Co-Chair Johnson stated that appeals for reassigned time positions to be reevaluated should go to IPC (not directly to VPI). This creates transparency, ensures appeals are on the record, and protects the Office of Instruction, VPI and Faculty member. A committee member did state that IPC is not the final decision maker but agreed that this is a good avenue to have an on record appeal be presented. Co-Chair Johnson stated that IPC is an advisory committee but the VPI will not make decisions that run counter to the sensibility of the IPC.

D. Setting Goals for 2017-18 – Discussion

Co-Chair Johnson brought up the [2016-17 IPC goals](#) put forth from the May 19th, 2017 IPC meeting. In the May 19, 2017 [minutes](#), it is indicated that “Members agreed that the items that are not highlighted are the ones in progress and should be added to next year’s goals.”

GOALS FOR IPC, 2016-2017 (9/30/16)

- Provide recommendations to Academic Senate regarding Instructional Program Review (IPR) questions and process
- Revise IPR’s rubric, if needed
- Create exemplary list of IPR sections for program review authors – provide examples of well written IPR documents, examples of how disciplines have used the program review process to improve programs, etc.
- Examine how IPR can strengthen current programs (feedback)
- Examine and discuss IPR’s role in program migration and revitalization, as well as opportunities to create new programs (feedback; draft via AS)
- Provide IPR training and/or documents to faculty regarding IPR expectations
- Review Request for Reassignment Proposal (RRP) process and make any necessary recommendations to AS
- Provide IPC members with overview of training on planning processes. This training can include how to coordinate the planning process and the different kinds of data that can help inform the planning process (e.g., institutional – and program-level data provided by PRIE, interdepartmental data, Equity Gaps data)
- Examine professional development as it relates to instruction and leadership; share findings and/or provide feedback to PD committee

Co-Chair Johnson touched on the idea of being proactive and positive about Program Improvement Plans (PIP) for programs before they get to Program Improvement Viability (PIV). IPC can be seen as a resource with regard to PIP and PIV.

Co-Chair Johnson advised the committee to think of goals they would like to set for IPC for 2017-18 and come back to the next meeting ready to discuss and advise updated goals.

4) Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 am