



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES OF**

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

**Members Present:** Gregory Anderson, Nick DeMello, Heidi Diamond, Valeria Estrada, Michael Hoffman, Maria Huning, Jessica Kaven, Nicholas Martin, Katie Osborne, Cindy Streitenberger (ASCC)

**Members Absent:** Danielle Behonick, Chialin Hsieh, Anniqua Rana

**Guests:** Tracy Huang, Jamie Hui, Erin Moore, Melinda Ramzel

---

---

**1) Adoption of [Agenda](#)**

**Motion** – approve the agenda as presented

**Discussion** – none

**Abstentions** – none

**Approval** - approved unanimously.

**2) Approval of [Minutes](#) – September 02, 2016**

**Motion** – approve as presented

**Discussion** – none

**Abstentions** – none

**Approval** - approved unanimously.

**3) Business**

**A. UPDATE: IPC Discussion Related to Professional Development - *Discussion***

Co-chair Kaven introduced this topic by reminding members of the discussion last meeting about [College Governance Survey Results & Program Review Process](#) and commented the outcome of it was around the need for professional development and mentorship/building leadership from within the college. Although IPC originally discussed the need to research leadership/mentorship opportunities from within, further discussion is needed. Co-chair Anderson stated to have heard from employees the desire to still add - a leadership development for instructional participatory governance - item on a future IPC meeting.

## **B. Professional Development Framework Feedback - *Information/Discussion***

Erin Moore presented this item by commenting that she and team of 4 more Canada college employees participated in two of the [RP group “Leading from the Middle” conferences](#) in which they were tasked with creating a professional development framework for this college. She shared with members the timeline and the framework drafts. She also commented on how inclusive this developing process has been by accepting many campus groups feedback. She added that another college that is also developing their framework also provided feedback on our drafted framework which is also a very valuable contribution. She encouraged members to share their thoughts about this document and commented that this framework should reflect every employee in this college and that she is also looking for missing or repetitious pieces of information and any other observations.

Members shared comments and asked questions on:

- developing the reasoning behind “celebrating strength and achievements,” perhaps adding “to further motivate community services”
- update the title to “professional learning” instead of professional development
- question about more information on the 3 categories – professional learning and teaching, communication and collaboration, and career and personal growth and development.
  - Erin commented that there was a lot of thought to minimize the bullets to the three topics and then from the college feedback they tried to make sure that the learning came before teaching
- the 3 categories are not currently in place, as governance is the current focus instead of professional learning
- inclusive framework to the entire campus is ideal but it needs to be presented with a plan
- relate framework with current employee challenges would improve this document
- need for more professional development resources to improve professors knowledge / the teaching quality because this is a teaching institution – professors need to become professional in their area of expertise

## **C. Program Review recommendations: process & questions–*Discussion and action***

Co-chair Kaven presented this item by showing a list of the feedback she received from members to assure the program review process & questions are clearly formulated. She asked members to be prepared to provide a motion based on their feedback provided and current discussion to be shared with the Academic Senate committee. Two feedback pieces were highlighted to members:

- It is unclear where to find the information to answer question # 2 which is about Articulation. It asks for quantitative data not provided to the reader.
- There is a need to add a directive to quantitative data in question # 3 related to the community labor and needs.

Dean Diamond commented to have heard about, in the near future, members having more access to data pertaining to topics described – probably through SPOL – and guaranteed to bring more details to this committee when available.

ACES representative, Hoffman, recommended adding 2 supplement questions - 7C (community equity for access) connected to equity and AD (community equity for success). He commented to have met with Research Analyst, Huang, to prepare disaggregated data for making information clearer to include in the program review. He demonstrated the [“Equity Supplement Data for Program Review 9/30/16”](#) and stated the idea with this supplement is to compare the enrollment for each program with the current enrollment to identify the enrollment gap – difference between the program enrollment with the entire college enrollment. For instance, the gap might indicate that more males should be attending a specific classroom. The data packet demonstrates the access and success rates in each program. Considering access being who is enrolled in the program and success being how successful students are based on their grade.

Members commented on:

- under representative equity gap considered only, over representative gap not included
- supplement only observed differences; didn't give examples with recommended action for each program
- irrelevant to ask for a discussion item instead of what would you do
- questions # 7 and # 8 need to include three fundamental steps:
  - a) observation step to look at the data and see the differences
  - b) interpretation to point out the trends found in these differences and why you think the trends exist
  - c) propose changes in this program for the upcoming year to seize the opportunities expressed in those trends or to prepare for the problems seen on those trends
- create another question, in this case # 9, and include the three fundamental steps instead of adding these steps to questions # 7 and # 8. It seems to include too much data information to look at in a short period of time.

**Motion** – transmit [feedback](#) around the need of arranging order and clarifying questions to make them concrete to the instructions to be used with equity data that will be provided during the program review process

**Discussion** – co-chair Kaven will finalize member's feedback and will provide this item to the Academic Senate committee to be included in their next meeting on October 13<sup>th</sup>. Members expressed interest in including the revised questions in the upcoming program review.

**Abstentions** – none

**Approval** - approved unanimously.

**D. [ACCJC Mid-Term report](#) – Information**

Co-chair Anderson confirmed the ACCJC Mid-Term report was approved on September 28, 2016 by the Board of Trustees with minimal discussion ([Board Report No. 16-9-1B, page 54](#)). The college had already addressed deficiencies in previous reports, specifically the reports that required follow-up and those reports are approved once more. He recognized Dean Hsieh's continuous hard work and expressed gratitude to the IPC committee who was also part of giving feedback and approval to this report.

**E. [Membership](#) – Discussion / Action**

Co-chair Anderson presented the item by asking classified representative Maria Huning the status with the Academic Senate committee and the CSEA approval of Jamie Hui as the second classified representative at the IPC meetings. Maria confirmed this item to be ready for action.

**Motion** – approve as presented

**Discussion** – none

**Abstentions** – none

**Approval** - approved unanimously.

**F. [Setting Goals for 2016-2017](#) – Discussion**

Co-chair Kaven presented this item by providing last year's goals and inviting committee members to share feedback on approving the in progress items or adding any items of interest for the current year. Members commented on:

- professional development leadership
- reassigned time review process (in progress)
- strengthening current programs
- program migration, revitalization and opportunities for new program creation discussions

**G. Announcements – Information**

Co-chair Kaven asked members to remind faculty and department coordinators of the deadlines below:

- Reassigned Time Proposals due to Dean by 1/26/17
- [Instructional Program Reviews](#) due by end of February 2017

**4) Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:39 am.