



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, October 20, 2017
9:30 am – 11:30 pm, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: Loretta Davis Rascon, Nick DeMello, Valeria Estrada, David Johnson, Jessica Kaven, Matt Lee, Susan Mahoney, Sandra Mendez, Katie Osborne, Katie Schertle

Members Absent: James Carranza, Tracy Huang, Luis Mendez, Rebekah Taveau

Guests: Candice Nance

1) Adoption of [Agenda](#)

Motion – Approve as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – None

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes – [October 6, 2017](#)

Motion – Approve as presented

Discussion – None

Abstentions – Jessica Kaven

Opposed - None

Approval - Approved unanimously

3) Business

A. Reassigned-time applications received as of 8am on 10/20/2017

- i. The Office of Instruction announced that there have been no reassigned-time applications received as of the time of the meeting. The deadline for reassigned-time applications to the deans is end of day on 10/20/2017.

B. Reassigned-time application decision rubric

- i. Co-Chair Johnson would like to try and find a way to quantify the decision making process as it relates to prioritizing requests for reassigned time. A tool should be created to be used by IPC as well as to present to others how we assess our applications.
- ii. The proposed rating form (found under the materials column for the 10/20 meeting [here](#)) was handed out to IPC members for discussion. A rating form was created with four

- considerations to be scored on a five point Likert scale. The considerations were derived from the IPC Feedback Document that had been used in past years. The proposed rating form includes a rating form for each reviewer (voting IPC member) to rate each consideration for each application/position. Those scores would then be moved into the total/master rating form. Each application would have a total/master rating form and an overall or average score would be included on the form along with comments from IPC members for each consideration.
- iii. The committee looked over the considerations presented in comparison with the Request for Reassigned Time Application to map each consideration with questions on the application. Co-Chair Johnson stressed that the considerations on the rating form should be reflective of the questions that are asked on the application. The committee discussed if each consideration should have the same weight or if some considerations should be weighted more than others. This can be looked at from a rubric standpoint or as a competency score. Each category/competency levels can be worth a particular percentage. It was also discussed if some of the considerations should just be rated as “yes” or “no” versus on a Likert scale. It was decided that we look how well the scores worked for this years’ iteration and moving forward in upcoming years, we can weight certain considerations etc. once we have an idea of how well the scoring may have worked for this current year.
 - iv. The final considerations were confirmed to be updated on the rating form
 1. Consideration #1 (aligns with #10 on application) – The responsibilities associated with this reassignment are NOT included as part of faculty workload.
 2. Consideration #2 (aligns with #11 and #12 on application – The position’s proposed outcomes align with the college’s strategic plan and initiatives.
 3. Consideration #3 (aligns with #6, #7, #8 and #9 on application) – Amount/duration of reassigned time requested is reasonable.
 4. Consideration #4 – Duties are most appropriately performed by a faculty member.
 - a. There was conversation regarding this consideration amongst IPC members. The question proposed does not have anything to do with if a classified position for these duties already exists. The question that is presented is, can and should this be done by someone other than a faculty member? Is the need not being met and should a faculty member be meeting that need? The committee discussed the need for a document that outlines duties that qualify as something a faculty member would do versus something a classified professional would do. It was pointed out that if IPC comes to the conclusion that the job being presented can and should be done by a classified professional, there is nothing to be done about that (permanently) until the next year based on the position proposal timeline. Although, if the need is immediate, something like a short-term, temporary position could possibly be created. It was agreed that IPC members should include comments for their rating score of consideration #4.
 - v. The Process of how the Request for Reassigned Time applications will be vetted was discussed. The applications will go to IPC for initial review. The applications will be made available to IPC members prior to the first review meeting on 11/3. IPC members will use the agreed upon rating form to determine their initial review of the applications. This will be done at a meeting to create collective feedback review from IPC members. The review (including comments and master rating forms for each proposal) will be presented to PBC

and Academic Senate. PBC will look at the review based on the financials and Academic Senate will look at the review based on the educational merits. The feedback from PBC and Academic Senate will come back to the Office of Instruction (VPI).

In year's past, there was no discussion of application amongst IPC members and they worked in small groups looking over some of the applications per group. At IPC, not every member saw every proposal. Their group's comments were then sent to the VPI who then had individual optional meetings that were scheduled. The VPI then went to speak to the instructional deans before making his decision.

C. Online Degrees

- i. Sandra Mendez (IPC member and Counselor) was asked by Co-Chair Johnson to create sample Student Educational Plan (SEP) for students who might want to obtain a degree online for some of our most popular programs. The programs identified would be ones that might be appealing for students to take online. Through the SEPs we could look at how much of that program degree or certificate could be taken online. Co-Chair Johnson stated that he would like to base these SEP's on a pathway model based on sequencing that has already been successful (like College for Working Adults) over a three year period. Three different program degrees and/or certificates were identified via SEPs (see the IPC documents from today's meeting here):
 1. Certificate in Entrepreneurship Small Business Management (21 unit certificate)
 - a. ACTG 100 and 200 are not offered online at Cañada but they are offered online at CSM. They both have a DE addendum so could potentially be offered online at Cañada.
 - b. BUS 180 is only offered in the fall semester in our district. We are relying on students taking a specific sequence of courses. We would need to guarantee offering courses within the sequence regardless of enrollment.
 - c. There was a conversation regarding quality classes being taught online and student concerns regarding instructors who teach only online.
 2. AS in Business Administration for transfer to a CSU
 - a. In this example it is assumed that the student is coming to us at transfer level (not basic skills). This SEP is for 6 semesters, including summer term.
 - b. Sandra tried to add GE courses across multiple divisions and subjects.
 - c. Candice Nance stated that part of the strategic growth in Business has been to offer their three core transfer classes (BUS 100, BUS 103 and BUS 201) every semester (including summer).
 3. AA in Interdisciplinary Studies with an emphasis in Social Behavioral Sciences
 - a. Interdisciplinary Studies is a major but the student still needs to choose their emphasis.
 - b. Students typically don't come to us for an AA in Interdisciplinary Studies as their first goal, it is usually their secondary goal for a second Associate Degree. In this example there is a lot of ambiguity beyond spring 2018.
 - i. Some factors include if the student is interested in transferring, what other major they are pursuing as their first goal etc.
- ii. Co-Chair Johnson stated that the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor is concerned with our drop in enrollment throughout the District. We need to improve our enrollment numbers by offering programs in a way that would appeal to our student.

Our online enrollment numbers are very high which is why we are looking at the idea of possibly creating online degrees. IPC should be looking at what programs would be the most attractive to be offered online as well as feasible. Co-Chair Johnson is looking for suggestions for possible online degrees. Social Sciences have the highest online enrollment currently. He feels that Business and Psychology looks to be very appealing to be offered online. Committee members also suggested Communications, Psychology, Political Science, Communication, Sociology and Econ. Candice Nance thought it would be good to look into the new Public Policy Law ADT to see if this could be made into an online degree as well. Dean Stringer has stated that Science and Technology is hard to do 100% online due to labs. A committee member also suggested Interdisciplinary Studies because some students do not know what they want to major in when they first start at Cañada. Students tend to gravitate towards anything that sounds vague. The problem with this is that if we model our potential online degrees after CWA then students do not have the option to pick their classes and they must stay on a specific pathway. We could start with the GE pathway for Interdisciplinary studies which would give students some more time to focus on what they want their emphasis to be. After the GE pathway sequence students could move into their guided pathways for their specific emphasis. IPC could look at it two ways – driving it from the GE perspective or driving it from the major perspective.

- iii. If we move towards offering online degrees and certificates we also need to look into providing online Student Services so that our online students are still supported. We need to look at the student as a whole and providing everything our students need in order to be successful regardless if they are students who come to campus or students who are taking courses online.

D. Announcements

- i. Co-chair Johnson announced that an email had gone out for those faculty interested in applying for the CIETL Coordinator reassigned time. This opportunity is open to both Full Time and Adjunct Faculty. The deadline to apply is 11/10/2017. The position is currently being split for the fall 2017 semester between Jessica Kaven and Lezlee Ware but Jessica Kaven announced that she will not be reapplying for the position. She also noted that the title of this position has changed over time

4) Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:13am