



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, November 3, 2017  
9:30 am – 11:30 pm, Building 2, Room 10**

**Members Present:** Loretta Davis Rascon, Nick DeMello, Tracy Huang, David Johnson, Jessica Kaven, Matt Lee, Susan Mahoney, Luis Mendez (ASCC), Sandra Mendez, Katie Osborne, Rebekah Taveau

**Members Absent:** James Carranza, Valeria Estrada, Katie Schertle

**Guests:** Candice Nance (Curriculum Rep), Michelle Marquez, Dayo Diggs, Jamillah Moore, Allison Hughes, David Reed

---

---

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

**Motion** – Approve as presented

**Discussion** – None

**Abstentions** – None

**Opposed** - None

**Approval** - Approved unanimously

### 2) Approval of Minutes – [October 20, 2017](#)

Revision of minutes should include Jessica Kaven as present as well as change the major to include “Communication” (singular) in the Online Degree’s section.

**Motion** – Approve minutes with all necessary corrections listed above.

**Discussion** – None

**Abstentions** – None

**Opposed** - None

**Approval** - Approved unanimously

### 3) Business

#### A. Proposed changes to the Program Review Resource Allocation process

VPA, Michelle Marquez and Interim Dean of PRIE, Tracy Huang presented the proposed changes to the Program Review Resource Allocation process. The document that was presented can be found [here](#). PBC has been working towards developing a more sensible and comprehensive way to get through the Program Review Resource Request process. There is a need for a mechanism to be created to help inform decisions related to the Program Review resource requests as there has not been one at our college. There is a need for transparency in this process to show exactly how decisions are being made. They are proposing the creation of a process by which they can prioritize Resource Requests and allocate funds based on prioritizations. Interim Director of Operations,

Dayo Diggs, has led the efforts in looking at examples from a number of institutions and their processes and they have taken what they feel will work best for Cañada. They would like to activate Cañada's planning councils to be involved in the Resource Request allocation process. Currently the planning councils review Program Reviews and give feedback but do not give input on any Resource Requests. They want to create one process for the college that is clear and helps people understand what is being done. This process gets planning councils involved in the prioritization of Resource Requests as well as inserts the Deans involvement before and after the Program Review Resource Requests are submitted. This process states that programs that are putting forth Resource Requests should work with their Deans prior to submitting the requests. The Deans will prioritize their Division's requests and the requests will then go to the planning council level. IPC would look at all of the instructional division program requests, SSPC would look at all of the student services program request and APC would look at the administrative program requests and all would be prioritized by each council. After planning councils review the requests they will go to PBC where an all college prioritization will be done.

- i. Jessica Kaven noted that the language on the document is not consistent as the term "Program Lead" and "Project Lead" are used interchangeably. This will be updated so the language is consistent.
- ii. Rebekah Taveau inquired about the length of the process and if it was a 10 month process. Michelle Marquez verified that the process does span the entire academic year and is based on the current cycle that is used. Currently, Resource Requests are due in February and final decisions are made by the end of May so that Faculty leave for the summer knowing what has been approved and Division Assistants are able to start ordering during the summer, in time for fall classes.
- iii. The dissemination of decisions regarding Resource Requests is something they will also be working on.

The Rubric and Scoring Sheet for Program Review resource Requests was presented. The rubric includes 8 different categories to be scored: program review, college mission and strategic goals, district strategic goals, college operational plans, learning outcomes, fiscal responsibility, health safety and liability and legal or accreditation mandate. Additionally, a set of guidelines, frequently asked questions and examples will be provided to faculty and staff prior to Resource Requests being submitted. They are proposing to have this adopted late this fall and try it out in February. At the end of this year an evaluation will be done of the new process and feedback will be collected in order to make changes and/or adjustments for next year. The hope is that this will create a process so people will understand how the funding is allocated and what goes into a Resource Request. A Resource Request should be submitted for resources that go above and beyond what the college has already provided in a program budget.

- iv. Allison Hughes asked if this rubric would be used for Resource Requests that are submitted for programs that are not in a Program Review year. Michelle Marquez stated that this rubric will be used and programs can tie the Resource Requests into previous Program Reviews.
- v. Jessica Kaven asked about Resource Requests based on program need and gave the example of a pilot program she is trying to start up. She explained that some justifications may be very specific to the program itself. Katie Osborne also included that the rubric doesn't lend itself to requests such as equipment for fitness classes – how would she tie something like jump ropes into the college mission and strategic goals? Michelle Marquez stated that if you think about it from the perspective of the college mission and strategic

- goals, the program itself is very important to the college mission and goals and the jump ropes are important to the program that then ties into the college mission and goals.
- vi. Katie Osborne asked if someone is requesting a resource or item and the evaluators might not understand what the item is, will there be a place to write a description of the item? Michelle Marquez stated that the evaluators will still be able to see the justifications that was included in SPOL.
  - vii. They are working with Allison Hughes to try and reduce the number of categories in SPOL because there are about 8 categories that do not make sense from a budgetary perspective (example – subscriptions and memberships do not mean anything from a budgetary perspective and that request should be categorized as supplies). The three categories that are looked at for Resource Requests are supplies, equipment and IT.
    - 1. There is a lot of confusion of where personnel requests go within Program Review. There is a narrative portion in Program Review to talk about the personnel within the programs but actual requests for personnel should come through the formal college Position Proposal process. Personnel should not be included in the Resource Request portion of Program Review as personnel funds are not allocated through this process.
  - viii. Rebekah Taveau stated that it would be helpful for Faculty and Staff to have the final rubric ready when they are submitting their requests. It was also suggested to have some kind of a cheat sheet and examples. Michelle Marquez stated that it is the intent to have a finalized rubric as well as examples available by the end of December. Michelle is also happy to meet with departments as they work through the new rubric.
  - ix. Candice Nance asked if the programs/campus community will be able to see what was approved as well as the process that was taken after the decisions have been made. Michelle Marquez confirmed that this information will be available.
  - x. VPI Johnson is thankful for this new process as it aligns with the colleges push to make things less “opaque”.
  - xi. Michelle Marquez asked the IPC members to take some time to look over the rubric and process and let Michelle or Tracy Huang know if they had any suggestions or comments. They will be bringing the process and rubric back to PBC in November to have it approved.

## **B. Accreditation**

President, Jamillah Moore, presented on Accreditation. On Friday, October 27<sup>th</sup> Cañada had their accreditation kick-off meeting and accreditation teams have been formed. Teams are identified by each standard and a list of the standards can be found [here](#). Tracy Huang will be taking the lead on the ALO work and President Moore feels we are off to a very good start. Our accreditation page is up on our website already and includes a list of all of the teams and members. Tracy Huang and President Moore explained that the accreditation teams at Cañada will be working on an Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) which is a self-study that is turned into the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The ISER outlines how our college has identified and addressed our four standards. ACCJC have asked us to start our ISER from January of 2017 which is when the mid-term report was approved by ACCJC and we were reaffirmed. It does not make sense for institutions to go 6 years back (which is how it was done in the past) in their ISER when they have already been reaffirmed. Our ISER will start with what is most pressing including our Educational Master Plan, District Strategic Plan and how our own Strategic Plan works into that and we will break that down into the four standards. ISERs are then submitted to Peer Review teams who read the ISER before performing campus visits.

President Moore just returned from an accreditation visit and wanted to share her experience of the process being on a peer review team. The peer review team included 12 members. She learned that this is a new a different type of ACCJC that is looking at teams going out to the colleges as “peer reviewers”. The peer reviewers are not the compliance officers and are not the accreditation police. The peer reviewers are coming out to do visits and make sure that what the colleges have identified in their ISER is also what can be found on campus. President Moore feels that ACCJC is moving in a direction that is more supportive of Faculty and Staff and what they are doing on continuous quality improvement.

The visit started off with a kick-off and two forums, one in the daytime and one in the evening. Each forum was led by the team chairperson and lasted one hour and included Faculty, Staff and Students. Administrators were asked not to attend the evening forum so attendees would feel free to ask any questions they wanted. The forums included questions such as, “what do you love about your college?”, “What do you think is important to your college?”, “How do you think your college serves its community?” and “What do you love about your students?” Any complaints that people wanted to voice were directed to the complaint process which is a third party process through ACCJC. This third party process allows the team not to get distracted or caught up in things that may take away from their visit.

All team members were placed in a hotel during their stay and they had a working room in the hotel. Each team member had a standard that they had to write on which included two assignments that needed to be completed prior to the visit. The purpose of the assignments is to put the shell of the report together prior to the visit so that when they arrive the teams spend less time writing and more time completing follow up. The teams met during the day on campus where they had a room set aside for them as a working and meeting room. The teams set aside time for meetings within their team as well as attended meetings that were already scheduled during that week on campus such as College Council, Curriculum Committee, etc. The teams also conducted interviews of the President, the Vice Presidents as well as Faculty and Staff.

Some team members met with the college president after the report was concluded and let the president know how they felt they did, focusing on positive feedback. Reports were closed out late in the week and the team invited the campus community to come back for a report out, closing meeting, led by the team chair. The report-out went through the report step by step and the team’s findings. This report-out was informational only and no questions or recordings were allowed. The team then forwards their report to ACCJC. ACCJC meets twice a year (January and June). Every campus that had a visit in October will have their reaffirmation decision made in January and every college that has a visit in Marcy will have their reaffirmation decision made in June. The final decision on reaffirmation comes from the commissioners.

President Moore answered some questions from IPC members regarding specific findings during her college visit. Some key points she wanted to bring back were that it is important to acknowledge potential negatives/downfalls (such as declining enrollment) but it is not necessary to have them fixed by the time we complete the ISER. What is important is that we have acknowledged something that needs to be addressed and have *evidence* to show how we are working on addressing it and what steps have already been taken towards continuous, quality improvement.

President Moore encouraged Faculty and Staff to volunteer to sign up for one of our accreditation standard teams. The Makeup Accreditation Kickoff will take place on November 13<sup>th</sup> from 1pm to 3pm in Building 2-10.

### **C. Integrated Plan (SE, BSI, SSSP)**

Rebekah Taveau and David Reed presented this item. The State Chancellor's Office has asked colleges to integrate their Basic Skills, SSSP and Student Equity Plans. A team has been formed at Cañada to work on this integrated plan which is due to the Chancellor's Office in January, 2018. The Integrated Plan will be presented at the District Board meeting on 11/29 which means the plan must be completed and submitted to the Board by 11/15. An overview of the Integrated Plan was presented and can be found [here](#).

- i. David Reed mentioned that he was at a SSSP Districtwide meeting recently and it was decided as a district to align the integrated plans around the District Planning Metrics which can be found [here](#).
- ii. Any feedback on the Integrated plan is welcome and should be submitted to David Reed or Rebekah Taveau

### **D. Reassigned-time application review**

Hard copies of all RRP applications, as well as the grading rubric were distributed to IPC members. Members who were not present were also sent this information via email. Co-Chair Johnson asked that members review the RRP applications over the next two weeks and return to the November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting with their review sheet completed. During the November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting the IPC members will review their review sheets and discuss notes they included on each RRP application. They will then prioritize the applications to be brought forth to PBC and Academic Senate.

Co-Chair Johnson mentioned that IPC members will be reviewing an RRP Application for a GE Pathways Coordinator. He wanted IPC members to note that there has been an opportunity provided by the State for funding for colleges doing work towards guided pathways that is in the works. Much of the work the GE Pathways Coordinator has been doing aligns with this opportunity.

Co-Chair Johnson announced that during the November 17<sup>th</sup> IPC meeting, he would like to work on creating some kind of mechanism (form, report or rubric) for faculty who have received reassigned time to come back to IPC and report what they have done with the reassigned time that they have been granted. This is important in terms of accountability and will help inform future decisions about reassignment. In the past, there has not been any requirement to log hours worked but some Faculty may have been doing if, for example, they were being paid on overload via a timesheet.

## **4) Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 11:30am