



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING
COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF
February 19, 2021
9:30 am – 11:30am, Zoom**

Members Present: Jessica Kaven, Lisa Palmer, Allison Hughes, Alex Claxton, Katie Perkins, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Chris Burns, Joan Murphy, Susan Mahoney, Tammy Robinson

Members Absent: Pisith Keo, Sakol Bun, Jill Sumstad, Karen Engel, James Carranza

Guests: Jamie Hui, Diana Tedone-Goldstone

1) Adoption and Approval of Agenda

Motion – To adopt agenda: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Susan Mahoney

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes

Motion – To approve minutes of February 5, 2021: M/S: Alex Claxton, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

3) Program Improvement/Discontinuance Process

Diana Tedone-Goldstone presented on this item. Diana shared that in 2017, the Academic Senate President at the time began the process for program development improvement and discontinuation. Diana mentioned that while there are board policies and procedures, there is not something more specific for the campus. Diana shared that in Academic Senate last week, this project was discussed once more, and she would like IPC to review a draft that has been created, refine it, make suggestions, and return with this input back to Academic Senate.

Diana shared her screen and showed the committee the following webpage, Program Development, Improvement, and Discontinuation:

https://www.canadacollege.edu/academicsenate/program_devtodiscontinue.php

She explained that this page includes link to the board policy, and the area of focus for the committee should be the link found on this page entitled “Draft of Program Improvement and Viability Process (Spring 2019). Diana explained that she would like IPC to review this

draft and see where improvements can be made, with the goal of making the document official to share with the campus at some point in the future. Diana added that the accrediting team also noted that this was not a process that the campus had formally written down, so this project would address that issue as well.

Jessica added that she would like to see continued clarity on what is expected of IPC, as variations of this have been proposed over the years. Diana stated that she would like to see IPC put together an updated draft of the document, to review the draft at the division level for additional feedback, and put together a final draft to bring to Academic Senate. Tammy added that she can add this to the upcoming iDeans meeting on Monday, February 22 to ensure this process reaches all levels.

Jessica asked if this process had been started for any of the current programs. Tammy mentioned that she is not aware of any programs that are going through the program improvement and viability process at present, but it is something that the campus needs to have in place in a proactive fashion. Susan shared that upon viewing the document, there are several areas that could benefit from clarity and revision, as the document is still quite vague. Tammy added that we need to have a local process that is as fair and cogent as possible so that programs can be assisted. Tammy shared that she felt it would be a good idea to report to Academic Senate possibly once a month providing updates, and giving IPC to the end of the semester to complete the document. Diana stated that she agreed this seemed like an appropriate plan. Lisa suggested that input from people who have been through the improvement and viability process with their programs would be useful to better understand what may be helpful, with the hope that there may be room in the process to produce ideas that can assist in sustaining the programs in question. Tammy added that programs would go through an improvement plan and discuss options and background information prior to entering into this process. Alex pointed out additional areas of the document that could benefit from further clarification, and Tammy reiterated that different employees with different backgrounds will have valuable input regarding the significance of and need for changes. Rebekah added that she would find it useful to have outside voices incorporated in feedback for the programs in an effort to be proactive and constructive. Jessica added that she is pleased that feedback is being sought in a proactive way, and appreciated that this will allow input to be offered in a thorough way that is not rushed. Diana agreed that she felt it was important to complete these when no programs were going through the process, as emotions are not high. Tammy agreed that this allows the review process to be completed with a neutral mindset. Susan asked if the committee would put this on a future agenda to revise. Tammy stated that this would be a standing agenda item for the committee and updates will be provided to Academic Senate on a monthly basis. Tammy will take the document to iDeans and ask that the deans review this at their division meetings for further input stressing that this is a campus effort. Diana stated that she would send to the committee the dates of Academic Senate meetings so that they can prepare to provide monthly updates accordingly.

4) Reassigned Time Process

Tammy asked the committee if there were any general questions regarding the reassigned

time process to begin. Joan asked for clarification regarding the mandated reassigned time positions versus the discretionary positions in addition to the application and renewal process. Joan added that there can be confusion with the different timelines for the position renewals, and that tracking and differentiating the positions will be useful. Lisa added that it is her hope that the busy work be removed from this process, to ensure that the faculty are completing the most streamlined applications possible. Rebekah added that it is necessary to be clear about what the committee wants to see in applications to be able to evaluate them properly, and so the people applying know what to include in their applications. Diana added that Academic Senate Officers (President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer) are voted for by the faculty, and campus-wide coordinator positions (online instruction, honors, assessment, etc.) go through IPC for the position renewal in the fall and then faculty apply in the spring. Diana added that these applications are reviewed by committees put together by Academic Senate and their recommendations are sent to the appropriate VP for final decision. Lastly, Diana added that department coordinator positions (English, ESL, Digital Art, etc.) go through the IPC process for the position renewal in the fall and in the spring the program recommends a faculty member to serve to their dean, and the dean forwards the faculty member to the VPI who makes the final decision.

Jessica projected the Academic Senate website and directed the committee to the “faculty service” and “faculty coordinators” sections of the site side-bar. Jessica shared this page: <https://canadacollege.edu/academicsenate/coordinators.php>. Jessica added that previously, much of the information found here was not available, and thanked Diana, Tammy, the deans and additional faculty members for their input on the information available on the site at present. Jessica added that positions and position descriptions, the amount of reassigned time, the type of funding, the term of service, and the current coordinator in place are now available in one location for campus reference. Jessica reviewed both the campus-wide faculty coordinator positions document and the department/program faculty coordinator positions document with the committee. Jessica shared that this is an attempt to link IPC and Academic Senate. Jessica shared with the committee a working excel document that she and Diana have been working on to further clarify faculty coordination and reassigned time which included information regarding mandatory positions, Academic Senate appointments, State Academic Senate recommendations, and discretionary positions. The committee asked clarifying questions regarding interpreting the excel document. Jessica added that clarifying for the campus how the various positions connect to and interact with IPC in the approval process is a priority. Joan added that clarity was further needed in understanding Academic Senate’s role in the review and approval of various positions. Jessica reviewed the reassigned time application timeline with the committee, and agreed that additional intervals could be added to reflect Academic Senate’s role in the timeline for clarity. Diana added that in the spring, the Academic Senate president solicits applications for the positions. Jessica summarized that the committee is seeking for the entire process to be outlined including IPC, Academic Senate, and the Office of Instruction’s roles with clearly outlined steps present. Tammy apologized for the confusion that has existed in past cycles of the review process, and stated that she is working with current coordinators regarding job descriptions and roles to ensure understanding and clarity. Rebekah shared that allowing all positions to go through the same process may assist with the consistency and transparency of the process. Rebekah added that it is in everyone’s interest to have people involved and commenting on the process as positions change and evolve as well.

Tammy added that throughout the process, we need to ensure that we are being good stewards of our taxpayer dollars, ensuring that the time and pay is substantiated. Alex added that as someone who was new to the reassigned time process this year, he found it difficult to assess the distinction from D1 duties, and suggested that emphasizing how the reassigned time roles are in excess of D1 duties should be incorporated more directly in the process. Tammy agreed that this is a central focus, as the reassigned time roles have to go above and beyond the D1 duties to be warranted. Lisa asked if there were ways to simplify or codify the information presented in the chart to attempt to lessen the amount of work for all parties involved in relation to the application process and cycle. Tammy added that the process has been simplified greatly in recent years, and although the process is arduous, there is a fairness and equity to it. Tammy also agreed that the process can continue to be improved.

Rebekah asked for clarification regarding how the unit amount is decided. Tammy clarified that for .2, 7.5 hours per week should be dedicated to this work. With .4, 15 hours per week should be dedicated to the reassigned time role. Tammy clarified that the baseline is .2. Rebekah asked who makes this decision. Tammy stated that the decision is made in consultation with the relevant employees who are connected to that role, clarifying that generally, 7.5 hours is sufficient, and if not, the allocation is reevaluated. Jessica added that she, Diana, and Tammy are working to continuously ensure clarity is achieved in this process, and that it sounds as though more conversations should be had regarding this topic. Tammy added that she will ensure time is available within each meeting so that the committee can continue to discuss and understand the process. Katie added that as a long standing member of the committee who has seen the evolution of the process over the past several years, the robust process does allow for transparency and equity in understanding decisions, and without this, the worry that the transparency of the process may be lost is present. Katie added that with a more rigorous process, there has typically been less conflict when ultimate decisions regarding positions are made. Katie also added that it had previously been discussed to streamline the different amounts of reassigned time related to the number of faculty members and students served in a department, and asked that this continue to be a part of the discussion moving forward as this was not something that the committee had recently discussed. Katie stated that she is in agreement with the longer process because of her history with the committee and seeing the ramifications of a less thorough process. Susan added that the more transparency that is present, hopefully the easier it will be to make a streamlined, simple and more uniform process across the board. Susan suggested using a formula to justify reassigned time allotment as a way to assist people in understanding why different departments receive different amounts of time, and a set criteria can be referenced to ensure transparency. Jessica added that she and Dr. Robinson received a recommendation that a small group of the committee get together and talk through this process and make a recommendation to the larger committee regarding how the current meaningful discussion can be factored into the process. Joan shared that she felt this was a good idea, and volunteered to assist as a staff representative. Susan added that it will be important to have people on this subcommittee that represent both large and small departments to ensure voices are represented. Diana, Jessica, Allison, Joan, Rebekah, and Alex volunteered to be part of this group. Jamie Hui asked if the committee would like her to bring this request back to the BDW division to see if anyone is interested in representing the area.

5) Good of the Order

Joan revisited the conversation that took place at the previous meeting regarding the CIETL coordinator position, and shared that she would like to know what the future of the position may look like. She stated that she has trouble with the name of this position as the center that is associated with the name no longer exists. Diana added that she is awaiting the updated position description. Allison shared that the discussion from the previous meeting revolved around if the name of the position should be changed and if the position description should be updated. Tammy shared that the position will be reviewed.

6) Adjournment

Motion – To adjourn the meeting: M/S: Alex Claxton, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

a) Meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.