



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, February 5, 2016  
9:30 am – 11:30 am, Building 2, Room 10**

**Members Present:** Danielle Behonick, Nick DeMello, Valeria Estrada, Michael Hoffman, Chialin Hsieh, Maria Huning, Jessica Kaven, Adolfo Leiva, Andee Liljegen (ASCC), Nick Martin, Katie Osborne, Anniqua Rana, Alexandra Wildman (ASCC).

**Members Absent:** Gregory Anderson.

**Guests:** David Johnson, Sarita Lopez, David Meckler.

---

**1. Adoption of Agenda**

**Motion** – Approve as presented

**Discussion** – None

**Abstentions** – None

**Approval - Approved unanimously**

**2. Approval of Minutes – December 4, 2015**

**Motion** – Approve as presented

**Discussion** – None

**Abstention** – Dani Behonick

**Approval - Approved unanimously**

**3. Business**

**A. Membership – Discussion, Action**

Chair Kaven presented that there are two membership items that needs discussion: IPC representative at ASGC and appointment of a second Dean to replace Interim Dean Hamilton who left the college in December.

- IPC rep at ASGC

At the last IPC meeting in December, the topic of having an IPC representative (faculty member, not classified staff) on Academic Senate Governing Council was discussed to ensure that pertinent topics that involves both committees will be properly reported to each committee. Included in the discussion, Co-Chair Anderson stated that for this to be formally adopted, the IPC By-Laws needs to be changed. Per ASGC President, the by-laws do not need to be changed but only an appointment from IPC is needed.

There was discussion about representatives having to wear two hats such as Dani Behonick represents Curriculum at ASGC and since she is also an IPC member, she can represent IPC at ASGC. This scenario only works when it comes to covering topics but not when items are being voted on for it becomes confusing on which committee the person's vote should count for.

Nick Martin volunteered to be the IPC representative at ASGC.

**Motion** – Approve Martin as IPC rep in ASGC

**Discussion** – None

**Abstentions** – None

**Approval - Approved unanimously**

- Appointment of a second Dean to replace Interim Dean Hamilton

Chair Kaven stated that she discussed this with Co-Chair Anderson who stated that Dean Diamond has agreed to be the second Dean at IPC. However, it was noted that Kaven has not discussed this with Dean Diamond.

**Motion** – Approve Diamond as second Dean Representative at IPC.

**Discussion** – None

**Abstentions** – None

**Approval - Approved unanimously**

## **B. Reassigned Time Applications** – *Discussion*

Chair Kaven stated that last year, there were four major areas reviewed: read the applications, provide strengths and weaknesses, determine if the proposals are outside of the faculty contract, and determine if the requested release time is appropriate. Additional criteria taken into consideration are if the requested release time fits with the college's mission and values, and if the job can be completed by a classified staff instead of a faculty member.

IPC members were divided into three groups and there were six applications to be reviewed. The group was instructed to submit their findings by completing the document at <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B6S8FxI2IXClbXRSU2MzZ01iTWs&usp=sharing>

Groups of four IPC members reviewed the following:

1. Nick Martin, Chialin Hsieh, Andee Liljegren, Adolfo Leiva reviewed English and Reading Department Coordinator application.
2. Maria Huning, Dani Behonick, Nick DeMello, Alexandra Wildman reviewed Entrepreneurship, Social Sciences, Athletic Director applications.
3. Katie Osborne, Valeria Estrada, Michael Hoffman, Anniqua Rana reviewed Social Science Coordinator, HTP Coordinator, Fine & Performing Arts applications.

After the group reviewed the applications, the following were discussed:

- It was noticed that while one application was easy to evaluate for the answers were in an essay form, another was not because it didn't respond to the question of "how to?"
- It was stated that it was challenging to evaluate applications that have already been reviewed last year since it confused the reviewers why the same applications are being reviewed again this year. The VPI presence is crucial to provide context as to why last year's IPC feedback were not taken into account for applications that have already been granted reassigned time.

Chair Kaven stated that faculty can apply up to two years but can be renewed every year. A new application doesn't mean that they will not be requested to renew it for the next year.

It was asked why IPC's feedbacks from last year's applications are not shown on this year's applications. Dean Rana mentioned that IPC's feedbacks were shared at the iDeans & VPI's meetings. It was noted that it would be helpful to know how the feedback from last year was handled in order to have better understanding of this year's applications.

- Dean Hsieh confirmed that IPC's feedback is shared at the iDeans & VPI. She also recommended that VPI Anderson share the reassigned time decisions with IPC. It was agreed that transparency for the feedback is crucial to understand why last year's applications have come back to be reviewed again this year. She also mentioned it might be beneficial for the applicants to generate a report and/or present an update on what's been done in order to close the loop.
- A question was asked of what qualifies as a reassigned time?  
It was stated that Appendix B contains information of what can be paid for. In the contract, there should be a list of areas that one can apply for reassignment.
- It was noted that two applications were for programs that students have never heard of (Social Science Hub Speaker Series) or have just started hearing about (Entrepreneurship). The concern was that since this is a reapplication for Entrepreneurship, what has the program done for the past year? As for the Social Science Hub Speaker Series, what does this program do for students?
- It was stated that program data (how many students have been served) is necessary to determine if the application should be approved for renewal of reassigned time.
- It was stated that a rubric is needed for the reviewers to how to calculate what is being requested on the applications such as the statement of "coordinating meetings".
- It was also suggested that a workshop that goes over how to fill out the application might be necessary.
- It was stated that these reassigned time applications should match what is in the program review document.

Chair Kaven concluded that this discussion needs to continue with VPI Anderson's presence and for IPC members to continue thinking about the process for reviewing reassigned time applications.

### **C. Report on Visual and Performing Arts Programs – Information**

Dean David Johnson stated that this report is also known as the Hamilton report, which was completed by David Hamilton before he became the Interim Dean of Business, Design and Workforce. Johnson stated that this was presented at Planning and Budgeting meeting last Wednesday.

The purpose of this report was to provide analysis and recommendations, and a five-year program plan for the Music, Theater Arts, Dance, Studio Arts, and improvement of building 3. Hamilton was hired as a consultant in 2014 by then College President Buckley. The report suggested the following: need for faculty to connect with local high schools, professionals, organizations, community, creation of niche programs (songwriting, scriptwriting, mariachi band, jazz, world music), renovation of building 3, and a new division that would serve the Arts (Fashion Design, Theater, and other programs that could fall in the Arts category).

The faculty in the programs, which many disagree with the recommendations, reviewed the report. It was noted that faculty were not consulted as Hamilton created this report.

To rectify this report, a taskforce has been initiated to review the future of the Arts programs. The taskforce is made up of faculty from Studio Art, Music, Dance, Theater programs and faculty from the Business, Design, & Workforce division, and the Science & Technology division. Also included in the taskforce's responsibility is to review the relocation of the Art Gallery.

Chair Kaven requested that IPC members review the document, ask questions, and be prepared to discuss this at an upcoming meeting.

The documents are found in the PBC website under Feb 3, 2016 meeting  
<http://canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/meetings.php>

### **D. Instructional Program Reviews reminders – Information**

Chair Kaven stated that program reviews are due at the end of February and the meeting on March 18 will be dedicated for IPC to review the documents. Note that the meeting is set for 8:30 am – 12:00 pm and breakfast will be served.

### **E. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:33.