



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018  
9:30 am – 11:30 pm, Building 2, Room 10**

**Members Present:** Nick DeMello, Valeria Estrada, Tracy Huang, David Johnson, Matt Lee, Susan Mahoney, Sandra Mendez, Katie Schertle, Rebekah Taveau

**Members Absent:** James Carranza, Loretta Davis Rascon, Jessica Kaven, Luis Mendez (ASCC), Katie Osborne

**Guests:** Nick Carr, Dayo Diggs, Leonor Cabrera

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

**Motion** – Approve as presented  
**Discussion** – None  
**Abstentions** – None  
**Opposed** - None  
**Approval** - Approved unanimously

**2) Approval of Minutes – [December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017](#)**

**Motion** – Approve as presented  
**Discussion** – None  
**Abstentions** – None  
**Opposed** - None  
**Approval** - Approved unanimously

**3) Business**

**A. Program Review**

Interim Dean of PRIE, Tracy Huang, presented this item. She reminded everyone that Program Review and Resource Requests are due in SPOL on February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2018. The following programs are due this year (even years): Humanities, Learning Center, Athletics, Kinesiology and Library:

Reviews due in Even Years (due 2016, 2018, 2020)	Economics	Library	Spanish
Anthropology	English	Music	Theatre Arts
Art and Art History	English as a Second Language	Philosophy	
Career Courses	History	Political Science	
Communication Studies	Kinesiology, Athletics & Dance	Psychology	
	Latin American Studies	Sociology	
	Learning Center		

The Programs below are up for their Campus-wide presentations, which occur on a 6-year cycle and The Campus-wide presentations will take place during IPC on Friday, May 4<sup>th</sup>.

<b>2018</b>
English
English as a Second Language
Latin American Studies
Learning Center
Library
Spanish

The March 16<sup>th</sup> IPC meeting will be an extended meeting from 8:30am to 12pm and will be dedicated to providing feedback on the Instructional Programs that submitted their Program Review this year.

Tracy went over the different templates and forms for Program Review which can be found [here](#). She noted that if anyone has any questions pertaining to submitting their Program Review information into SPOL, they can contact Allison Hughes. Tracy confirmed that previous submissions would be automatically populated into SPOL and Faculty should be updating and adding new information for this current year.

Resource Requests are submitted by all programs (not just those that are up for Program Review). These requests are for resources that are outside of a program's normal program budget. We will be piloting a new process for Resource Request Prioritization that was previously presented at an IPC meeting by Tracy and VPA Marquez. This year the new process will include the Deans and the Councils; Instructional Planning Council (IPC), Student Services Planning Council (SSPC) and Administrative Planning Council (APC). IPC will review and prioritize all Instructional Resource Requests that have been submitted. IPC's prioritization needs to be submitted to PBC by the end of April. It was decided that IPC would include the Resource Request Prioritization to their agenda on April 6<sup>th</sup> with the April 20<sup>th</sup> IPC meeting as needed.

When IPC schedules their Program Review meeting, IPC members break into groups to look at separate Program Reviews per group. By doing this it poses a potential problem because not all members look at each Program Review. This information is important now that IPC will also be looking at Resource Requests and how they are tied to each Program Review. It was decided that at the end of the 3/16 meeting, the IPC agenda would allot time for each review group to summarize the Program Review they looked at so everyone could then make informed decisions on Resource Requests during the 4/6 and 4/20 meetings. Within the Resource Request document there is a question that states, "How is this request related to your Program Review?" which is helpful when prioritizing Resource Requests. Even if the person reviewing the Resource Request

has not looked at the entire Program Review they should be able to gather how the resource relates to the Program Review.

Tracy also went over where programs can find their [Data Packets](#) which provide program data. There are four different types of packets: Productivity, Student Characteristics, Effectiveness and Equity. IPC member, Rebekah Taveau, asked members if they felt comfortable analyzing their Equity packets or if it would be beneficial to have someone come to their department and explain the data within their Equity packet. Most departments felt they had adequate resources to enable them to interpret the data in their Equity Packets.

## B. Reassigned Time Application

Interim Vice President of Instruction, David Johnson presented this agenda item. The Office of Instruction recently sent out an email notifying the campus of the results of the Reassigned Time Position Proposals which can be found [here](#). Once reassigned time positions have been granted/approved, the Office of Instruction will send out an application for Faculty members to complete in order to apply for the different reassignment positions. IVPI Johnson worked with IPC members to modify application questions. An email was sent to all Faculty members on Friday, February 2<sup>nd</sup> asking for Faculty Application for Receiving Reassigned Time to be submitted by Monday, February 12<sup>th</sup>. Decisions on who will be assigned to each role will be made by Thursday, February 15<sup>th</sup>.

The Office of Instruction will share the applications that have been submitted to the Deans and IPC but ultimately the decision of who will receive the reassignment is up to the Vice President of Instruction. If there is more than one Faculty member applying for a certain reassignment role then the VPI will consult the Deans and IPC.

## C. Enrollment/FTEF Allocation

Interim Vice President of Instruction, David Johnson presented this agenda item. IVPI Johnson feels it is important for IPC to have an understanding of what is a major element to how we are making decisions with regard to scheduling and cancelations. We are moving to a model where we are allocating FTEF to each division and having that inform the decisions on what sections are offered, how many sections are offered and when. IVPI Johnson presented the FTEF calculator that has been used by the Deans and the Office of Instruction to track FTEF, LOAD and more:

**Cañada College**  
**Office of Instruction**  
*Division Term Information (FTEF, FTES, WSCH and Load)*  
*(Excludes Contract Courses)*

\*Spring 2018 Data as of 02/05/2018

17-18	Summer 2017					Fall 2017					Spring 2018*					PROJECTED YEARLY TOTAL 17 - 18					
	Division	FTEF Assigned	FTEF Actual	FTES	WSCH	LOAD	FTEF Assigned	FTEF Actual	FTES	WSCH	LOAD	FTEF Assigned	FTEF Actual	FTES	WSCH	LOAD	Div.	FTEF Assigned	FTEF Actual	FTES	WSCH
3340	0.39	0.40	6,200	186	465	0.97	1.00	16,407	492	492	0.74	0.97	15,585	468	484	3340	2.10	2.37	38,192	1,146	484
3345	0.00	0.00	0,000	0	0	0.13	0.00	0,000	0	0	0.13	0.00	0,000	0	0	3345	0.26	0.00	0,000	0	0
3411	3.89	4.12	69,980	2,099	510	20.74	20.48	299,940	8,998	439	20.49	20.28	297,343	8,920	440	3411	45.12	44.88	667,263	20,018	446
3413	7.67	8.74	155,727	4,672	535	42.72	39.23	582,849	17,485	446	40.96	36.25	519,390	15,582	430	3413	91.35	84.21	1,257,966	37,739	448
3414	12.70	12.59	214,400	6,432	511	34.89	35.78	631,079	18,932	529	36.43	34.92	585,130	17,560	503	3414	84.02	83.29	1,430,609	42,924	515
3416 #	1.76	2.43	45,082	1,352	558	6.50	6.52	95,233	2,857	438	6.02	5.90	90,205	2,706	459	3416	14.28	15.00	230,520	6,916	461
3421 #	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.27	0.27	10,413	312	1170	0.13	0.20	8,805	264	1321	3421	0.40	0.40	19,218	577	1441
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26.41</b>	<b>28.27</b>	<b>491,389</b>	<b>14,742</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>106.22</b>	<b>103.28</b>	<b>1,635,921</b>	<b>49,078</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>104.90</b>	<b>98.52</b>	<b>1,516,458</b>	<b>45,500</b>	<b>462</b>		<b>237.53</b>	<b>230.06</b>	<b>3,643,768</b>	<b>109,319</b>	<b>475</b>

FTEF = Full time equivalent instructor  
FTES = Full time equivalent student  
WSCH = Weekly student contact hours  
LOAD = WSCH / FTER  
FTEF = WSCH / 30

**FTEF/FTEF RATIO\***

	16-17	17-18
SUMMER:	18.29	17.38
FALL:	16.09	15.84
SPRING:	15.79	15.39
YEAR:	16.20	15.84

**TARGET 320 REP.**

1718 FTES GOAL: **3,852**    **0**    PA  
1718 LOAD GOAL: **487.1**

# For Summer 2017, both LIBR and LCTR courses were included in Division 3416.

The 2018/19 academic year will be the first full year using FTEF assignments because when this calculator was started, the Summer and Fall 2017 schedules had already been completed. The calculator includes the FTEF that has been assigned versus the actual FTEF.

FTEF can be looked at as the number of sections being offered. 1 FTEF is equivalent to 15 units (assignment for one Full Time Faculty member). LOAD can be looked at as how full our classes are. IVPI Johnson used the example of having 12 people who needed to travel across town. You could take 6 cars with 2 people in each car but it would be better to take 3 cars with 4 people in each car because that is more efficient. Our target LOAD is 525. In Fall of 2017 we came in under our assigned FTEF but our LOAD was only 475.

There was a discussion regarding LOAD and course totals. The target enrollment number per course is 35 to meet the target LOAD of 525. The example of English classes being capped at 26 students was discussed as they may meet or exceed their fill rate but the LOAD may not be high in these courses. Some IPC members felt that we may be losing students by having larger class maximums because more students are being turned away. If we have smaller course maximums then we may be able to add more sections which would lead to less students being turned away, but then our FTEF would be over our target. IVPI Johnson mentioned that in English they will occasionally offer an additional online section of a course that has multiple full sections because that will allow those students on the waiting lists of the full sections to take the course regardless of their course schedule limitations (as the different full courses may be on different dates and times).

The questions were asked, do we have anyone looking at the tipping point? Are we getting so efficient that we may be losing overall enrollments because we do not have enough course offerings? Are students going to other campuses because they have more offerings that work with students' schedules and does this lead to diminishing returns? IVPI Johnson addressed this question by providing information on courses that are left open, which contributes to our low LOAD. This also exhibits that our college understands that we need to provide adequate scheduling options for students. There is information regarding courses that are canceled as well as left open [here](#). It is hard to know how many students we might be losing because they can't get into classes and then do not return. Tracy Huang mentioned that enrollment is a very complex issue and our administration is looking at fill rates, room capacities and more which all play into enrollment management. The idea is to predict within 3% what our enrollment will be in order to allocate FTEF and schedule courses.

There was a discussion regarding late start courses. IPC member, Sandra Mendez mentioned that our semester at Cañada starts later than some other campuses which has an impact on our students. When students do not get into classes at other campuses they may come here but it is too late for them to start courses unless they are late start courses. As a District we also need to do more to help our students be self-sufficient by making WebSCHEDULE more transparent so students can see which classes that may be in progress still have open spaces. IVPI Johnson said we do have a few English and ESL classes that start late but we can look at more potential late start

classes. The challenge is that we need to commit to those late start schedules in advance due to block scheduling and room availability so we wouldn't be able to decide to add a late start course after the semester begins. IVPI Johnson also added that he does not think that we have been very intentional with regard to scheduling 8 week classes.

IPC member, Rebekah Taveau mentioned there may be a domino effect where students tell their friends when they do not get into classes and are turned away and then their friends decide to choose other campuses based on what they have heard. Additionally, students succeed more in smaller classes and if they are succeeding they will continue to reenroll and stay longer. If we have larger courses and success rates are not as high, students may feel discouraged and not continue which then feeds into declining enrollment. She also stressed the importance of communication between the Deans and Faculty as Faculty need to make decisions about adding more students who are on their waiting lists but it is hard for them to make those decisions as they may not know if there might be the potential for an additional section to be added.

Interim Dean of Business, Design and Workforce, Leonor Cabrera presented some information regarding the BDWF courses. She noted that CTE does not have the same population as other majors and she had to make the hard decision to drop a program due to low enrollment. This affected students because there were still students in the pipeline. Because some accounting classes were canceled in the Fall, it has been hard to fill the accounting classes in the Spring because students have gone to different colleges. Deans have hard decisions to make regarding scheduling. Leonor spoke about Strong Workforce funds (categorical funds) that could possibly be used for a new certificates etc. Categorical funds take courses out of the General Funds (not institutionalized) and are good for courses or programs that are new or just starting out. If those courses or programs do well then they could potentially be institutionalized later on. You cannot move a course that is being offered via General Funds into Categorical Funds because that is considered supplanting.

IVPI Johnson stated that we are down 6 FTEF which is the equivalent to approximately 80, 3-unit sections. The IPC members discussed the class maximum calculator which is being discussed in the Curriculum Committee. It was noted that we need more information in order to create a sufficient and successful class maximum calculator including research about class size because we want our students to be successful. It is also important to note that each instructor teaches differently.

Interim Dean of Business, Design and Workforce, Leonor Cabrera stated that in her opinion, we need to have a larger institutional discussion. We tell students that 12-units is full time yet the State of California (in their LOAD calculation) uses 15 units as full time equivalent. There was a discussion regarding campaigning for students to take "one more class". We also need to be careful about our students and their time management. By our students to take 15 units instead of 12, that may be at the detriment of their other courses if they do not have enough time to dedicate to all of their courses.

#### **4) Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 10:50am