



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF
December 6, 2019
9:30 am – 11:30 pm, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: Adrian Afif, Chris Burns, James Carranza, Nick DeMello, Allison Hughes, Jessica Kaven, Joan Murphy, Candice Nance, Tammy Robinson, Rebekah Taveau

Members Absent: James Aganon, Karen Engel, Susan Mahoney, Katie Osborne

Guests: Alex Claxton

1) Adoption of Agenda

Motion – To adopt agenda: M/S Allison Hughes, Nick DeMello

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes of 10/18/19 and 11/15/19

Motion – To approve minutes: M/S Nick DeMello, Rebekah Taveau

Discussion – Candice shared she felt that the discussion that ensued regarding the program review process should be highlighted in some way. Tammy shared that there will be an opportunity for members to voice their concerns and provide feedback later in the day's meeting.

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

3) Proposal to Rename Professional Learning Committee

Professor David Meckler proposed that the Professional Development Committee would like to rename itself to Professional Development Planning Committee because this better reflects the duty of the committee. The primary task of the planning committee is to plan Flex Days. The name change would distinguish the committee from the classified and faculty professional development committees that exist in which employees apply for funding to attend professionally relevant events. David shared that currently, the committee reports to APC, and as the committee responsibility lies in assisting faculty in growth opportunities, he shared that it made sense to report to IPC. Nick DeMello suggested utilizing the word “growth” as opposed to development in the naming of the committee. Development implies that we are attempting to turn those who are already professionals into professionals rather than support their continued development. He suggested that this wording would assist in distinguishing from faculty and classified professional development as well.

David shared that part of the reasoning behind the name change had to do with a more

focused alignment with the other two campuses. Allison shared history regarding the campus confusion of the meaning of professional learning. Rebekah shared that there has been a push to move toward professional learning which encompasses a change of concept to focus on deeper, sustained learning. David shared that the description of the committee would be sure to include this language. James asked the committee to consider the process for changing the name and the reporting structure. Jessica clarified that IPC would only offer support toward the name change but would not be the deciding body to put the change into effect.

Motion – To propose that IPC endorse the proposal of name change and allow Professor Meckler to move forward to the next appropriate deciding body: M/S: Nick DeMello, Joan Murphy

Discussion – Regarding the reporting structure, the committee discussed the benefits of possibly having a joint reporting structure to include both APC and IPC as both committees reflect different campus needs. Committee members expressed their wish for both Academic and Classified Senate to be informed of changes and to obtain support from both bodies when moving forward.

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

4) Reassigned Time Application Review

The committee reviewed the reassigned time applications. Tammy shared that the committee should be aware when reviewing applications that it is important to consider if the request is outside the duties faculty members are contractually obligated to perform or outside of the parameters of work completed campus-wide. Tammy shared that she wants to make sure the committee is transparent about approvals and denials.

The committee was provided access to 13 applications for review. Each committee member ranked each application according to the following considerations:

Consideration 1:	The responsibilities associated with this reassignment are NOT included as part of faculty workload.
Consideration 2:	The position's proposed outcomes align with the college strategic plan and initiatives.
Consideration 3:	Amount/duration of reassigned time requested is reasonable.
Consideration 4	Duties are most appropriately performed by a faculty member.

The following Likert Scaling was used for each consideration:

<u>Likert Scale</u>
1= Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3= Neutral
4= Agree
5= Strongly Agree

Committee member comments were projected and the committee discussed pros and cons of each proposed position, in addition to campus need. The committee shared that they appreciated the new way to review and provide feedback on applications. The considerations were clear and the organization was succinct. Jessica shared that the committee will not be making decisions about the approval or denial of applications, but rather would be providing feedback and making recommendations to the Vice President of Instruction who will make the final decision. The following positions were discussed, and the averages of the committee responses were supplied. The committee discussed if they agreed with the overall rankings of each consideration, or if they wished to amend their level of support after discussion.

Arts Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	2.1
Consideration 2:	3.4
Consideration 3:	2.7
Consideration 4	3.6

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that the majority of duties in this proposal were considered part of faculty workload.

Business Department Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	3.9
Consideration 2:	4
Consideration 3:	4.1
Consideration 4	4.3

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that there are three Business faculty members and consideration was placed on the responsibility of the faculty and the size of the division.

Dream Center Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	4.3
Consideration 2:	4.1
Consideration 3:	4.3
Consideration 4	3.7

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that a staff position within the Dream Center was established due to a federal mandate. It was suggested that future applications give applicants the opportunity to elaborate on the current campus roles that complete duties relevant to the proposed application role. James suggested a review of form submission process to ensure appropriate administrators who oversee campus areas that would be impacted by reassigned time roles be included to review and offer support on submitted applications.

English Department Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	3
Consideration 2:	4
Consideration 3:	3.3
Consideration 4	4.3

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **further supported** the rankings submitted in discussion due to AB705 and encouraging administration to encourage parity across the district. It was noted that the college should have a focus on equity of release time in comparison to the other two campuses.

ESL AB705 Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	2.9
Consideration 2:	4
Consideration 3:	3
Consideration 4	4

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that consideration should include AB705 support across the district for this role.

Faculty Tutoring Hours	
Consideration 1:	3.7
Consideration 2:	3.9
Consideration 3:	2.9
Consideration 4	3.4

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that tutoring is a necessary and important aspect of the campus, however, there was confusion regarding the request for reassigned time as the correct approach to attaining this need.

Flex Day Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	3.4
Consideration 2:	3
Consideration 3:	2.4
Consideration 4	2.6

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that clarification regarding the separation of duties between this role and CIETL Coordinator were needed. Faculty focus was considered more appropriate on the pedagogical versus administrative needs of the campus.

GE Pathways Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	3.7
Consideration 2:	3.6
Consideration 3:	3.4
Consideration 4	3.7

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that further clarification was needed regarding milestone transcriptions and further data was deemed necessary.

Instructional Assessment Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	4
Consideration 2:	3.4
Consideration 3:	3.3
Consideration 4	4.4

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **further supported** the rankings submitted in discussion due to the year-long position requirements and the campus-wide impact of the role. It was noted that this position is very much outside the role of contractual faculty duties and is central to accreditation. Building in longevity support was considered appropriate to support the faculty member in the role.

KAD Faculty Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	3.1
Consideration 2:	3.9
Consideration 3:	2.9
Consideration 4	3.6

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that the requested amount of reassigned time appeared disproportionately high to other positions. It was also noted that many of the duties listed were within the scope of faculty contractual obligations.

Paralegal Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	3.1
Consideration 2:	3.7
Consideration 3:	3.3
Consideration 4	4

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was also noted that many of the duties listed were within the scope of faculty contractual obligations. Clarification was sought regarding paralegal staffing within the BDW Division.

Social Sciences Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	3.9
Consideration 2:	3.9
Consideration 3:	4
Consideration 4	4

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that this role could possibly include a broader focus and therefore more release time.

ZTC and OER Coordinator	
Consideration 1:	4
Consideration 2:	3.7
Consideration 3:	3.7
Consideration 4	4

Based on the information provided in the application, the committee **agreed** with the rankings submitted in discussion. It was noted that the current workload may not be sufficient for the proposed workload. It was also noted that consideration of college collaboration is necessary.

Additionally, the committee reviewed two student services applications (Guided Pathways Coordinator and Guided Pathways Faculty Lead) submitted as a courtesy to IPC. The equivalent of a full faculty load of reassigned time may be approved for a position related to Guided Pathways. Student Services will complete the campus-wide application, and IPC was sent the application for review and acknowledgement, but did not supply recommendations to the Vice President of Instruction. Tammy shared that it is important that all reassigned time applications come through IPC.

5) Provide Feedback on Instructional Program Review Process

In the interest of time, Jessica suggested creating a Googledoc where committee members can submit their feedback on the Instructional Program Review Process. This would create a living document to supply feedback and recommendations to Academic Senate. Candice shared that she would like to see program review process recommendations discussed and a policy established for when faculty are on leave or do not complete their program review. She would also like to review AB705 and equity and parity across the district at a future committee meeting.

Jessica provided an update on the Counseling program review. Faculty are working to complete their packet by the end of the term, and Jessica will ask for volunteers to review the program review submission.

Tammy shared that next steps in the reassigned time process include the VPI meeting with

the respective deans of each area to further discuss each position. A decision will be made by Friday, December 13 and then later in the process faculty members will have the opportunity to apply to serve in the approved roles.

6) Revisiting & Updating IPC Bylaws

In the interest of time, this item was tabled.

7) Good of the Order

8) Adjournment

Motion – To adjourn meeting: M/S: James Carranza, Joan Murphy

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

a) Meeting adjourned at 11:43am.