



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE
Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

Partnership Resource Teams
Summary of Initial Visit
 Date of Visit: October 17, 2016

Name of Institution: Cañada College
 Partnership Resource Team Members: Rachel Rosenthal (Lead), Anthony Culpepper, Clint Dougherty, Mark Williams, Maureen Chenoweth, Rick Fillman, Sharon Eveland

Area of Focus	Institution's Point Person or Group, If Known	Heard during the Visit: Institutional Activities Underway	Heard during the Visit: Ideas Discussed with the Institution	Other IEPI Resources Needed?
Integrated Planning	College Cabinet, Planning Council, Educational Master Plan Committee	1. Educational Master Plan is in development. 2. Faculty/staff/administrators attended Society for Colleges and University Planning (SCUP) Planning Institute. 3. Utilization of Strategic Planning Online (SPOL) software expanded to include management and tracking of key aspects of planning and budgeting. 4. Rigorous tracking and reporting of Program Review, and annual progress reports for ten college master plans through highly support Research Office. 5. High level of engagement and institutional dialogue related to decision making.	A. College plans are too numerous and not integrated. a) Significant workload required to track and complete progress reports for each plan. b) High level of concern that current processes are not sustainable due to associated workload. c) Interest in ensuring that plans are actionable. d) College plans not integrated with District Strategic Planning B. Lack of consistent and clearly defined structure for planning, budgeting, and resource allocation processes. a) Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC) does not plan or make recommendations for budgeting. b) PBC reviews budget late in the development cycle, but does not recommend or prioritize. c) PBC reviews staffing requests, but not facilities or equipment requests. Prioritization of faculty positions occurs through the Academic Senate. d) PBC functions well as a communications hub, with broad-based attendance and participation. e) Roles of PBC and Cabinet are unclear.	

Area of Focus	Institution's Point Person or Group, If Known	Heard during the Visit: Institutional Activities Underway	Heard during the Visit: Ideas Discussed with the Institution	Other IEPI Resources Needed?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) Program Review resource requests go to College Cabinet, not PBC. g) Departments and units may be required to identify and obtain their own resources in support of their goals and objectives. h) Cabinet is only group to review and prioritize resource requests. i) Campus personnel are unclear about the final priorities and which items are funded. C. Educational Master Plan is under development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Lack of clarity as to how the EMP will integrate with, and provide an overarching construct for, all of the other college plans. b) EMP work group is highly experienced, collaborative, functional, and engaged. 	
Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Director of Professional Development 2. Academic Committee for Equity and Success (ACES) 3. Community of Practice Committee 4. Faculty Professional Development Committee 5. Classified Professional Development Committee 6. Campus-wide Professional Development Committee 7. Leading from the Middle Workgroup 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New Director of Professional Development position, resulting in improved clarity. 2. New college wide PD committee. 3. Faculty compensated for participation in ACES program that supports "fearless inquiry" related to student success. 4. Training provided through the RP Group's Leading from the Middle program to support organizational coherence. 5. Communities of Practice program for classified staff within similar job categories. 6. Classified staff provided time to participate in PD. 7. Broadly communicated training opportunities across all constituencies. 8. Center for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning is faculty-driven and would like more classified input. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Lack of a Professional Development (PD) Plan that integrates and provides a framework for PD efforts across the college. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Strong tradition of honoring constituency groups' separate interests relative to PD, resulting in a siloed structure. b) Strong desire for a plan that is inclusive, sustained, and diverse. c) Lack of clear definition for professional development. As an example, does it include health and wellness? d) Comprehensive assessment of PD needs and interests is needed. e) Lack of vision and comprehensive approach for PD. f) Classified staff concerned that PD plan would result in loss of opportunities to participate B. Perceived inequities and lack of clarity regarding PD funding sources and levels. C. Number of faculty participating in ACES inquiry relatively small. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IEPI Leadership Development Grant could be an excellent resource. 2. IEPI Professional Learning Network may be an excellent resource.

