



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF**

**Friday, November 6, 2015
9:30 am – 11:30 am, Building 2, Room 10**

Members Present: Danielle Behonick, Nick DeMello, Valeria Estrada, David Hamilton, Michael Hoffman, Chialin Hsieh, Maria Huning, Jessica Kaven, Andee Liljegren (ASCC), Nick Martin, Katie Osborne, Anniqua Rana, Alexandra Wildman (ASCC)

Guests: Kim Lopez, Susan Mahoney, Erin Moore

Members Absent: Gregory Anderson, Adolfo Leiva.

-
-
- 1. Approval of Agenda**
Approved unanimously
 - 2. Approval of Minutes – October 2, 2015**
Approved unanimously
 - 3. Business**

A. Sustainability Plan

Susan Mahoney, Co-Chair of the Cañada Sustainability Committee, presented the Cañada College Sustainability Plan to the IPC. The current plan in effect is the 2013-2016 plan and is Cañada's first attempt at a sustainability plan. It has 11 goals with specific programs and objectives (about 60 total) within each goal area. All 3 colleges in SMCCCD worked together in developing their sustainability plans and ours is one of the first districts in California with a sustainability plan. The Plan can be found on the Sustainability Committee's webpage:

<http://www.canadacollege.edu/sustainabilitycommittee/documents/Sustainability-Plan.pdf>

She noted that during the 2014-2015 academic year, the College of San Mateo's Sustainability Committee focused on climate action, while the Skyline Sustainability Committee focused on water; campuses are now sharing results.

Mahoney gave the following highlights of our campus community's sustainability progress

- Campus photovoltaic solar system – Cañada's Solar Farm went fully online in Spring 2015 and is currently producing more energy than was expected, so the pay-back period may be shorter than anticipated. It can be used as a "living lab," as the campus can obtain real time data from the system.

- Upgrade to “smart” LED lighting in parking lots/roadways – this upgrade has provided more safe and energy efficient light (upgraded lights have motion sensors). All outdoor lighting will be upgraded to this by May 2016.
- Submetering project – we’re moving away from having a single gas/water meter serving the whole campus to better identify big energy users/inefficiencies and address these.
- Reduction in water usage – district-wide water use has been reduced by more than 25%, our campus reduction has been less (23%) due to our low usage in the first place.
- Solid waste audit & new signage – the goals of this effort were to educate the campus on our solid waste stream, to collect data for new waste hauler proposals, and to encourage the district to consider a new contract for waste haulers (3 colleges not currently using same haulers); new signage lets campus know what goes in which can
- Events – Earth Day celebration, Solar Farm ribbon cutting
- GE Pathways initiative – one of initial pathways selected was Sustainability Pathway

Susan stated that the Cañada Sustainability’s focus for the 2015-2016 academic year will be campus and community awareness and involvement and curriculum. Curriculum efforts will include development of the GE Pathway in Sustainability, partnering with Skyline on the Sustainability Blitz (faculty partnering with Climate Corps fellow to develop lesson plans and increase sustainability curriculum, see <http://www.skylinecollege.edu/sustainability/sustainabilityprograms.php>), and creating an Environmental Sciences degree. She also stated a need to update our current sustainability plan, which expires in 2016, to coordinate with our sister colleges as well as other districts on planning, and to make the goals in the plan more measurable; this task may require reassigned time.

Dean Chailin Hsieh suggested that Susan ask for these additional resources when she presents the Sustainability Plan to PBC in the coming weeks.

Motion: Approve Sustainability Plan.

Approved unanimously

B. Relocation of Career & Transfer Center

Interim Vice President of Student Services Kim Lopez led a conversation with IPC regarding the proposal to relocate the Career Center and Transfer Center to the space in building 9 currently occupied by the Art Gallery and CIETL.

She provided the following background information on how the proposal came about. On opening day in August, President Buckley shared his vision regarding growth and transfer. In particular, students are taking more transfer level courses and he wanted to move the Transfer and Career Centers to areas with more visibility. At the time there was no funding or specific plan for this. The district then received \$10 million in one-time funding from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office and asked for proposals from each campus regarding how to spend this money. Cañada’s proposal included the relocation of the Transfer Center and Career Center.

Interim Lopez stated that there is no protocol for making this decision, but that it falls

under the purview of the VPSS. She stated that she wants to use the participatory governance process to collect feedback from the campus on this process, and will be visiting division meetings to solicit feedback as well. From these meetings she will be creating a pro/con list that she will present to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC). PBC will then make a recommendation regarding this proposal to the current administrators. She stated that it is not necessary to make decision about this proposed relocation by end of the Fall 2015 semester.

Feedback from IPC members on the proposed relocation of the Transfer Center and Career Center included the following:

- If these centers are relocated to the proposed Building 9 space, how will the space be used? Will former Art Gallery and CIETL spaces remain separate from each other, or will Career Center and Transfer Center be in one unified space?
- What is current usage of Art Gallery and CIETL space?
- What are the expected outcomes of the Transfer Center/Career Center relocation?
- Is this funding “use it or lose it”?
 - Interim VPSS Lopez stated that the funding from the CCCCCO must be used for something. If it is not used to relocate the Transfer Center/Career Center, then there must be a process to identify other 1-time-use projects.
- This proposal takes away an arts-specific facility and no one is talking about that.
- Is anyone actually talking directly to art faculty about this proposal? Faculty have already expressed not feeling supported and being concerned about communication processes on campus.
 - Interim VPSS Lopez stated that the administration has met to talk directly with art faculty about this proposal. IPC members stated that it is important for administration to meet directly with faculty to have these discussions, not to rely solely on attending participatory governance body meetings to “talk to faculty.”
- Arts are being dismantled on this campus. This has been occurring for the last 15 years. Arts are treated as an afterthought.
- The current Art Gallery is minimal at best. If it goes away we must create something better.
- Have students (aside from the ASCC) been asked for input on this proposal? Specifically, have students who use Transfer Center and/or Career Center been asked for their input?
- ASCC International Education week is next week – we could incorporate survey about this into the activities and collect feedback from attendees (students, faculty, staff).
- If Transfer Center/Career Center were to be relocated, would this interrupt their function?
 - Interim VPSS Lopez stated that if relocation were to happen, it would have to be during “downtime” (e.g. during a break).
- It’s currently unclear where the Transfer center is and that we have one, so students aren’t really using it right now. Shouldn’t we create the demand for the Transfer Center first, then determine what we need in the space and design it accordingly (use the money to design/develop the space)?
- CIETL, as a campus organization, is effectively “dead” and no one is talking about this.
- This feels like an incoherent and abrupt plan. Efforts to help transfer students is

very important – data and anecdotal evidence show that we have many transfer students and this is a very difficult transition. There is a larger issue that President Buckley threw out a general desire to increase assistance for transfer students, now there's money behind it and we have pressure to do something. There is no holistic vision for how we will support transfer students and unify disparate initiatives on campus.

- This is not the first time that this campus has come up with a really good idea and then shoved it where we have space. When we design a space for a purpose, we never keep it for that (e.g. CIETL space was designed as faculty work/meeting/social space, now faculty and staff sneak in when no one is using the space for a meeting. The current Career Center was designed to be a Career Center, now we're going to change it to something else. This points to a lack of vision. Faculty and staff are not generally asked what we want. The feedback regarding this proposal reflects years of people being annoyed that they haven't been asked.
- The physical spaces in consideration (current Art Gallery and CIETL spaces in building 9) should be pulled out of this discussion/proposal. The campus needs to increase the presence of the Transfer Center and Career Center, and now we have the financial resources to do this – let's start the discussion there. How can we meet the needs of the Transfer Center and Career Center?

Interim VPSS Lopez then asked IPC how we would like this conversation/process to proceed. IPC members agreed that this should have been part of the Program Review process, with the Transfer Center and Career Center presenting data/information on their needs to be incorporated into a design process/proposal. Members would like to see a proposal from the Transfer Center and Career Center with specific goals – do these goals relate to needing a new space for these centers? do these goals relate to needing more support (additional staff/faculty)? IPC members also stated they would like to see something come back to IPC. Something tangible related to this proposal must be reviewed through the Program Review process. Interim VPSS Lopez stated that she will also be attending the Administrative Planning Council (APC), Academic Senate Governing Council (ASGC) and Humanities and Social Sciences Division to gather feedback on this proposal. Dean Anniqua Rana, the IPC Representative to PBC, stated that she will bring an update back to IPC on this proposal from PBC.

C. Educational Master Plan Progress Report

Dean Chialin Hsieh presented the Educational Master Plan progress report for the 2014-2015 academic year. This document can be found at:

http://www.canadacollege.edu/plans/EMP%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_11152015_Final_Summary.pdf

It consists of 4 goals and 25 objectives; these have not all been completed (e.g. some facilities objectives have not yet been completed because Measure H just passed, some Professional Development objectives have not yet been completed because Director of Professional Development and Innovation was just hired). Dean Hsieh stated that the objectives must be completed this academic year.

Dean Hsieh stated that the creation of the new Educational Master Plan starts during the

2016-2017 academic year. The current Educational Master Plan has been in place for 3 years. She is interested in whether any objectives in the current Educational Master Plan are outdated such that they should not be included in the new Educational Master Plan.

Motion: Accept Educational Master Plan progress report.

Discussion: Alexandra Wildman pointed out that the progress report states that Professional Development objectives are 50% completed, and asked whether this has to do with the fact that CIETL is no longer functioning. She stated that professional development is discussed in a number of venues on campus and is an important issue for students (as it relates to faculty training). Erin Moore, Director of Professional Development and Innovation stated that professional development will become more institutionalized and this will allow the Professional Development objectives in the Educational Master Plan to reach 100% completion. She stated that her position is about building professional development, and that she is currently attending as many meetings of participatory governance groups as possible to understand campus culture and the needs of faculty, staff and students around professional development. Dean Rana stated that CIETL was previously run by 3 faculty members, and that this was not a sustainable arrangement, and did not allow for CIETL to become institutionalized. She stated that there are elements of professional development currently happening on campus, but these need to be centralized.

Approved unanimously

D. Strategic Plan Progress Report

Dean Hsieh presented the Strategic Plan progress report. This document can be found at: http://www.canadacollege.edu/plans/StrategicPlanProgressReport%202014-15_11152015_Final.pdf

Dean Hsieh stated that our Strategic Plan is a series of smaller plans (e.g. – Educational Master Plan, Distance Education Plan, etc.) that feed into it. When these other component plans are updated, the Strategic Plan is then updated as a result. Many objectives have reached 100% completion. Dean Hsieh is currently waiting on the Facilities Master Plan update from VPA Marquez for the progress report.

Dean Hsieh stated that after this academic year, the College will decide whether to develop a new Strategic Plan, and whether to use a different model for our Strategic Plan. She expects that this spring semester, conversations will begin about the process of developing a new Educational Master Plan and a new Strategic Plan.

Dean David Hamilton asked why this progress report was being presented to the IPC with data missing. Members of the council pointed out that other plans have also been presented to IPC and approved in draft form with data/sections missing earlier this academic year. It was confirmed that the council was being asked to approve the draft progress report as it stands, and that the progress report would next go to PBC for approval. Dani Behonick suggested that the IPC discuss the issue of what it means to review and approve various campus plans, especially those that are not complete and/or those with which they are unfamiliar, at a future IPC meeting. She expressed concern that the council is serving as a “rubber stamp” for plans without truly understanding what they’re reviewing and approving. Michael Hoffman pointed out that, from the perspective of individuals and groups who write these plans, the review and approval of participatory

governance bodies is often required on these plans, and they are often on very short deadlines.

Motion: Approve draft Strategic Plan Progress Report as it stands.

Discussion: Dean Rana pointed out that when plans are presented at participatory governance meetings, the level of thought and effort that goes into the plans is not necessarily reflected in the review/approval process. She asked at what point a group could hope to fully understand a plan in reviewing/approving it. Chair Kaven supported the suggestion of a future agenda item to discuss IPC's process of review/approval of campus plans. Maria Huning suggested that it would be helpful to have summaries of plans in the future.

Approved unanimously

E. Instructional Program Review Process & SPOL

Dean Hsieh discussed the Program Review process. She showed the Program Review website (<http://canadacollege.edu/programreview/>) and reminded IPC members of the Program Review timeline. Program Review documents will be submitted to instructional deans by the end of February 2016 in SPOL (Strategic Planning Online). Deans will review these documents by mid-March. IPC will review these documents and provide feedback to faculty in mid-March and April. This feedback will be distributed to faculty Program Review authors and Vice Presidents in mid-May. More details on this process/timeline can be found here:

http://canadacollege.edu/programreview/Program%20Review%20Resource%20Request%20Process%20and%20Timeline%202015-2016_11042015.pdf. All of the disciplines in the divisions of Athletics, Learning Center, Library, Kinesiology and Dance, and Humanities and Social Sciences are scheduled to complete Program Review this academic year.

Resource Requests will also be submitted through SPOL this year. These are due by February 28, 2016, will be reviewed by instructional deans in March, will be reviewed by the VP of Administrative Services in April, and will be reviewed by the administrative cabinet in May. Vice Presidents and instructional deans will be notified of decisions in June.

Faculty authors can work on their Program Review documents in the Word template provided, and then copy-paste their work into SPOL. These documents cannot be uploaded directly into SPOL. Responses to questions can also be typed directly into SPOL.

Academic Senate Doug Hirzel will run a SPOL training workshop on Flex Day (November 25, 2015) and will also be available to train faculty to use this website.

Chair Kaven demonstrated the use of SPOL to complete Program Review documents. She noted that the Firefox web browser was not compatible with all elements of SPOL. She noted that IPC's options in providing feedback to faculty Program Review authors were to either upload a completed rubric document to SPOL for each Program Review, or to go into each area of a discipline's program review to write a narrative in SPOL.

F. IPC Rubric & Application

Chair Kaven noted feedback that IPC received from Program Review faculty authors regarding Program Review feedback. She stated that faculty authors were frustrated that there was not enough commentary in the feedback (i.e., evaluators checked boxes on the rubric but did not provide written comments), and encouraged IPC members to consider what their feedback would look like in evaluating the feedback rubric. She also stated that check boxes were added to the rubric to facilitate Program Reviews being utilized at a later date in the accreditation process. In accordance with suggestions from the Academic Senate, a rating related to program viability has been added to the end of the rubric. She also noted that instructional deans will now be asked to provide a comment/narrative in SPOL on each plan. She emphasized that the goal was to make the rubric user-friendly and also as meaningful as possible.

IPC members divided into working groups to review the updated IPC feedback rubric draft, and to test it by applying it to sample Program Review documents.

- Group 1 (page 1 – Program Context)
- Group 2 (page 2 – Looking Back)
- Group 3 (pages 2-3 – Current State of Program)
- Group 4 (page 3 – Question #8 a-c)
- Group 5 (page 3 – Questions 9 & 10)

This process will continue at the December 4 IPC meeting.

G. Instructional Program Review and Reassign Time Announcement

This item was tabled until the December 4 IPC meeting