



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

February 14, 2007

Members Present: Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Katheryn Garlow, Terry Humphrey, Chantal Maher, Wilma Owens, Pat Schwerdtfeger, Mark Vernoy, Debi Workman

Members Absent: Norma Bean, Robert Frederick, Karen Huffman, Becky McCluskey, Peggy Richardson, Tina Riley, Mollie Smith, Sara Thompson

Guest Present: Brent Gowen

Recorder: Suzanne M. Holt

I. Approval of January 24, 2006 Minutes

MSC Judy J. Cater / Debi Workman to approve the minutes of January 24, 2007.

II. 75/25 Requests

The “Departments 75/25 Distribution for (FY 2004-05)” handout was distributed, updated as of 2/12/07. There were two requests, one from Reading requesting \$975 for a flat panel monitor and the other request from Communications for \$2,029.35 to purchase a portable light kit for TV/Film classes.

MSC Judy J. Cater / Terry Humphrey to approve the 75/25 funds requested from Reading for a flat panel monitor for \$975 and from Communications for a portable light kit for TV/Film classes for \$2,029.35.

III. Institutional Review

Discussion continued regarding all of the processes and how to integrate them with institutional review. The last two accreditation site visits require us to show how planning is tied to resource allocation.

It was suggested that the different forms and data used should match. The accreditation reports should be reviewed to determine what is being asked of us. A timeline with the procedures for block grant, budget development, faculty position requests, and curriculum could show how the processes could include the same information provided by Research and Planning.

Katheryn Garlow distributed a handout, “Planning Process Timelines”, completed by her and Mollie Smith, which shows the timelines for current funding procedures. It was noted that the table does not show the class schedule development timeline which involves planning that requires resources. New questions could ask how funding for instructional programs would support student learning. How will institutional review be used for decision making at the department level and the institutional level. Some revisions on the institutional review document could tie all the procedures together and could become our primary planning document.

Berta Cuaron stated that the institutional review process could be the responsibility of the Planning Councils, including modifying the forms and recommending the cycle. The current annual cycle may be unrealistic. Each Planning Council could be responsible for its specific area.

It was suggested something simple should be done for the planning documents, to determine the needs for next year, and to see how each need relates to everything else and how they all tie together. It was noted that it becomes messy when the needs are aggregated for all of the areas, making it difficult to make decisions. Since the institutional review process should be the driving force for departments, the same processes should be used and a broad based planning document is needed. Better coherence is needed with all processes. How other colleges integrate processes into institutional review and how planning is tied to resource allocation should be considered.

A small working group comprised of Berta Cuaron, Katheryn Garlow, Mollie Smith, Wilma Owens and Debi Workman will make recommendations of how to modify the form and a proposed timeline will be brought to the next meeting.

IV. **Proctoring Services in Tutoring**

Brent Gowen was a guest at the meeting and discussed the Faculty Senate's concerns with proctoring services in Tutoring. He stated that Ruth Barnaba, Coordinator of the Tutoring Center, had spoken to the Faculty Senate last semester regarding the increased volume of proctoring being done in the Tutoring Center. Both the online professors and other faculty refer their students to the proctoring services. Some professors have greater expectations on what the proctoring services should provide. There is not enough staff nor space to meet the current and growing need for proctoring services and students feel that it is not a good space to take tests. The Faculty Senate is not in a position to do anything to alleviate the problems and is asking IPC to consider the need and make some recommendations.

Judy J. Cater stated that the proctoring services have been very successful. Because the service is open entry/open exit, students coming in at all different times is very distracting. Scheduling times has not been enough to meet the needs. More staff hours to offer more proctoring over longer hours would help. It was noted that the proctoring staff has to be district employees but cannot be student workers.

Mark Vernoy distributed a handout of a memorandum from Ruth Barnaba, Coordinator, Tutoring Services, dated December 21, 2006, that included "Proctoring Analysis – Fall 2006", "Proctoring Request Form" and "Proctoring Rules". The spreadsheet showed recent proctoring statistics with a steady increase and the need for additional staff and part-time hourly to assist with proctoring tests. The proctoring services in Tutoring is at the saturation point with staff and space. There are peak periods during the semester and there is a problem of staffing during Intersession and Summer. Proctoring services are open the same hours as the Tutoring Center but not open the same hours as the Library. The Tutoring Center personnel is very happy to perform proctoring services and would like to do more with more resources.

Some solutions to proctoring services is to go back to using the TV model, where the students are present and the faculty proctor their own exams. Make-up tests can be arranged with the students and their faculty to schedule exams in specified classrooms. The Assessment Center could be an additional location for proctoring services. It was suggested that criteria could be developed of those who can use the proctoring services, whereby the Internet students would be served first. It was pointed out that there

is not a priority list or procedures, as this is a curriculum and Faculty Senate issue, but there are proctoring rules for faculty and students.

A possible short-term fix would be to expand the hours by adding another staff person. As all online classes grow, tests and orientations are done and the demand for proctoring services will continue to expand.

The short-term proposal would be to do a budget increase request and show the need and include a long-term plan. A budget increase can be requested. The Curriculum Committee is currently looking at online classes and the support needed for students.

Berta Cuaron requested that Mark Vernoy work with Ruth Barnaba in developing a proposal for a 45% position for evening coverage and to also consider how to plan for proctoring services in the new Library and Learning Resource Center (LLRC) that is being designed.

V. **Standing Reports/Projects**

There was no report.

VI. **Other**

The "Rationale Form for Faculty Positions" will be distributed to department chairs on February 8, 2007. The completed forms are due to the Deans for signature on March 2, 2007 and the signed, completed forms are due to Instructional Services on March 5, 2007. A meeting for the IPC subcommittee will be scheduled before Spring break so that a priority list can be completed by March 31, 2007. IPC will take action on the recommended priority list by April 11, 2007 and SPC will review IPC's recommendations by April 17, 2007.

Pat Schwerdtfeger announced the event to welcome the new Boehm Gallery director that is taking place in the Gallery tomorrow, February 15, 2007.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.