



Instructional Planning Council

MINUTES

April 23, 2008

MEMBERS Present: M. Bealo, N. Bean, R. Borden, C. Francis, T. Humphrey, C. Maher, S. McDonald, M. Mufson, W. Owens, M. Smith, M. Vernoy, D. Workman

Members Absent: J. Cater, L. Cox, B. McCluskey, L. Romain

I. Approval of April 9, 2008 Minutes

Minutes were not available and will be presented at the next meeting.

II. 2009-10 Faculty Position Priority List Recommendations

A question was posed as to why the Math position requests were not pared as had occurred in the past. It was stated that the question did not come up as the IPC Subcommittee prioritized. There were so many positions requested (32) and it seemed that committee members wanted to be objective and to judge each request on its own merit, particularly given the budget constraints the College is facing these next couple years. Discussion also included concerns that as membership changes each year in the subcommittee that some of the general understandings that exist should be reviewed before members do their individual reviews and before the prioritization begins. Next year, we should make sure all members know the history, any general understandings, and that all agree on the game plan before the process begins. It was also stated that we may want to consider inviting each chair or a discipline representative to give a 3-5 minute brief on the request and respond to any questions that committee members may have. This would take some of the burden off of the Deans and other committee members who may have requests from their own discipline or department. It is difficult for each member to be completely impartial in the process. In looking at the final list, it is clear that each member takes the process seriously and each is trying to be fair in establishing the list. How many faculty will be hired is determined in mid-September and despite budget constraints, it is always important to plan.

It was suggested to (1) establish an earlier timeline if possible to allow for more dialog in process; (2) discuss and review parameters or previous understandings, what is the game plan before starting the review process; (3) committee members review applications to determine any questions then; (4) invite department chair or representative to answer any questions (clarification) and make a brief pitch for position request (3-5 minutes only). Before we begin the process next year, we need to be certain that the two Faculty Senate representatives participate in the discussion and agree on the game plan.

It was understood by the subcommittee that the Theatre Arts (#6) position request will be filled only if a pending retirement actually occurs.

Discussion continued regarding how so many departments that had more faculty at one time now find themselves with less full-time faculty. The reality is as the College has grown and more programs are added, it means that more faculty position requests come to the table. In reviewing the Institutional Review and Planning documents, it is clear that departments are stating full-time faculty positions are a high priority for many. It was stated that we may need to be willing to take a step back, look at our budgeting process and ask ourselves what are our priorities. Perhaps we could consider this an unfunded

liability and set aside a percentage to fund new full-time faculty positions. There are lots of ways to do this but as a college we have to be willing to change our budgeting process. As the Instructional Planning Council, shouldn't we drive this message and make a recommendation to SPC. As an example, in our own personal budgets, we budget for what we have to have; shouldn't we be doing the same in our district budget. It's about choices; it's about priorities. Having so many part-time faculty requires time from the chair or faculty member to evaluate, to schedule, to follow-up. A question was asked about what the 75/25 work group was doing. The hope is that the group will come back with some recommendations and strategies that would be brought to SPC and other planning councils for consideration. With so much faculty planning taking place, we also need to take this opportunity to plan for faculty and staffing needs. Clearly, as we review the IR&P documents, the plea for faculty positions is there time and time again. There are ways to do this but it will cost us something; we can't have everything. There is only one pot of money.

MSC Vernoy/Bean – Approve 2009-10 Faculty Position Priority Recommendations for 2009-10. The recommendations will be presented to SPC on May 6.

III. Summary of Institutional Review & Planning Documents

Committee members presented their summaries and observations on the planning documents. The following planning documents were summarized:

- 1) Art Department
- 2) CSIS Department
- 3) Automotive Technology
- 4) Diesel Mechanics Technology
- 5) ESL Credit
- 6) Physical Science
- 7) Physics
- 8) American Studies
- 9) American Indian Studies
- 10) Philosophy
- 11) Religious Studies
- 12) Sociology
- 13) Economics
- 14) History
- 15) Physical Education Department

The Committee members will present their summaries and observations on as many planning documents yet to be reviewed, as time will allow at the next meeting.

The intent is to develop common themes for general and faculty/staff needs, plus general observations and concerns in learning outcomes. The goal is to make recommendations and give feedback to departments and to identify instructional priorities.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.