



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING
COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF
December 3, 2021
9:00 am – 11:30am, Zoom**

Members Present: Jessica Kaven, Lisa Palmer, Allison Hughes, Joan Murphy, Jill Sumstad, Diana Tedone-Goldstone, Alison Field, Katie Perkins, James Carranza, Rian Morrison, Susan Mahoney, Alex Claxton, Karen Engel

Members Absent: Tammy Robinson

Guests: Nancy Moricette, Hyla Lacefield, Ameer Thompson, Kendra Carpenter, Sarah Harmon, Maureen Wiley, Elizabeth Terzakis, Juan Cornejo, Lezlee Ware, David Reed, Doniella Maher, John Perez

1) Adoption and Approval of Agenda

Motion – To adopt agenda: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Susan Mahoney

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes

Motion – To approve minutes of October 15, 2021: M/S: Joan Murphy, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

Motion – To approve minutes of November 5, 2021-Instructional Program Review: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Joan Murphy

Discussion – Susan shared that she would like to continue exploring options to encourage more people to become involved in the program review process and participate. Jessica agreed as did Joan who mentioned the process is not as meaningful without attendance. Jessica added that this could be a future agenda item to explore. Jill added that some sort of incentive may be helpful from an adjunct perspective. James suggested that it may be useful to reflect on the purpose of program review, the role it serves and its function and then consider how to review the process and involvement. From James' perspective, program review is one of the most important things the college does and having a broader range of people, particularly faculty, student, staff, and

administrator leadership present in the room to become familiar with what faculty and their programs are sharing is important. Jessica added that it is worthwhile to consider how IPC can make the process more engaging, and James added that it will be important to consider how the process is integrated into our college environment and how it is used for continued planning.

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

3) Equity Team Update

Nancy Moricette and Kendra Carpenter of Asé Power Consult introduced themselves to the committee as an equity, diversity, access, and inclusion consulting company that has been working with the college for the past several months. They shared that they were invited to provide IPC an opportunity to ask questions about their work on campus and provide updates to the committee. Nancy read the following statement to assist the committee in understanding the intention of the campus in its original call for proposals in this process:

In the next iteration of its 5-year educational master plan, the College is seeking to facilitate major shifts in policy and practice in order to further its goal of becoming an antiracist institution and keeping the following commitments included in its draft Antiracism Framework: Critically examine our behaviors and college practices for the conscious and unconscious ways in which we contribute to systemic racism; Uplift stories and data about the impact of anti-Blackness, oppression, poverty, and racism in our communities; Re-imagine and build a community of learning and service based in anti-racism, social justice, and liberation.

Asé completed listening sessions with the campus to allow employees to discuss their experiences at the college from, for example, their cultural perspectives and their perspectives in proximity to power. Two sessions were held each for students, classified staff and the Academic Senate. Around September, there was a partial update from the listening sessions. The projected date to have the full report concluded is December 20.

Nancy provided the link to the Asé proposal with additional background information [here](#). Nancy also addressed that there are various compounded traumas that as a nation, we are experiencing: explicit anti-black racism, explicit xenophobic experiences from folks from different historically marginalized groups, school shootings, economic downturn impact, and a new COVID variant that has recently emerged, and all of this impacts the data. Nancy added that the qualitative and quantitative data will inform the step by step process and allow this to lead the long term vision and strategy at a later part of the process.

Nancy added that in addition to the listening sessions, there was a cultural audit process that took place where data was collected from different perspectives, engaging as many stake holders as possible within the limited amount of time. There were 32 anonymous survey questions posed to classified staff and faculty. Karen Engel added that last spring, students participated in a national racial climate survey and the results of that are being analyzed.

Nancy provided some details regarding key themes that are emerging in the partial update. She shared that students had a lot to say about equity and access within Middle College, and how resources are allocated. Communication and accessibility are both areas of focus within this. Another theme is that there is a need for space to commune and talk about challenging issues related to racial equity, racial fatigue, BIPOC fatigue and wanting to have affinity spaces sponsored by the college to continue having these discussions.

Nancy shared that the internal equity scan also involved a series of one on one interviews with folks across multiple systems within the College. These were transcribed interviews, and the interviewees would be sent copies of the transcription to review and decide what information they wanted to be aligned with in the final report. There were around 25 respondents. Nancy shared the following as the systems that were explored in the interviews through three definitions: bridges, potential barriers, and systems:

Teaching and Learning, including supplemental instruction (Tutoring, Library, etc)
Student Services (Registration, Counseling, Education Planning, and Financial Aid)
Administration (Scheduling, Facilities, Hiring and Retention of faculty, staff and administrators)

Communication – identify any bias in language or the way information is made available for a broad audience on our website and course catalog

Students Participatory governance and decision-making

Professional Development

Nancy shared that the information gathered will be included in the information report, which includes case studies from other colleges that are also working on these issues. Nancy took questions from the group.

Jill thanked Nancy for the update and shared her excitement for the future. Other committee members echoed their thanks.

Kendra Carpenter shared some of the themes she is seeing emerge among those interviewed. The following barriers were repeatedly mentioned: silos leading to duplicating efforts and a lack of organization around areas where momentum is present, a lack of clarity and confusion regarding employee titles and their roles, inadequate staffing, underfunding, workload issues, a culture of denial including race-lighting. The following bridges emerged as themes: a great new president, appreciation for what the administration has been doing in terms of equity, and that the college community (leaders, staff, faculty) were so approachable.

Nancy offered her email to the committee should they have any additional questions: nmoricette@asepowerconsult.com. On January 13, college FLEX Day, an executive summary of the report will be provided to begin to unpack the key findings and recommendations. The full report will then be accessible to everyone. Stakeholders who took part in the process will be able to dissect the report in a meaningful way in follow up sessions.

4) Naming of Faculty Professional Development Coordinator Position

David Reed presented on behalf of this item. David mentioned that after engaging in further deliberations about an updated title for the Faculty Professional Development Coordinator, he has returned to put forward to the committee an updated title. As background, this was revisited because there has been some confusion around the title. David stressed that the title should distinguish the coordination of professional development activities rather than the coordination of the committee that reviews requests for faculty professional development funding. David shared the title that is being proposed as: Coordinator of Faculty Professional Development Programming. He shared that this is inclusive of feedback received from IPC and the Professional Development Planning Committee with the intention of providing more clarity and distinction. David added that this title is a bit of a compromise between those that were involved in the discussion.

Lisa Palmer asked if the AFT Faculty Professional Development Chair/Committee was approached for feedback. David shared that that committee was not addressed directly. The word ‘programming’ was added to assist in the distinction regarding planning for activities and programming rather than reviewing funding requests as part of a committee.

Susan asked if much of the role had to do with FLEX Day planning and how that differentiated from the new IETL coordinator position. David shared that FLEX Day planning is a big part of the position as is review proposals. Since there is not a lot of release time, there is not a lot of time beyond that to dedicate to other endeavors. This position also helps to develop other programming outside of FLEX Day, however, such as outreach and communication to the campus. David mentioned that this position would be distinct in that the IETL position would focus more around instructional development and teaching and learning for faculty.

Lisa shared that the title sounds very similar still. Joan suggested dropping the word “programming.” Jessica proposed talking to the AFT committee to ensure that they are part of the discussion. Karen suggested Faculty Flex Day Coordinator, and David mentioned this is not the entirety of the role. Jill suggested Coordinator of Faculty Planning and Programming. Susan asked for more clarity regarding the duties outside of FLEX Day and how they would differentiate from the IETL position. Lezlee Ware added that she would want to ensure accountability to Academic Senate. David added that the position does have a regular report to Academic Senate. James echoed the alignment with Academic Senate as being crucial.

David added that he is hoping to fill the position in the spring and asked for clarification on the timeline and the ability to move forward with the position. The position would report to the ASLT Dean. James suggested accepting the position and rethinking the title later as much time has been spent on this discussion and there is a real need for the position.

James proposed the following motion:

Motion – With the inclusion of closer alignment with Academic

Senate, to accept the position as is described with the current title understanding that the title can be revised for continued improvement:
M/S: James Carranza, Jill Sumstad

Discussion – Karen added that the IETL role and this role do not appear clearly distinct, and clarifying this distinction appears to be the next appropriate step. Jessica added that in the original approved description for this position, one critique was that outside of FLEX Day, it was not focused on supporting teaching. Karen added that for the campus, both the name and duties need to be distinct. Lezlee Ware asked if the IETL role could play a part in regard to FLEX. David Reed shared that besides FLEX Day planning, this person is also the co-coordinator of the FLEX Day Planning Committee. Allison suggested approving the motion with three additional items that need to be addressed: the establishment of the Academic Senate relationship, the distinction between both positions clarified, and the name clarified. Lisa added that the committee already approved the position, so it exists. Lisa felt that the title currently does not distinguish the position very well and added that it is her belief that the discussion also include the AFT PD committee. Lisa added that she believes the committee needs to either approve the title or disapprove the title, or possibly approve with the caveat that it will be revisited.

Abstentions – none

Opposed—Lisa Palmer, Joan Murphy, Karen Engel, Allison Hughes

Approval – the motion failed. Motion not approved.

Jill Sumstad suggested an alternate motion “To temporarily accept the position to move forward in spring with the understanding that the connection to Academic Senate will be tighter and the title will be reworked for clarification purposes by the end of Spring 2022 Semester.” Jill added that if the committee moves forward, if a person is in the position, there is the possibility for more clarity which would assist in renaming the position appropriately. Jessica added that the committee already voted and the item was not approved. James added that the process was followed and next steps for the chairs may be to organize the information and consider the particular issues, and revisit this at a future meeting. Jessica added that she will circle back with Tammy Robinson to understand how this vote impacts the position moving forward and what the appropriate next steps are in the process. Allison added that she felt a deadline was necessary for the changes to be made by to prevent possible confusion in the future.

5) Review Reassigned Time Applications

Jessica shared that the committee was meeting today to review the applications related to reassigned time including new applications, revisions and renewals. Applications were shared with the committee along with the Deans’ comments. A summary of committee members’ level of agreement for the following four questions related to each application were projected, along with comments by committee members:

- 1) The responsibilities associated with this reassignment are NOT included as part of faculty workload
- 2) The position’s proposed outcomes align with the college strategic plan and initiatives
- 3) Amount/duration of reassigned time requested is reasonable

- 4) Duties are most appropriately performed by a faculty member.

The committee reviewed and discussed each application and voted on the recommendation that would be supplied to the VPI for final review and decision making. Dean Ameer Thompson led the discussion in VPI Robinson's absence:

Business Department Coordinator: Renewal Application

Lisa added that many of the comments focused on if this position was appropriate for faculty reassigned time and if the duties fell within D1 duties. Dean Lacefield provided comments stating that coordinators are vital to career education because of the direct contact with the industry, there are too many different programs and areas within the division for a single person or a Dean to maintain proper connections with the community partners, the level of outreach required for career education is far greater because many first time community college students are unaware of career education programs and what opportunities exist, career education programs have a far higher percentage of highly specialized adjuncts (often current professionals in their respective areas) than other areas and many adjunct instructors can only teach one class because of their specialty. Coordinators therefore maintain the relationship allowing industry faculty to teach in their area, and Business is only the current CE program or department with 3 full time faculty, only one of which is tenured. The coordinator will work with many external groups including internships and fully online degree options. Currently, the Grow with Google certification pairing with for-profit offerings is being piloted. The Business Coordinator has been historically highly involved in the scheduling of the many classes which have high enrollment due to the thought and strategy contributed by the coordinator. Lisa added that the dean's comments were more illuminating than what was present on the application. Susan shared that it would be wise for the college to have some type of formula for automatically having departmental reassigned time, and the recurrent approval process can serve as a barrier, and a more systemic solution would be helpful. The committee discussed the importance of fairness and consistency in reassigned time for division coordinators. Jessica added that some of the coordinator positions are renewed on a two year cycle versus a three year cycle. Katie recalled revisiting a similar conversation to what Susan suggested and was unsure of the outcome. She suggested, for example, that the terms for division coordinators are established and the release time would be decided upon with a fair metric dependent upon the size of the division or amount of workload. Alex added that the discussion from last year did prompt changing the application and putting forward the Communication Work Group but that other areas were not addressed. Susan added that different departments have different needs and intentions so some type of formula to decide appropriate release time may be an appropriate starting point. Susan added that larger departments may not necessarily need more release time, because they may have more employees available to assist with various tasks and responsibilities. Susan added that the CTE groups have specific tasks that need to be completed. Alex added that there also exists the entire Business interest area and potential overlap between this position may exist as another perspective to consider. Karen agreed with Alex based on her proximity to the Guided Pathways process. Karen added that for many years, GP money has paid for interest area specific lead faculty who completed design and build work for GP. Now the college is attempting to institutionalize the operation of the interest areas, and Karen would like to see the recommendation from IPC that these positions have within them the expectation that this coordinator would also be the lead faculty for the Business interest area. Lisa suggested making a recommendation to the VPI that the college create a formula for assigning release time to departments and programs that need it and inclusive of this release time will be working on guided pathways as opposed to arguing for something every cycle. Alex added that there seems to be hesitation with the overlap of D1 duties even acknowledging the differential role that coordinators play, and that as written in the application, it is hard to capture the extent of the role. Karen added that she would like the recommendation to include that the role be refined and what is proposed is not final. Susan added that this position is requesting 4 years when other department coordinators request 2 and the committee would like to see consistency in the number of years

proposed. James added that it was not clear why that amount of time was requested. Jessica summarized that there are questions and concerns regarding this submission.

Motion – To support this position as written: M/S: Karen Engel, Diana Tedone-Goldstone

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Opposed -- none

Approval – approved unanimously

English Department Coordinator: Renewal Application

James noted that he added comments but remained neutral in his responses to the questions for positions that were under his division. Doniella Maher asked for clarification regarding the role of deans in this process so that there may be consistency across divisions and asked the committee to consider providing clarity on this for next year to ensure fairness across divisions. Doniella addressed how this position relates to the Writing Center Coordinator. She stated that the Writing Center Coordination units have largely been used to create the Writing Center as opposed to being used as a liaison between the English Department and Writing Center even though this is an eventual need. Most work has been related to tutor training and content area, developing instructional materials and events to support student learning, and running workshops. The role of English Department Coordinator is thus being the liaison and helping with tutor trainings but that is the only Writing Center specific areas of focus. Most of the work is related to the institutional role that English plays. Doniella added that there is often sometimes an assumption that because the department is so large, a division of workload should be simple, however, this department is involved in so many institutional programs on campus (Puente, partially Umoja) and state mandates directly impact English. English plays a disproportionate role on campus regarding the areas it touches and it is impossible for faculty to complete those tasks and run the department without release time. Doniella added that some of the duties will not be completed without coordination time which is the reality of the situation. James stated that he supports the position with the idea that the campus as a whole does a better job in focusing efforts to support students in crucial endeavors that release time currently allows for faculty to dedicate time to completing.

Motion – To support this position as written: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Joan Murphy

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Opposed – Alex Claxton

Approval – approved

Writing Center Coordinator

Lisa added that there appears to be much agreement on this position amongst the committee. Susan asked for clarification on if this was more focused on creating the Writing Center or if it is more operational and related to continuing development. Maureen shared that it is about continuing to develop but also facilitating. Maureen shared that this coordinator is involved in building and facilitating Writing Center workshops, working on faculty drop in tutoring, and working with marketing to promote tutoring and workshops. Maureen noted that this is not something that belongs in the English department because Writing Center tutoring is not only for students in English classes, but rather for students who are in any type of class where any type of writing assignment is present, so it supports all students on campus. They are in the process of building up offerings, such as grammar support and citations, and once back on campus a full tutoring schedule of peer tutors, instructional aids and faculty drop in tutoring will be

available online and in person. Maureen added that this coordinating role works with all departments on campus where writing is a part of the courses offered, and is vital to the campus.

Motion – To support this position as written: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Susan Mahoney

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

Innovation and Excellence in Teaching & Learning Coordinator: New Application

No additional discussion, comments or questions were posed for this position prior to the motion being made.

Motion – To support this position as written: M/S: Joan Murphy, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Alex Claxton

Opposed- none

Approval – approved

OER/ZTC Coordinator: Renewal Application

Alex mentioned that the release time requested is a 4x increase from the previous release time. Diana responded to a question in the feedback form asking for information regarding the current Academic Senate stipend. Diana added that the current stipend is provided for a faculty member to be a liaison with the state Academic Senate and is offered at \$500 a semester which was not covering reassigned time duties but rather keeping people abreast of the state senate updates and opportunities as opposed to coordination. Diana added that ZTC/OER is ramping up state wide and there is a lot of work needed to continue the momentum and meet the demands that are present. James added that ZTC/OER saves students millions of dollars in textbook costs annually and it is crucial for our students at this time. Sarah Harmon added that the current release time does not allow for all of the data analysis the position requires to be completed, and come spring semester, there will be significantly more work that will need to be done and she is hopeful to gain support in this. Alex asked for clarification regarding what maintenance would look like. Sarah shared that this would depend on state and federal support and the maintenance is high because most courses have to be updated every few years and OER materials or library subscriptions have to be revisited.

Motion – To support this position as written: M/S: Diana Tedone-Goldstone, James Carranza

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Susan Mahoney, Lisa Palmer, Alison Field, Joan Murphy

Opposed—Alex Claxton

Approval – approved

Online Instruction Coordinator: Renewal/Revision Application

No additional discussion, comments or questions were posed for this position prior to the motion being made.

Motion – To support this position as written: M/S: Joan Murphy, Alison Field

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Opposed—none

Approval – approved unanimously

Social Sciences Coordinator: Renewal Application

Karen stated that she believes the recommendation to the VPI include that this position be institutionalized as the faculty lead for Human Behavior and Culture Interest Area. Lezlee Ware addressed the comment about SLO, Program Review, and Assessments as being part of D1 duties. She stated that while it is part of each department’s D1 responsibilities, someone has to take the data and put it together as a coherent story that is not the sole responsibility of anyone in the department. Additionally, she added that the majority of the departments in the Social Sciences have one full time faculty member which is a workload issue. Susan appreciated Social Sciences for the way they have approached their coordination and reiterated her earlier point about the formula needed to approach release time on a systemic level. Alison F. elaborated on the approach that the Social Sciences department takes that Susan appreciated, stating that it works well for the needs of the department.

Motion – To support this position as written: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Joan Murphy

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Jill Sumstad, Karen Engel

Opposed—Alex Claxton

Approval – approved

Umoja Coordinator: Renewal Application

Alex asked if this level of release time is expected indefinitely and how that connects with the PSC possibly being hired for this program. James added that the PSC at a part time capacity serves an outreach role whereas the faculty coordinator would work more closely with other faculty, advising course planning and scheduling, and considering professional development opportunities among other areas. Lezlee added that it is not yet confirmed how much support will be granted from Counseling or from the PSC position. Jessica added that Umoja is in “soft

launch” and the amount of resources and time it takes to build a program of this magnitude is an appropriate endeavor to support. James clarified that this is a three year request because a three year timeline will allow for 2 years of data which is integrated into the program model to best assess outcomes and ultimately return to IPC.

Motion – To support this position as written: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Joan Murphy

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Opposed—none

Approval – approved unanimously

6) Provide Feedback on Instructional Program Review Process

Jessica asked the committee to ensure they added their feedback related to the Instructional Program Review process on the google form that was created and emailed to them. Jessica also shared the link with the committee in the chat.

Diana added that the rubric has been updated to reflect Academic Senate’s vote of removal of particular wording for clarity.

7) Good of the Order

John Perez asked the committee to encourage their students to take the Student Technology Survey.

8) Adjournment

Motion – To adjourn the meeting: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Diana Tedone-Goldstone

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

a) Meeting adjourned at 11:39 am.