



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING
COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF
February 5, 2021
9:30 am – 11:30am, Zoom**

Members Present: Jessica Kaven, Lisa Palmer, Allison Hughes, Alex Claxton, Katie Perkins, James Caranza, Karen Engel, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Chris Burns, Jill Sumstad, Joan Murphy

Members Absent: Pisith Keo, Sakol Bun, Tammy Robinson, Susan Mahoney

Guests: Jamie Hui, Matt Lee, Hyla Lacefield, Julian Branch, Patty Hall

1) Adoption and Approval of Agenda

Motion – To adopt agenda: M/S: Alex Claxton, James Carranza

Discussion – Karen Engel shared that she had an update on the focus groups that are being planned at the end of February regarding the campus Cultural Center. At a previous meeting, she said she would return to update the committee. The committee agreed to include this item within the good of the order section of the agenda as opposed to amending the agenda to include a separate item for discussion.

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes

Motion – To approve minutes of December 4, 2020: M/S: Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Joan Murphy

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

3) Renewal of CTE Liaison, CIETL and Emergency DE Coordinator Positions

Jessica provided the committee with a bit of an update regarding this agenda item. Jessica stated that position descriptions were reviewed at a previous IPC meeting, yet the application for renewal of CIETL was not put forward, so this will need to be reviewed. Jessica stated that the DE Coordinator (emergency second position) was approved for a one year term due to the pandemic, and the VPI has stated that there is a need for additional time for this role, so the committee will be discussing this decision for continued support. Jessica stated that the CTE Liaison position expires spring 2021, and the submission of the application was an oversight, and therefore Patty Hall is present to discuss this position with the committee.

James added that the committee will make considerations on these positions and provide the recommendations to the VPI. The committee first discussed the CIETL position. Joan stated that she feels the CIETL name is outdated and not reflective of the role. Rebekah agreed with Joan's statement. Karen added that the committee discussed three types of reassigned time: college needs, discretionary, and mandatory positions. Karen shared that it was her belief that the CIETL position fell within the mandatory role. James projected the description for the position and stated that because an application for this role was not submitted, the committee has to decide if they feel the role should continue and provide that feedback to Dr. Robinson. Karen stated that the faculty may not have submitted this application as the view may have been that the scope of work was changing and the college had decided that this was an important position that needed to move forward. Jessica added that this is not the campus process, and Jessica provided feedback that it would be preferable to have a clear idea of the college wide positions that the campus is committing to, rather than having the oneness on the faculty member to submit the application. Rebekah shared that she felt this is complicated, and if the position is to be changed, perhaps the committee should wait to provide a recommendation. Karen stated that the process has existed where the faculty member's role is to resubmit an application for the role renewal, and in this case, this did not happen. While this did not happen, this does not mean that the campus does not need the position, and this is where the issue in the process exists. Karen shared that she believes the process should be revisited. Joan added if the incumbent faculty is not seeking to fill the position in the future, it is not clear whose responsibility it is to submit the renewal application. Allison added that if the position is something the college has agreed upon over time, the renewal process should be made more clear. Joan added that clarity regarding applications submitted through Academic Senate would also be helpful for the committee.

James added that the committee has one recommendation to further revisit this process as a whole in the future. Rebekah shared that having one process that everyone goes through may be helpful to facilitate the process and allow for discussion of positions as conflicting information has caused challenges in the process in past semesters. Hyla added that the CTE Liaison position is required by Academic Senate, but the position was not required to have release time associated with it. The tri-chair model of the Director of Workforce Development, the CTE Dean, and the CTE Liaison would represent the faculty to the group and represent the group to the faculty. Hyla clarified that it is a crucial position and that it historically has been challenging to find someone to fill the role without reassigned time being offered. Hyla reported that she was under the impression that Academic Senate was renewing the role as career education is an Academic Senate position and not within her division. Hyla enthusiastically endorsed this position and gently recommended that it is something that should be under Academic Senate purview. Patty added that while not mandated, this position is essential to the functioning and development of workforce programs. Patty also noted that it is her view that the process needs to change as well and encouraged the committee to revisit and revise it. Julian added that CTE grants have parameters to follow to ensure compliance. Julian echoed his support for the position as the position will support many areas on campus. Hyla added that better communication regarding dissemination of information for the campus is necessary, and this position would assist with that.

James clarified the recommendations the committee has considered thus far. Allison added that she would like to make a recommendation that a clarification be made between the roles of the two DE Coordinators as the same job description is being used for both roles. James summarized

the committee's recommendations once more to take the items to the vote of the committee.

Motion – To recommend the consideration for approval of the CTE Liaison position to the VPI with the recommendation of transferring it into the appropriate scope of work form: M/S: James Carranza, Karen Engel

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

Motion – To table the CIETL Coordinator position until appropriate representation is present to further discuss and clarify the scope of work and the organization of the role: M/S: Joan Murphy, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau

Discussion – Joan added that it is challenging to vote for the forward movement of a position when the scope of work has not been finalized. Karen agreed and asked if the committee could invite professional development faculty to a future meeting to clarify the scope of work and better understand the needs of the position. Karen suggested a meeting with this group as soon as possible to move the process along. Jessica added that the IPC meeting on February 19 could also solely be dedicated to reviewing the reassigned time process.

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

Motion – To recommend the consideration for approval of the one year extension of the emergency DE Coordinator position to the VPI with the recommendation of differentiating this role from the second DE Coordinator role: M/S: James Carranza, Karen Engel

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

4) Program Review Workgroup Update

Jessica stated that she is on a program review work group with both Karen and Allison where discussions have taken place regarding how to streamline the process. Allison shared that the committee is working on putting together a list of things that need to occur this semester to prepare for program review in the fall. Allison stated that one issue that has occurred in the past is that changes are made last minute which adds to further confusion. Additionally, the task force is outlining how to better communicate regarding program review, for example, when reminders are being sent, when things are due, who they are being sent to, and who is sending them. Karen added that the reason the work group exists is because, while IPC holds and manages instructional program review on behalf of the senate, there needs to be alignment with student services and administrative program reviews to agree to the timeline and due dates for the

following year no later than spring break. Karen stated that the workgroup may come to IPC with a proposed timeline and dates for next year for the consideration of the committee. Karen also shared that the committee discussed having a policy regarding extensions. The committee will draft the policy and come to IPC for further review at a future meeting. Allison encouraged the committee to ask questions at this time if they had any related to the process.

James asked if the workgroup had a mission outlining their policies. Allison shared that one does not currently exist, but discussions have come up regarding the need for a document such as this. James suggested a chart with information regarding what is the intended accomplishment of the workgroup. James made a recommendation that a set of outcomes and objectives are created in addition to a timeline of what the group is going to assist in organizing.

5) Updates to IPC Bylaws

Jessica projected the current draft of the IPC Bylaws for the committee to review. Jessica asked the committee to review the current list of tasks to ensure they accurately reflect the responsibilities of the committee. Jessica highlighted duplicates of responsibilities and information that was not present. The committee discussed each item and edited the tasks together. The finalized list of tasks is seen here:

The advisory tasks include:

1. Develop and oversee the annual process of instructional program review (on behalf of Academic Senate)
2. Provide feedback on instructional program review narratives in accordance with the Academic Senate guidelines.
3. Evaluate the instructional program review process yearly.
4. Host Instructional Program Review presentations (this could include a collaboration with SSPC).
5. Coordinate the annual program review college-wide process (including the timeline, communication, due dates) in collaboration with all councils and appropriate work groups
6. Recommend and review policies and procedures as they relate to instruction.
7. Provide support and feedback on the development of new instructional programs and instructional program discontinuance.
8. Annually review how the campus is meeting Standard IIA and IIB.
9. Completion of a yearly review of the purpose and the role of the Instructional Planning Council.

10. Discuss and identify innovative instructional methods and opportunities to enhance teaching and learning.

11. Review and provide feedback on reassigned time applications.

Motion – To approve the above changes made to the IPC Bylaws: M/S:
James Carranza, Allison Hughes

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

6) Good of the Order

Karen provided the committee with an update regarding the upcoming opening of the campus Cultural Center. Karen shared that a more deliberate process for collaborative design of programming of what would take place in the Cultural Center both pedagogically and more generally is the goal. The committee is proposing to address this through utilizing focus groups this semester. There will be 7 focus group sessions with participation from all campus constituencies. Focus groups will be approximately 90 minutes and pre-registration is required. The focus groups will be co-facilitated by Career Ladders Project Partners, and the ideal focus group would be approximately 10 participants or less per session.

The following campus experiences are proposed:

Campus Constituency	Date of Focus Group	Time of Focus Group
The migrant and immigrant student, faculty, and staff experience - including international students	Monday February 22	12:30 – 2:00 p.m.
The Black and African American staff and faculty experience	Tuesday February 23	12:30 – 2:00 p.m.
The Black and African American student (only) experience	Tuesday February 23	5:00 – 6:30 p.m.
The Latinx student, faculty, and staff experience (as a Hispanic Serving Institution)	Wednesday February 24	12:30 – 2:00 p.m.
The Asian American, Native American, Pacific Islander student, faculty and staff experience (as an AANAPI Serving Institution)	Thursday February 25	3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
The lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, non-binary+ student, faculty and staff experience	Tuesday March 2	12:30 – 2:00 p.m.
Open to all experiences	Friday February 26	9:30 - 11:00 a.m.

Regarding the timeline, in December 2020, the initial proposal and feedback via IPC and

SSPC took place. In Late February or Early March, the 7 focus groups will be hosted. The committee is looking to possibly activate a link to submit online anonymous feedback for the Cultural Center. In April, the focus group feedback will be reported to the campus.

7) Adjournment

Motion – To adjourn the meeting: M/S: James Carranza, Karen Engel

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

a) Meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.