



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING
COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF
October 1, 2021
9:30 am – 11:30am, Zoom**

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

Members Absent: Alex Claxton, Susan Mahoney

Guests: Richard Schulke

1) Adoption and Approval of Agenda

Motion – To adopt agenda: M/S: Joan Murphy, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes

Motion – To approve minutes of September 17, 2021: M/S: Alison Field, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Katie Perkins, James Carranza (were not present for 9/17 meeting)

Approval – approved

3) Reassigned Time Expectations

Tammy Robinson presented on behalf of this item. Tammy shared that she would like to ensure expectations for reassigned time roles are clear across campus. Tammy added that most recently, the CTE Liaison role was offered to Professor Billy Burger. Professor Burger was the only applicant for the role, and the committee met and had some critical concerns that were addressed both with the applicant and Academic Senate President David Eck, as this was a position that had not been filled for quite some time. Tammy shared that it is imperative to meet with those who take on the role to ensure they understand fully the expectations associated. Tammy reiterated that it is crucial that applicants understand the magnitude of the role prior to accepting the role. Tammy would like to onboard applicants and have an expectation meeting with each applicant who will fill each reassigned time role moving forward to ensure there is clarity and understanding.

Jessica asked if Tammy felt the expectation/onboarding meeting was productive. Tammy

shared that she felt it was important to have this meeting, as the CTE Liaison would begin their role immediately, and there was significant information regarding expectations that had to be discussed. She thought it went really well, and found it to be useful. Jessica reiterated that the onboarding was helpful and went well. Alison Field shared that she believed this type of onboarding would be helpful, to allow for discussion of what the college expects of the person filling the role in addition to what the faculty member requires in terms of campus support to do the job well. Diana Tedone-Goldstone agreed that it was a good idea, highlighting that adjunct faculty members or new faculty members would also benefit campus-wide from this onboarding.

4) Naming of Faculty Coordinator Working with the Professional Development Committee

- Formerly CIETL position
- Discussion to rename “Faculty Professional Development Coordinator”

Jessica reminded the group that last meeting, the committee discussed that the old CIETL position had been tabled and the new position that was reviewed was seemingly similar to the specific needs of the Professional Development Planning Committee. The committee took some time to review the naming of the role to avoid confusion moving forward. Jessica shared the proposed titles that had been both discussed by the committee at the last meeting (8-17) and those that had been emailed and submitted since (1-7):

1. Professional Development Planning Committee Coordinator, or PDPC
2. Staff Ongoing Learning Coordinator, or SOL
3. Cañada Staff Ongoing Learning Coordinator, or C-SOL
4. Faculty-Staff Ongoing Learning Coordinator, or F-SOL
5. Ongoing learning Coordinator, or OLC
6. Continuing Education Coordinator, or CEC
7. Continuing Learning Coordinator, or CLC

8. Faculty Professional Development Coordinator
9. Campus Professional Development Coordinator
10. Professional Development Planning Committee Faculty Coordinator
11. Professional Development Planning Committee Campus Coordinator
12. Professional Development Planning Committee Campus-wide Coordinator
13. Faculty Professional Development Planning Committee Coordinator
14. Campus-wide Professional Development Faculty Coordinator
15. Campus Professional Development Faculty Coordinator
16. Coordinator of Faculty Professional Development and Growth
17. College Professional Development Faculty Coordinator

Diana added that this coordinator's emphasis is on faculty, and any suggestions that mention staff should be removed. Jessica added that the spirit of that is in regard to campus-wide professional development. Joan mentioned that the application description had little to do with staff professional development and she has no issue with this being a faculty focused position, but that the staff portion was so minimal that it seemed to not represent the needs of staff, and perhaps a different position focusing on staff needs may be appropriate. James agreed that the description should match what the role would be responsible for. James suggested that perhaps a different coordinator is needed for the larger professional development committee or more assistance is needed to support ASLT, which may both involve different and additional conversations. James mentioned it will be necessary to understand how the committee envisions CIETL versus how the committee envisions professional development for faculty and how does this fit in with the larger campus professional development group. Joan added that she would like to see a space for faculty to come together and share ideas and lead workshops above and beyond FLEX day offerings. Lisa added that she recalled David Meckler stating that staff needs are part of the ongoing learning goals and this is why names including staff are suggested on the list. Alison Field added that the discussion still feels "muddy" to her, that in David's presentation, it appeared most of the position's time was devoted to FLEX Day planning.

The committee reviewed the list of duties and percentage of time allocation submitted on the application for the role. The committee discussed the inclusion of staff support in the position application. Allison Hughes added that she understood that the position was to be more general in terms of campus-wide support, however, upon reviewing the application only about half of the duties within the time allocation appear to focus on staff and faculty needs, while half focuses on solely faculty support more directly. Allison highlighted that collaboration with Classified Senate was not present in the application. James suggested relying on Academic Senate to clarify if a campus-wide coordinator is the expectation, or if a CIETL-like faculty professional development coordinator focused position is the expectation. Jill Sumstad asked if the staff support were removed from this position description, is there a role on campus that would fill that void and support staff. Joan and Allison shared that there is a committee to review staff professional development off campus opportunities, but there is not anyone who coordinates and plans professional development opportunities specific to staff needs/wants outside of the professional development governing committee and the group that plans FLEX day as a whole. Allison suggested that three positions may be an appropriate approach: a FLEX Day Coordinator, a Faculty Professional Development Coordinator, and a Staff Professional Development Coordinator, or at least two positions where one person does FLEX Day planning and coordinating and another does professional development coordinating. Alison Field added that there is inadequate representation of staff in the leadership component, and if we truly want to be a campus-wide group, then leadership from all sides is necessary. Alison added that it also seems the time allocation may be insufficient as the teaching and learning component appears to still be missing. James suggested speaking to Classified Senate to find out what classified staff interest may be. Jill suggested adding more reassigned time to the position. Katie Perkins stated that it does seem the role responsibilities appear to represent different positions, which is why it is challenging to find one name

that accurately reflects this role. Diana asked the committee what the goal of the committee was for today's meeting. Jessica added that the committee approved the position, and they are tasked with naming the position. Diana added that she felt clarifying the position's role should be the priority over the naming of the position, and perhaps the role clarification involves more voices than just those within IPC. Lisa suggested approving the broadest name on the list, Professional Development Planning Committee Coordinator (PDPC). Lisa then suggested changing 'development' for 'learning' and suggested Professional Learning Planning Committee Coordinator to differentiate from the AFT Faculty Professional Development Committee Chair and members. Jill, James, and Joan were in agreement that Professional Learning Coordinator seemed most appropriate and that the removal of 'committee' was necessary to differentiate the role. Alison asked if the committee was looking to move forward with the hope that the position grows into the title, or if they should base the name off of what is actually in the job description right now and onboard someone and then look at the bigger picture and figure out what is needed at that juncture. Jessica suggested bringing this back as an item on next week's agenda. Lisa agreed that perhaps more input and clarity is needed, and alternately suggested that a title be approved and then continue the discussion regarding what coordination is needed to fulfill the functions of the campus community.

Tammy stated that there is a point where the committee needs to make a decision. Tammy suggested honoring the position and then updating the title at a later time. Tammy suggested honoring the recommendations that have been made: firstly, will this one person be able to complete all the necessary duties, or should a staff member be utilized and paid through overtime or comp time to coordinate with this position. Tammy shared that she is hearing that staff feel inadequate representation on their end. Tammy also mentioned that if this does not work, the committee has the option to return to the conversation and update this as appropriate, but that the person should be able to begin to fill the role and be on-boarded. Lisa agreed with Tammy and stated that she believes the committee should accept a title such as Faculty Learning Coordinator and the committee makes a recommendation that a person come forward to fill the role of Staff Learning Coordinator, and these two people would work in tandem. Joan seconded this suggestion, noting that it is challenging for staff to typically become involved as they are not able to receive release time and this would be an additional component of their workload. Joan appreciated the suggestion of offering overtime/comp time and believed that many more applicants would be interested in participating with this additional piece offered.

Jessica added that from her perspective, the reason these same conversations keep happening is because they are happening in one place and the conversation is not being addressed further, for example, those who are proposing these suggestions are not speaking to the faculty or the staff. Tammy suggested that this be proposed at both Academic and Classified Senate meetings. Diana noted that the position has already been approved in IPC and agreed with the recommendation of voting on a title now and later recommending that this position return to IPC in a future cycle that might include the incorporation of two positions, one for faculty and one for staff. James shared he was in agreement with this, and suggested it may be helpful to communicate with the

senates and the Professional Learning Committee to assess the actual professional learning/professional development needs of the campus and then filling the role once the expectations and needs are clear. Jessica reiterated the need to work with other constituent groups on campus to ensure forward movement with this, as continuing to discuss it only in one setting results in a lack of progress. Lisa agreed that the committee needs to discuss and figure out the needs of the campus and then ensure that the position that is established meets those needs. The committee was in agreement that the title recommendation is for Faculty learning Coordinator with the addition of a Staff Learning Coordinator to work in tandem.

Tammy suggested that the next step be to take this to Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and the Professional Learning Committee. Joan and Allison Hughes volunteered to bring this content to Classified Senate. The committee asked if Richard Schulke would bring this item to Academic Senate, and he agreed, and it was noted that other committee members would also be present at AS to provide additional information if needed.

5) Reassigned Time Communication Workgroup

- **Online applications due by 11/12**

Jessica noted that the workgroup now consists of herself, Jill Sumstad, Joan Murphy, Diana Tedone-Goldstone, and new member Paul Naas. Jessica shared that the group met and reviewed the goals of assisting IPC in facilitating and communicating the reassigned time process with the campus. The group reviewed the timeline and created a list of dates that can be followed from a communication standpoint, identified positions for reassigned time that are up for renewal from the college-wide positions and program department positions, and drafted an email that was shared with Tammy with information that is recommended to be shared with the campus community including due dates, the online application, and renewal cycles. Jessica noted that the group recommended that this email be sent out campus-wide as opposed to solely to faculty to ensure all parties are aware of what is happening. Joan added that the whole idea is for this process to be as transparent as possible, and to communicate ahead of time so those involved are clear regarding due dates and expectations. Joan mentioned that a recommendation is that once the positions have been awarded, the campus community is also notified. Jill reiterated that communication appeared to be the missing piece and that is the goal the workgroup will be working to improve. Diana added that an archive of past positions and past people who filled the roles will also be updated for clarity on the website.

6) IPC Goals for 2021-2022

Jessica presented on behalf of this item. She mentioned that at the last meeting, the list of duties of IPC was discussed. Some members had emailed Jessica since the last meeting and shared that they felt it was necessary to focus on advisory task 10: Discuss and identify innovative instructional methods and opportunities to enhance teaching and learning. One

suggestion focused on the support of the faculty/staff learning coordinator role and another suggestion was incorporating the Anti-Racist Task Force in conversations. Feedback was also received that the group would like to continue having discussions and supporting methods related to excellence in teaching and learning beyond DE, focusing on pedagogical approaches and equity minded pedagogical approaches. Allison Hughes mentioned that the Technology Committee and DEAC are forming a task force to look into different modalities and ways of teaching taking into account the pandemic, and starting to define these modalities. Allison asked the committee to provide input if they would be interested in hearing updates on these items or providing insight into these items. The committee members agreed this would be helpful and useful. In terms of a new goal, James suggested the committee take a look at strategic enrollment management planning and college planning as the district prepares to return to campus in the spring. Jessica encouraged the committee to continue to share items they feel are necessary to discuss as the year progresses.

7) **Good of the Order**

Joan appreciated Jessica for her leadership in the committee.

8) **Adjournment**

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

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

a) Meeting adjourned at 10:49am.