



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING
COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF
May 20, 2022
9:30am – 11:30pm, Zoom**

Members Present: Jessica Kaven, Allison Hughes, Susan Mahoney, Alex Claxton, Lisa Palmer, Jill Sumstad, Karen Engel, Tammy Robinson, Joan Murphy, Alison Field

Members Absent: Katie Perkins, Diana Tedone-Goldstone, James Carranza, Rian Morrison

Guests: Lesly Ta, Sarah Harmon, David Eck, Ameer Thompson, Chris Burns, Lezlee Ware, Samantha Vargas

1) Adoption and Approval of Agenda

Motion – To adopt agenda: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Alex Claxton

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

2) Approval of Minutes

- May 6, 2022

Motion – To approve minutes: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Allison Hughes

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Alison Field and Joan Murphy (absent from 5/6 meeting)

Approval – approved

3) Personnel and Non-Personnel Resource request Update

Ludmila Pricecar was unable to attend the meeting, however, Jessica shared documents that were presented at the May 18 Planning and Budget Council (PBC) Meeting with the committee for their review. The documents shared were:

[Resource Request Update Presentation](#)

[Non-Personnel Requests](#)

Jessica encouraged all committee members to review the documents to be aware of the budget decisions that remain and which impact the campus. Allison H., PBC Representative on IPC, shared that the document shared the results of submitted requests. Additionally, if something was not approved this cycle, applicants will need to resubmit for the next cycle as these items will not

automatically roll over.

4) Online Learning-An Equity and Inclusive Issue

- **ASCC Recommendation: that the college provides 100% of certificate and degree classes online.**

Student Lesly Ta reported that she received significant helpful feedback from IPC regarding her presentation at the last meeting, and she wanted to thank the members for their input and support. Lesly noted that in her opinion, an equity issue is present when departments are not providing all of their degree and certificate classes in an online format as this limits access to students which prevents them from completing their educational goals. Lesly stressed that she is asking for support that 100% of degree and certificate classes can be taken online so that students are able to complete their educational goals. Lesly noted that she is aware faculty can choose the modality of their courses, and proposed ensuring equity by partnering with schools that have the same type of classes, having consortium agreements, educating our counselors on what classes will transfer to what colleges and providing a more well-rounded counseling program for online students, in addition to providing more in classroom tech support for instructors.

Karen Engel asked for clarity regarding what is meant by “online.” Lesly shared that by online, ASCC means being able to log into classes via an online format as opposed to having to come in person physically to campus to attend a class. Lisa Palmer appreciated Lesly for bringing this forward. Lisa clarified that there are many pieces involved in this, including the union, faculty purview, including the administration input. Lisa added that faculty have been asked to actually bring more classes back to campus which is the opposite of Lesly’s initiative, however, Lisa personally agrees with Lesly’s initiative but does want to note that there are many people involved in the decision. Lisa posed to the committee to consider if IPC feels as a body, they have the authority to take action on this initiative, and if they do make this a recommendation, what exactly that would entail.

Lesly clarified that she is looking for support on the recommendation as opposed to having this be finalized. She is seeking support to show the board and those who may be involved in the financial decision making process that the initiative has campus support.

Susan Mahoney reported that she believes this is a great initiative in terms of access. Susan asked how many of the campus degree programs are currently all online and how many are not. Susan also posed the concern of departments that only offer one section, if the online option moves forward, she worries that the students that prefer/benefit from in person instruction then experience the same challenge in a different way. Susan asked if hybrid learning opportunities are preferable. Susan also brought up the issue of courses that require the use of special equipment, that learning to use this in person is not going to be the same or possible to do virtually based on cost or size.

Lesly suggested that many of these questions will have to be considered through via the formation of a work group. Lesly noted that she is considering this realistically as well.

Alex Claxton noted that there is a difference between offering 100% of degree and certificate courses online and offering 100% of degree and certificates a pathway to online completion. Alex noted that the first presupposes that all of the courses will be offered while another is that you will be able to fulfill each requirement for a degree with an online section. Alex noted that

the latter seems more viable and he would not be able to support the current initiative as written. Lesly noted that she is comfortable with changing the verbiage to better reflect the intention, and welcomed members to make a motion with a revised recommendation.

Alison Field noted that she can consider pedagogical or curricular reasons why a faculty member may feel strongly that in order to achieve the goals of the course, it needs to be in person, and encouraged the committee and Lesly to be mindful of that as well to ensure we are meeting the needs of the courses and disciplines. Alison added that in conversation with her own students, it has been noted that there should be an option for students to complete their degree and certificate programs in face to face formats as well. Ideally, students should be able to choose and complete in the way that works best for them. Alison supports striving for this initiative but recognizes that there are numerous aspects to consider.

Allison Hughes stated that she agrees with Alison F.'s language of striving for offering as many online courses as possible as there are so many variables involved. Allison noted that teacher training is another aspect of this, having teachers trained and prepared to teach online can take time, and placing courses online without faculty being adequately prepared can cause the quality of the online course to suffer. Allison noted that the way the initiative is written, this only discusses 100% online courses either synchronous or asynchronous and those are the only modalities that are able to be offered online right now. Other modalities like HyFlex, where students can choose how they attend are not legally able to be offered currently. This information comes from the Chancellor's Office stating that attendance reporting for online versus in person classes is different, and there is currently not a way to account for a student attending in both of those modalities in the same class. While this can change as soon as spring 2023, currently this is not possible. Allison stated that if we move forward in making these changes before it is confirmed that we are able to, it risks potential issues with the transferability of courses. Allison noted that a workgroup would be a great idea in pursuing this further.

Lezlee Ware stated that it would be helpful to obtain data from faculty regarding which courses would be challenging to offer online and which would be better candidates for online learning. Lezlee suggested working with ASCC regarding obtaining funding and support for faculty who do wish to do better in combining modalities.

Tammy Robinson suggested supporting this initiative in phases. She mentioned that spring 2023 is likely not possible, but that this has to be a phased in process that we can prepare for in terms of the law and training. Tammy highlighted that we have to work with numerous entities to make changes. Karen Engel added that we need to be cognizant of how we can partner as a district to make this a reality for our students.

Motion – To approve the motion “IPC supports the ASCC recommendation that Cañada strive to create opportunities for students to take courses and complete degrees, certificates, and programs in whatever modality works for them (f2f, online, partially online, etc.). We commit to forming a workgroup in fall 2022 to facilitate this effort including researching how to work with Skyline and CSM to make this happen.” M/S: Lisa Palmer, Allison Hughes

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

5) Dual Enrollment Plan Update

Samantha Vargas presented on behalf of this item. She mentioned that Oxford Day Academy visited and learned about the college a few weeks ago and yesterday, Woodside High School Engineering students visited campus to learn about the college offerings. Hillsdale High School Dual Enrollment ECE students also came to campus yesterday for a tour. Samantha added that she has been working closely with the Boys and Girls Club to help students apply to the college. Lastly, she has been working with faculty and other departments to get dual enrollment classes scheduled for the fall.

Lisa asked about concerns she has heard of regarding dual enrollment, one being student behavior and another being the fact that enrollment has to be done by hand which is time consuming and has delayed access to students. Samantha mentioned that this is the first time she is hearing about student behavior and she will talk to her colleagues about this. Lisa suggested having a teacher from the high school present in the room the course is taking place could assist with behavior issues and Samantha shared she would look into this as an option. Samantha also shared that there are many departmental approvals and steps that are required on the student forms and this may be why the process is presenting as cumbersome. Jessica Kaven, Susan Mahoney, and Joan Murphy shared additional insight regarding the importance of faculty support related to student behavior. Jessica added that historically, there has been a faculty liaison to assist with communication, which could be something to revisit or look further into to ensure students are being served most effectively.

6) Program Improvement and Viability (PIV) Process

David Eck and Sarah Harmon shared the following document with the committee:

[Program Improvement and Viability Process](#)

David shared that IPC wanted an opportunity to review the feedback from spring 2021 to see how that compared to the draft that was presented at the last IPC meeting. Lisa added that this was taken to Academic Senate where additional feedback was sought, and now the document is returning to IPC for additional input.

Jessica Kaven asked for clarification regarding the timeline. David shared that this would depend in part on IPC's feedback. Jessica shared that one thing she added to the document was that a discussion should occur regarding IPC's role in the process, as IPC is charged with providing feedback on programs that are new and continuing. Currently, the process in the document goes from workgroup to senate to PBC, and Jessica would like to discuss what IPC can provide in the actual process outside being able to initiate PIV. David questioned if the role of program review would be potentially sufficient to address IPC's role. Jessica added that with program review, IPC provides feedback on comprehensive narratives, but nothing connected to program viability, so that step appears to be missing.

Alex Claxton noted that much of the text is copied directly from the administrative procedures, which creates some oddities in timelines. Alex asked for clarification if the procedure needs to happen in a specified order, or if it just needs to contain the specified components. Lisa suggested looking at this document and program review in tandem to ensure they are better aligned. Allison Hughes asked for clarification: would the group align the two processes so that a PIV process would not be started without a program review to reference in the process or would PIV be part of program review? Allison added that IPC could potentially be a first stop on the way to Academic Senate so

that all of the expectation does not have to fall on the task force before the more formal transition to Academic Senate. Lisa summarized that there needs to be careful consideration of the calendar, and careful consideration of how IPC is involved in the process and offers feedback and structure. Allison also suggested that since the cycle is currently three years, if a way to trigger an out of cycle early comprehensive program review prior to entering into the PIV process should be discussed.

Sarah Harmon noted that a question was posed in the draft as to who is chairing or leading the task force. Currently this is unclear, but Sarah noted that in her opinion it should be faculty driven, and it is unclear if this should be a faculty representative from IPC or Academic Senate. Jessica suggested continuing the discussion that it could be helpful to think about PIV as the program review process is occurring.

7) Reassigned Time communication Workgroup
• **Membership for Fall 2022**

Jessica shared that to date, Susan Mahoney, Jill Sumstad, and Lisa Palmer have expressed interest in serving on this committee. Jessica encouraged others who may be interested to reach out to her directly.

8) Instructional Program Review Presentation Date (Spring 2023)
• **Proposed change from Friday, March 17th to Friday, March 3rd**

Jessica shared that at the last meeting, a desire was expressed to have overlap with the divisions, and moving the meeting to March 3 would overlap with first Friday division meetings. Academic Senate will also be at plenary on March 17, and an official vote is required.

Motion – To change the presentation date for spring 2023 for program review presentations from March 17 to March 3: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Joan Murphy

Discussion – Susan asked if division deans have agreed to highly encourage their faculty to attend and participate. Jessica shared that a few have agreed and they are still working to confirm which divisions meet on this day. Lisa Palmer added that she mentioned this at Curriculum Committee and one meeting will be cancelled to encourage members to attend.

Abstentions – Jill Sumstad

Approval – approved

9) Appointment IPC Faculty Co-Chair and PBC Representative for 2022-2023

Motion – To approve Lisa Palmer as PBC Representative M/S: Alison Field, Jill Sumstad

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

Motion – To approve Jessica Kaven as IPC Faculty Co-Chair: M/S:
Susan Mahoney, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

10) Online Teaching & Online Learning Webpages

Allison Hughes presented on behalf of this item. Allison projected updated websites for the committee. She shared that this project was to consolidate all of the previous websites including the Canvas, DE, teaching resources sites to make information more clear for people to find. An online teaching website will have resources for faculty and an online learning website will have resources for students. Allison walked the committee through the various sections of the websites.

Alison Field thanked Allison for her work in creating these resources. She also noted that she looks forward to keeping in touch regarding the ACES and equity perspective and how she can help Allison in her work moving forward.

11) Faculty Resource Repository

Allison Hughes presented on behalf of this item. Allison projected the website of the Faculty Resource Repository. Allison shared that this has been built mainly by Kristen Denver who is our contracted Instructional Designer. Allison explained each module that was present on the website. Allison noted that this is intended to be a one stop shop for guides on all of the main parts of teaching an online course.

Jessica and the committee thanked Allison for her hard work on these projects.

12) Good of the order

-Jessica mentioned that the Guided Pathways faculty coordination out of cycle positions were approved, and per IPC's recommendation, the Counseling positions were not.

-Alex mentioned that CSEA and Classified Senate were not able to meet to select members to fill the roles for IPC membership. Jessica mentioned that Alex was interested in continuing to serve, and thanked Joan for her years of service on the committee.

-Lisa Palmer offered her gratitude to Dr. Robinson and wished her success in her next chapter.

-Alison Field mentioned that the campus has been working since 2017 to bring a mural to our campus and the first mural design workshop happened recently with the master muralist. In the fall, two more design workshops will move forward and community painting days will take place as well.

-Jessica mentioned that there is a new version of Improve where assessment results will be input and encouraged faculty to reach out should they have challenges or questions.

13) Adjournment

Motion – To adjourn the meeting: M/S: Alex Claxton, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

a) Meeting adjourned at 11:18 am.