



**INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING
COUNCIL**

**MEETING MINUTES OF
March 3, 2023
9:30-11:30am, Zoom**

Members Present: Jessica Kaven, Chris Burns, Candice Nance, Chloe Knott, Sarah Cortez, Alison Field, Erik Gaspar, Alex Claxton, Lisa Palmer, Jill Sumstad, Natalie Melgar, Chialin Hsieh, Susan Mahoney, Jose Manzo, Karen Engel

Members Absent: Allison Hughes, James Carranza

Guests: David Reed, David Eck, Kathleen Sullivan-Torrez

1) Adoption and Approval of Agenda

Motion – To adopt agenda: M/S: Karen Engel, Sarah Cortez

Discussion – David Reed requested that item K on the agenda, Professional Development Plan, be moved up on the agenda due to a scheduling conflict.

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes (February 3, 2023)

Motion – To approve meeting minutes of February 3, 2023: M/S: Sarah Cortez, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Karen Engel (absent from 2/3/23 meeting)

Approval – approved

3) Professional Development Plan

- **Planning Process**
- **Draft-Needs Assessment Survey**

David Reed and Karen Engel presented on behalf of this item. David noted that Coordinator Ellen Young was unable to attend the meeting, so he was presenting on her behalf. David shared that the purpose of this presentation is to ensure the committee is informed of the process in addition to sharing the expected timeline of finalizing the

draft of the needs assessment with the goal of launching soon. Karen Engel shared that there are three surveys that are being circulated which are attempting to capture information about the needs on campus. Alex Claxton is in charge of the survey for classified staff, Karen will work with managers, and Ellen Young will work with faculty. Karen noted that Ellen wanted to ensure IPC had a chance to review the survey that would be sent to faculty. Karen noted that Ellen is eager to receive feedback as the plan is to have the survey be sent by the end of next week. Karen stated that the group wants the survey to capture people's awareness, satisfaction with existing offerings, and the need for new professional development. Karen added that Jessica Kaven and Lezlee Ware as Faculty Teaching and Learning Co-Chairs have had the chance to include input on this survey.

Jessica Kaven appreciated everyone involved as a PD assessment was something that has been a goal for quite some time. Jessica shared that in the midst of obtaining feedback on the survey, folks began to realize some of the structural issues with PD on campus in general, particularly the confusion related to the Professional Development Planning Committee in connection with the Faculty Professional Development Committee. In addition, Jessica shared that she was grappling with the purpose of the survey in relation to the satisfaction of offerings outside of campus-wide purview and how that feedback would be used and implemented. Karen noted that Academic Senate will discuss this on March 9, and hopefully some of Jessica's concerns will be addressed at this meeting. Jessica shared that part of the frustration lies in addressing feedback that was offered years ago but not addressed.

Alison Field shared that she feels it is important to obtain information on programs currently being offered, but the new Equity and Anti-Racism Planning Council only just launched, and incorporating new offerings such as this will also be crucial to understanding the campus needs. Alex Claxton noted that the roles and responsibilities of classified staff are varied, and there are so many different needs and goals based on specific roles, that it is a big endeavor to create professional development that is relevant to the majority of folks. Jessica added that a suggestion from faculty leaders has been to introduce the needs assessment in phases, initially during Flex Day. Alex noted that a final piece to this is to ensure compliance for accreditation, and that evaluating professional development is part of maintaining compliance.

Lisa Palmer added that there has been a lot of dialogue circulating via email regarding the sample survey which was sent out. Lisa added that a big challenge continues to be the name of different professional development related endeavors on campus, how many of them use similar wording but the duties are very different. Chris Burns asked when the surveys will be complete and when folks will be able to access the results. Karen note that the results will be posted on the website and a Flex Day session will take place to discuss the results. Susan Mahoney shared that she is eager to hear how to support staff who have expressed their very different needs. Susan also expressed frustration regarding the professional development terminology, noting that the group spent quite some time last year attempting to finalize this, and there continues to remain confusion. Erik Gaspar suggested that action be taken regarding the terminology, which

can then be re-evaluated as necessary, as opposed to continuing to have conversations without implementing changes. Candice Nance and David Reed clarified that there are three separate surveys addressing the needs of staff, faculty, and administrators, as opposed to one survey addressing all three groups' needs. Sarah Cortez expressed excitement that classified staff will have a separate survey that is specific to their needs. Jose Manzo shared that he is looking forward to giving feedback from the Counseling perspective. Natalie Melgar shared that she liked the ideas that are being brought forward in this discussion.

4) Faculty Teaching and Learning Center and Lounge (FTLCL)

Jessica Kaven presented on behalf of this item. She shared that the FTLCL is open, no key is necessary. Employees are encouraged to come and see the space. Many changes are occurring including the ordering of new furniture and technology. Jessica added that she and Lezlee Ware under the leadership of Karen and Chialin have put forward a grant focusing on professional development and professional learning aiming to create a pillar structure of actual institutionalized support for teaching and learning. Karen added that this grant is state funding, and about \$300,000 could be received for 2 years beginning next year. Karen is happy to share the proposal with anyone who may be interested. Karen added that it was conceived by Jessica, Lezlee, and Ray Lapuz, and there is much support for the vision. The group should hear April 17 regarding the decision. Chialin thanked Karen for her contribution to assist with the grant application. The group continued to discuss the extent of the technology that will be added to the new FTLCL.

5) ACCJC Midterm Report

- **Seeking feedback**
- **Final draft due October 2023**

Jessica Kaven and Karen Engel presented on behalf of this item. Jessica shared the current draft of the ACCJC Midterm Report with the committee in addition to the feedback form. Jessica added that this will be brought to Academic Senate as well, but the goal is to review the document and provide additional feedback through the lenses of the roles represented by IPC committee members.

Lisa Palmer asked if the expectation was to write concisely, as opposed to longer narrative responses. Jessica confirmed that in 2019, this sentiment was expressed. Karen added that it is a balance between being concise but also complete.

Jessica walked the committee through some of the sections of the document. Karen noted that the campus has a deadline of April 12 to receive feedback/contributions/information/evidence. Karen noted that the hope and goal is to be as complete as possible. Jessica encouraged the committee to consider what information may be missing. Jessica and Karen highlighted sections on Assessment, Teaching and Learning, Enrollment, and Quality Focus. Karen walked the committee through the interpretation of data tables included in the document. Chialin encouraged the group to provide feedback to areas which they oversee or in which they have

experience. Chialin noted that the draft will be brought back to IPC once more in the coming weeks. She noted that this document is created based upon the work completed from the prior SEM, integrated with the EMP.

6) Enrollment Management Operational Plan

- Feedback on Draft of Operational Plan

Chialin Hsieh presented on behalf of this item. Chialin shared the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan with the committee. She noted that many of the strategies and objectives are connected to EMP objectives and strategies. Chialin noted that the SEM's participatory process and the EMP's participatory process are being combined into the Strategic Enrollment Management Operational Plan with very specific strategies for operationalization. The cabinet subcommittee has worked to attain a consensus on this operational plan. Chialin asked that the group provide feedback on the following objectives: 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.3, 4.1: 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 5.2. Chialin encouraged the group to consider that the Instruction and Student Services objectives should be aligned.

The group discussed the following sections:

Strategic Enrollment Management Goals, Objectives & Strategies

The primary objective of Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) is to *maximize the probability* that each student is able to achieve their educational goal(s) at Cañada *within two years*.

Goal 1: Strengthen and publicize clear degree and certificate programs that remove barriers to completion in two years.

Objectives

1.1 Maintain clear, accurate degree and certificate program maps in Program Mapper and align them with changes in Curricunet, the Catalog, and Student Education Plan templates.

Strategies

- 1.1.1 Bank old courses and degrees that we no longer offer to streamline the catalog and clarify pathways.
- 1.1.2 Evaluate high unit local degrees (over 34-degree units) to optimize degree complete-ability in two years.
- 1.1.3 Evaluate the differences between the local degree and AA-T and AS-T degree requirements and consider changes to local degree requirements in order to optimize complete-ability in two years.
- 1.1.4 Identify, address, and publicize hidden prerequisites in program maps, schedules, and/or the course catalog.
- 1.1.5 Publicize classes that are only offered once a year or once every other year in the catalog and make sure the Program Mapper and SEP templates are in alignment with the offering pattern.

Alex suggested that 1.1.2 should read over 34 major units as opposed to 34 degree units. Lisa Palmer added that faculty did an excellent job of getting started on 1.1.1 by clarifying the courses that could be inactivated. Lisa asked who updates the Program Mapper. Alex shared that it is a

combination of Alex, Frank Nguyen Le, and counselors/faculty members. Alex also asked for clarification regarding 1.1.5.

Goal 2: Create and manage a *course schedule* focused on student completion in two years.

Objectives

2.1 Create a Student-First Schedule that leverages various modalities and offering times to reduce scheduling conflicts and create course-taking opportunities for students. (EMP 1.3)

Strategies

- 2.1.1 Create a one-year course schedule (aka an “Annual Schedule”) to aid students’ planning as well as strategically manage course offerings to maximize the likelihood that the student will have access to the classes they need and be able to complete on time.
- 2.1.2 (new) Evaluate and offer 8-week hybrid short courses, mini-mester, or fast-track courses.
- 2.1.3 Effectively plan and implement the use of summers to support student completion. (EMP 1.16)
- 2.1.4 Provide and evaluate a variety of online and face-to-face courses and programs to maximize student completion (e.g., 100% online degree and certificate programs).
- 2.1.5 Evaluation and offer key courses (particularly those with one section per semester) in multiple modalities to leverage online and multi-modal instruction to maximize student access and success. (EMP 4.12)

2.2 (new) Ensure access to instructional technology, training and professional development to support quality of instruction across all modalities.

Strategies

- 2.2.1 Support alignment of online courses to CVC-OEI and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) standards to ensure courses are equitable, engaging, and effective for students.
- 2.2.2 Ensure all faculty, staff, and students have access to the hardware and software technology resources needed to provide instruction in multiple modalities (EMP 4.10).
- 2.2.3 Provide training and ongoing professional development to ensure new technology resources facilitate quality teaching and learning (EMP 4.11).

Goal 3: Align and sustain pro-active student support services with programs of study to ensure effective and timely student enrollment, retention, persistence, and completion.

3.3 Ensure effective and timely academic support in course retention and course success.

Strategies

- 3.3.1 Sustain and align Interest Area Success Teams with Special Programs to provide effective and timely academic support.
- 3.3.2 Develop and sustain processes for Interest Area Success Teams and Special Programs to monitor student progress, including course retention, course success, semester-to-semester persistence, and goal completion.

Goal 4: (revised) Create and sustain an inclusive, antiracist, and equity-minded campus culture (EMP Goal 2)

- 4.1.6 (new) Develop, support, and launch the Faculty Academy of Antiracist, Equity-minded Pedagogy and Classroom Practices that better supports learning outcomes success for disproportionately-impacted student groups, particularly from BIPOC communities (e.g., culturally responsive teaching which includes design, pedagogy, and classroom management).
- 4.1.7 (new) Support underrepresented student participation in program-relevant, experiential, and work-based learning, particularly students from BIPOC communities.
- 4.1.8 (new) Provide opportunities for faculty and Success Teams to critically examine their role in advancing equity-minded teaching and advising practices at the College (e.g., critically examining the role of unconscious bias in the classroom or advising that could affect student aspirations for a particular field and/or program selection).

Candice commended the updated language in Goal 4, appreciating the attempt to broaden the language to be more all-encompassing. Candice asked the committee to consider where the committee is reassessing the campus portfolio of programs to understand what may be missing and how disciplines can continue to be improved.

Goal 5 (new): Innovate and refine degrees and/or certificates to ensure access and achievement, particularly for working, part-time students.

5.2 Identify current course-taking patterns and repackage courses to create new degrees and certificates.

Strategies

- 5.2.1 Evaluate and implement degrees/certificates obtainable within 3 years via evening, weekend and online classes. (EMP 1.2)
- 5.2.2 Develop new Kinesiology, Athletics, & Dance programs and certifications in collaboration with the Community Fitness operations in Building 1 such that students have access to on-site job training and workforce development opportunities that effectively prepare them for health and fitness-related employment in the region. (EMP 1.5)
- 5.2.3 Increase the number of course offerings and support services at the Menlo Park site and/or other off-campus locations (East Palo Alto) to support program completion and help students access needed courses closer to home. (EMP 1.7)

Chialin requested that feedback committee members may have be sent to the IPC Co-Chairs. This item will be brought to IPC at a future meeting for additional review. Lisa suggested a sub-group get together to discuss this as the information is very vast. Lisa Palmer, Jill Sumstad, and Alison Field expressed interest in joining the subgroup. Chialin noted that she will inform the group of deadlines and due dates as they are confirmed.

7) Instructional Program Review Dates, 2023-2024

The group discussed the following proposed dates:

2023-2024 Program Review Schedule Proposed Dates

June 15 – Nuventive/Improve and Data Dashboards open

August Flex Day – Program Review Training open to all

September & October Divisions/Department Meetings – Divisions or departments discuss program reviews at monthly meetings

By October 13 – all Comprehensive Program Reviews, Annual Updates, Goals and Resource Requests DUE

October 18 & 25 – Deans and VPs review and complete feedback for all program review materials at Cabinet meetings.

By October 27 – Supervisors (Deans and VPs) complete their feedback on submitted program reviews

By November 10 – All responses to supervisor feedback are due and final submittals of all program reviews and materials are DUE in Nuventive/Improve

November 14 – President's Office Program Review Peer Review session

November 15 & 16 – PBC Hosts Position Proposal Presentations

November 17 – IPC Peer Review session

November 29 – SSSC Peer Review session – special meeting?

December 7 – Senates Prioritize Position Requests

February Division/Department Meetings – Divisions/departments meet to prioritize non-personnel resource requests

February 7 – Counseling/VPSS Office/Enrollment Services Department Meetings to prioritize non-personnel requests

March 15 – CTE Programs submit Mid-Cycle Reviews

March 15 – IPC Instructional Program Review Presentations

March 20 – PBC receives and certifies non-personnel resource request prioritizations

Jessica noted that this item will return to IPC so the committee can provide their recommendation to the work group based on the proposed dates. Jessica encouraged the committee to bring feedback to the March 17 meeting so the group can finalize this item.

8) Instructional Program Review Feedback

Jessica Kaven presented on behalf of this item. Jessica shared the instructional program review feedback document with the committee. Jessica shared that she compiled the feedback received at the last IPC meeting into this document, specifically into five sections: questions, suggestions, comments/suggestions on questions, data requests, and process comments/reflections in addition to the responsible parties who would address each area: Academic Senate, IPC, Office of Instruction, and PRIE.

Dear Academic Senate, IPC, the Office of Instruction, and PRIE:

Please find IPC's feedback on Instructional Program Review below. There are 5 bulleted areas: questions, suggestions - general, comments/suggestions on the PR questions, data requests, and process and reflections. IPC would appreciate your feedback and responses to the areas that you have been identified as a responsible party. We also understand that program review is faculty purview and will defer to the Academic Senate on all matters.

- Academic Senate
- IPC
- Office of Instruction
- PRIE

- Questions: Responsible parties: **Academic Senate** and **IPC**
 - Next year there are programs that will use the “general” rubric and the one for the Learning Center/Library. Are there any updates to the questions? If so, the rubrics also need to be updated.
 - Next year the first mid-cycle reviews are up. Does IPC provide feedback on them? If so, do we have the questions and the rubric?
 - If a program review is being done by a department that only has adjunct lecturers, who should be assigned to aid the adjunct in completing the form? Should this be an IPC rep, Academic Senate Officer, Dean? Can we assign a “coach” for all adjunct faculty who are completing program review? Perhaps a “buddy” system for all authors would be helpful.
 - How can we increase faculty participation in program review feedback sessions? Want more support across the campus with regard to reviewing program reviews. Can coordinators attend?
 - This process is less advantageous for new programs. It seems like it would be good to not review a program that hasn’t existed for at least 3 years. Can we create a shorter/streamlined form for newer programs?
- Suggestions - General: Responsible Parties: **Academic Senate**, **IPC**, **Office of Instruction**, **PRIE**
 - As part of the program review process, can we require authors to complete the rubric for reviewers as a guide/self-evaluation?
 - Make the rubric a working (i.e. collaborative, like a Google doc.) document
 - Small departments, especially departments that rely heavily on adjuncts, need more training on how to create and provide their information and feedback. Several of the Sections and Standards are vague in their needs or how they overlap, which is confusing the first time a person tries to fill it out and provide info. In the Paralegal review we found that several sections were missing vital info through no fault of the program but instead due to not having enough mentorship or training in the form of Program Review.
 - Writers could use more mentoring when analyzing quantitative data.
 - VPI should be present during the entire program review feedback session, in addition to Academic Senate Officers.
- Comments/Suggestions on questions: Responsibility parties: **Academic Senate**
 - More direction for question #5A: IPC Feedback (“Provide your responses to all recommendations received in your last program review cycle”)

- Maybe more direction to the authors to copy and paste the feedback and provide the responses to all recommendations received from the last review.
 - 7A & 7B seems a bit redundant and obfuscated; what is the difference between the two questions? This needs to be clarified. We “guess” that the difference is:
 - 7A = *What* are the trends?
 - 7B = *Why* are these trends occurring?
 - In this review process, only someone having access to Nuventive could access this section (Last Qsn. #11).....As for question #11 related to goals, we currently do not “check” if any were submitted (it’s part of “step 2” of the process). Do we want to do that or are we okay with just asking question 5B (“provide a summary of the progress you have made on the program goals identified in your last program review”) and assume goals were inputted.
 - Reviewers could not access the program goals in the exported document for question #11 without someone who could log in and access the program in Nuventive.
 - Would like programs to focus on goals. Some didn’t have stated goals and may not set goals again during the current cycle. Missing plans/action plans (how they plan to achieve the goals)
 - Suggested word limits for each question
 - Some were indepth with lots of information, others were minimal in their approach. Can we provide guidelines or gentle suggestions (e.g., suggest 3 goals for 3 years). Can we share examples or best practices?
- Data Requests: Responsible Party: **Academic Senate** and **PRIE**
 - It would benefit writers to have a clearer definition of “access” in the equity sections of program review.
 - Writers could use more mentoring when analyzing quantitative data.
 - Writers would benefit from an exemplary writeup of quantitative data online.
 - Authors still struggled with the data packets. Can we better align them with the questions, especially for those up for comprehensive review?
- Process comments/reflections: **Academic Senate** and **IPC**
 - It was great to have the program lead present during the review process. I was able to put a face to the name
 - Expanding and learning more about SLO/PLO assessment.
 - This process was much more meaningful in a number of ways than last time program review was done. First, the interactive format with colleagues allowed me to answer questions as an author and to have a dialog about what had been written. In the past, program review was a stream of information given in one direction, with colleagues listening to what they most likely had probably already read. The time was much better spent, and I understood comments given by the evaluators better. The second thing that felt more meaningful was having a division meeting in which those who could answer questions were all present, from the VP to IT support. I was able to write my program review ahead of time, then attend this meeting to have questions quickly answered. Those who had not started the process could collaborate with colleagues, so all with different approaches to this process could have their needs met.

- I thought the process was well-organized, and actually a pleasure to participate in (as much as these things can be “pleasurable”)
- IPC: Can reviewers work asynchronously?
- Want more support across the campus with regard to reviewing program reviews. Can coordinators attend?
- We need to think about working outside of the box. Can presentations be part of flex day? Can we have a program improvement/innovation fund to award programs. Let’s reimagine the process!

Motion – To approve the above Instructional Program Review Feedback document for submission to Academic Senate, in addition to eliciting feedback from IPC, PRIE, and the Office of Instruction as appropriate:

M/S: Jessica Kaven, Karen Engel

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

9) Increasing Engagement, Involvement, and Communication in Instructional Program Review

- **Participation from faculty**
 - **Faculty Reassignment**
 - **Faculty serving on committees**
- **Participation college-wide**

Jessica Kaven presented on behalf of this item. She shared that at previous meetings, the committee has discussed how to increase engagement, and two items arose: how to increase engagement from faculty in the instructional program review process and how to increase participation college-wide. From the faculty perspective, it was proposed that faculty who have reassignments/those who serve on committees be expected to attend as part of their roles. In addition, a suggestion was proposed that faculty be able to provide feedback asynchronously. Candice Nance suggested encouraging faculty who will be taking on reassigned roles in the upcoming cycle to attend Instructional Program Review. Susan Mahoney stressed how important this process is and how significant it is to have representation in the process. Candice asked if presentations could be incorporated into Flex Day. Jessica clarified that Academic Senate has tasked IPC with holding the presentations, but that this could potentially be discussed with Academic Senate. David Eck shared that he could discuss this with other parties to see what may be doable. Candice and Susan also proposed holding presentations during campus-wide division meetings. Alison Field proposed describing Program Review as a program showcase. Karen agreed that the group needs to be purposeful in returning to a healthy cycle. The group agreed that morale appears low and that incorporating fun and informative approaches would be appreciated.

10) Reassigned Time Due Dates, 2023-2024

- Agenda item G: Instructional Program Review Feedback (Action)
 - Final feedback on Instructional Program review
 - Review google doc and make comments ([click here](#)).
 - Will discuss and vote to finalize feedback
- Agenda item I: Reassigned Time Due dates, 2023-2024 (Information/Discussion)
 - Proposed dates:
 - November 10th: Faculty Submit Applications
 - November 13th: All applications will be sent to the appropriate dean/VP for review, recommendation, and signature
 - November 17th: Dean Review, provide recommendation, sign, and submit to the Office of Instruction
 - December 1st: IPC Reviews all applications, provides feedback, and votes on recommendations
 - December 4th: VPI and iDeans provide feedback on all applications
 - December 8th: VPI announces outcomes for applications informed by IPC's feedback
 - NEW: Faculty submit all appeals by end of January (for all out-of-cycle applications, appeals are due within 7 days of decision)
 - NEW: March 1: Faculty reassignments are determined. VPI announces faculty for each position and communicates to division deans, division assistants and VPAS
 - NEW: March 10th: VPAS Provides account number to division deans and division assistants
 - NEW: March 15th: Division assistances with approval from division dean submits PAF to Business Office. Deans will work with faculty regarding load and fall class scheduling
 - NEW: Note: Academic Senate and AFT will inform iDeans and VPI on their reassignments as soon as possible

Jessica Kaven shared the above with the committee, asking that the group to begin to consider their feedback, which will be discussed/voted on at a future meeting.

11) IPC Bylaws

- **Faculty co-chair term (increase from 1 year to 2 years)**- this item tabled due to time.

12) Good of the Order

-Program Review Presentations will take place on March 17, 2023.

13) Adjournment

Motion – To adjourn the meeting: M/S: Alex Claxton, Candice Nance

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

a) Meeting adjourned at 11:32 am.