

TLC Minutes

April 28, 2020 – ConferZoom online meeting

Dan Reade and Starlene Justice chaired the meeting

Present: Glen Graham (BEIT); Dr. Margarita Shirinian (COMM); Ken Hays (COMM); Dr. Sarah Burnett (SBS); Dr. Jody Tyler (Sci & Kin); Dr. Stephany Kyriakos (SBS); Maria Adams (SBS); Dr. Parissa Clark (SBS); Dr. Dominique Hitchcock (AHWL); Patty Worsham (BEIT)

Visitor: Dr. Gustavo Ocegvera (Dean of Student Equity)

Absent: Dr. Quinton Bemiller (AHWL); Mitzi Sloniger (COM)

- I. Motion to Approve Agenda
 - a. Move: Kyriakos/Second: Burnett
 - b. Approved unanimously.
- II. Motion to Consider the Minutes
 - a. Move: Graham/Second: Kyriakos
 - b. Approved with one abstention.
- III. Meeting Dates
 - a. Justice confirmed for the committee that TLC meetings will be held the 4th Tuesday of the month.
- IV. Review of first Brown Bag event “Restorative Practices,” presented by Dr. Parissa Clark.
 - a. Agreement within committee that it was a good event. Reade thanked Dr. Clark for her participation and fine presentation. Several members offered positive remarks.
 - b. Justice informed the committee that, though approval was delayed, the event did earn FLEX credit for all attendees.
- V. Brown Bags via tele-conferencing & Areas of training that stand out given current circumstances
 - a. Robust and productive discussion about potential topics. “Accessibility in online learning” was considered as a topic, but committee members felt that with the current push from administration, there will be plenty of Accessibility training over the next week or so.
 - b. Topics that gained excellent traction:
 - i. Sharing positive success stories (how to do things better).
 - ii. Strategies for maintaining mental health (Faculty can share what they do to stay focused, positive, and balanced).

- iii. A “Did you know?” session about tips, tricks, and hacks for online learning. (Ideas put forth included Flipgrid, discussion boards, grading, making online instruction more engaging, preventing cheating, and so on).
 - iv. Burnett suggested a joint effort between TLC and the Distance Education Committee with the witty title of “DE with a little TLC.”
 - v. One committee member summed up the discussion wryly: “How can we do a good job without dying?”
 - c. Additional conversation sprang from this discussion about the mental and physical fatigue of this emergency switch to an online platform. While most faculty have experienced an increased workload, some (especially in the sciences and CTE) are struggling with a nearly unmanageable one. Deep concern was expressed about additional demands from administration. Does administration truly understand the already-present pressures? Do they recognize that additional demands take time and energy away from instruction—which is already suffering?
 - d. A suggestion was brought forth about composing a letter to administration to apprise them/remind them of what faculty are really going through.
 - e. Dr. Ocegüera suggested letting administration know what faculty need and how administration can best support them.
 - f. Hays offered the reminder that not only are faculty fatigued, but so are students—and Zoom sessions should be kept to 30-50 mins, tops. Thus, even if using a “traditional” lecture format via Zoom, other ways of providing instruction must still be offered. All of this takes enormous amounts of time.
 - g. A question was brought forth: “Why isn’t accessibility training part of the initial Canvas training program?” Since faculty are required to be compliant in this area, maybe it should be built into basic Canvas training.
 - h. Graham suggested the possibility of special dispensation for “underemployed” adjuncts (not those already receiving their maximum hours) to take on some of the work of course-building and accessibility for this online environment.
- VI. Faculty Ethics Statement
 - a. Reade and Burnett provided some of the background information relevant to the discussion, including the request from Academic Senate and the proposed timeline.
 - b. Overwhelming feeling from committee members that they would like more time to peruse and think about the document, and that this is unlikely to happen at this time.
 - c. Initial concerns raised include:
 - i. Why is this document necessary?
 - ii. What is it used for? (Can faculty be certain it will not be used against them in I of I evaluations?)
 - iii. Discussions with the union might be appropriate.
 - iv. Language is uncertain, redundant, unclear, or inappropriate in some places. (It needs to be “categorically vetted”).

- d. Committee decided to vote to table the discussion of the Ethics Statement until the Fall semester.
 - e. Motion to table Ethics Statement: Kyriakos/Second: Graham
 - f. Committee voted via Yes/No in Zoom. Motion approved by a vote 12-0.
- VII. Good of the order
- VIII. Meeting adjourned at 1:57 P.M.