



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES OF February 7, 2025 9:30am-11:30am, Zoom/9-154

Members Present: David Eck, Lisa Palmer, William Tseng, Kiran Malavade, Paul Roscelli, Chialin Hsieh, Mirabel Zarate, Karen Engel, Erik Gaspar, James Carranza

Members Absent: Jose Zelaya, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Lindsey Irizarry

Guests: Hyla Lacefield, Alex Kramer, Alex Claxton, Ameer Thompson, Julie Luu, Gampi Shankar, Mayra Arellano, Gina Hooper

A. Adoption of Agenda –

Motion – To adopt the agenda: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Chialin Hsieh

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

B. Approval of Minutes – December 6, 2024

Motion – To approve minutes of December 6, 2024: M/S: Paul Roscelli, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

C. Reassigned Time- ESL Coordinator Position

The committee addressed the reassignment of the ESL Coordinator position. Since this position is partially funded by a grant and partially by Fund 1, a mix-up occurred regarding its inclusion on the list for IPC to review last meeting. Because the position is partially funded by Fund 1, IPC's review is necessary regarding this portion. The committee reviewed the application content submitted by Professor Aguirre. The conversation also highlighted that 12% of the college's students were ESL students, with nearly 800 enrolled at present. James Carranza emphasized the need for additional coordination, especially given national political developments and the increasing preference for in-person ESL classes. The committee discussed the growing demand for face-to-face instruction due to its effectiveness in language acquisition.

Motion – To support the position of ESL Coordinator: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Chialin Hsieh

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

D. ACCJC Update, Standards 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3

The committee welcomed the first visit from the accreditation ISER writing team, led by Karen Engel and Hyla Lacefield. David Eck explained that the goal is to review nine standards throughout the semester, tackling them in groups of three at a time. Karen Engel introduced the discussion, noting that Hyla Lacefield would focus on Standard 2, which dealt with instruction. Karen emphasized that the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) was being crafted for accreditation purposes and was available on the [college's website for review](#). She encouraged faculty members to contribute their expertise, as strong evidence was crucial to supporting the college's compliance with accreditation requirements. Hyla reiterated the importance of faculty participation, urging them to review the drafts and provide input. The committee then discussed how best to organize the review, considering whether to split into smaller groups or work together. Rather than split up, the group decided to review the sub-standards as a single group, believing that collaborative discussion would generate more valuable insights. They began their review with Standard 2.1.

Hyla discussed Standard 2.1: Academic programs at all locations and in all modes of delivery are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution's mission and reflect appropriate breadth, depth, and expected learning outcomes. (ER 3, ER 9, ER 12)

The Curriculum Committee plays a key role in validating these aspects, and relevant handbook areas and minutes are typically linked as supporting documents. The discussion highlighted the need for additional evidence in certain areas, such as district curriculum initiatives, where contributors like Lisa Palmer were asked to provide relevant materials. Karen Engel facilitated access to review criteria, and team members worked collaboratively on the document, suggesting edits and adding comments. Some participants opted to review and contribute asynchronously for personal preference and efficiency. Hyla also mentioned continued plans to reach out to individuals for targeted input.

Karen Engel discussed Standard 2.2: The institution, relying on faculty and other appropriate stakeholders, designs and delivers academic programs that reflect relevant discipline and industry standards and support equitable attainment of learning outcomes and achievement of educational goals. (ER 3, ER 9, ER 11, ER 14)

Karen highlighted feedback outlining the process for curriculum design, emphasizing faculty oversight, program monitoring, and revisions to address gaps in student achievement. The discussion also touched on the importance of equity considerations in program reviews and the need for documented evidence of efforts to address disparities. Karen highlighted the role of student learning outcomes (SLOs) and program learning outcomes (PLOs) in shaping curriculum revisions, particularly through industry feedback. The group discussed leveraging AI to extract evidence from program review documents to assess equity gaps. Faculty members were encouraged to document their discussions and strategies for closing these gaps, ensuring that data was meaningfully disaggregated. The committee also stressed the importance of advisory board meetings in aligning programs with regional and industry needs. Moving forward, efforts were planned to improve documentation, enhance faculty understanding of evidence requirements, and incorporate regional support organizations in program development.

Karen and Hyla discussed Standard 2.3: All degree programs include a general education framework to ensure the development of broad knowledge, skills, and competencies related to communication, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, information literacy, civic responsibility, and the ability to engage with diverse perspectives. (ER 12)

Karen reviewed criteria for general education (GE), emphasizing the importance of faculty input in determining which courses qualify and ensuring that GE offerings provide meaningful student engagement. Hyla discussed the relevance of curriculum documentation and ensuring that cited evidence specifically supports GE determinations. The discussion also touched on changes related to CalGETC, which would affect GE degree structures. It was noted that further revisions would be needed with input from the Curriculum Committee. Lisa was identified as a key contact for assisting in refining the draft before presenting it for further review. The group acknowledged the complexity of this process and the need for continued collaboration.

E. Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) Work Group

1. Follow-up on November 1, 2024 IPC discussion of ILO assessment. In the meeting, there was discussion about the need to study discrepancies with ACCJC Standards (2.3) and evaluate current ILO assessment methods.
2. Proposed action: recommend the creation of a work group. Proposed membership of the workgroup: at least one member from Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, Student Services, and VPI will be encouraged. Aim of work group would be to review if changes are needed, but not to change the ILOs.

The Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) Work Group is being established to address discrepancies in the current ILO framework. The group will aim to explore potential updates and present recommendations for changes. Four representatives were initially sought from Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, Student Services, and Instruction. The group planned to consult with additional stakeholders as needed.

Motion – To approve the ILO Work Group membership of Lisa Palmer (Curriculum Committee), Paul Roscelli (Assessment Coordinator, Academic Senate), Chialin Hsieh (Instruction), Mayra Arellano (Student Services) and Karen Engel (PRIE): M/S: David Eck, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

F. Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEM) Update

1. 2.1.2: Evaluate and offer hybrid short-term and late-start courses (e.g., mini-mester)-Alex Claxton and James Carranza
2. 2.1.4: Continue to assess our course offerings to determine the feasibility of online degrees and certificates-Chialin Hsieh
3. 2.1.6: Offer key courses (e.g., popular, commonly needed General Education courses) in multiple instructional modalities-Chialin Hsieh
4. 5.1.2: Scale the Promise Scholars Program for part-time students- Mayra Arellano
5. 5.2.3: Utilize the Program Improvement and Viability (PIV) process to assist in the revitalization of instructional programs.

James Carranza and Alex Claxton presented on behalf of 2.1.2. James shared the following slides:

The MiniMester Experience!:

8-Week Late Start Session

Fall 2023-SPRING 2025 HSS Pilot

When *Boring* is Good!

- ▶ *Predictable* 2nd course taking opportunity in a single semester
- ▶ *Consistent* start dates, 2nd 8-week session
 - ▶ Late registration, drop date, Withdrawal date
 - ▶ Quarter System Dates
- ▶ Hybrid courses
 - ▶ 50%/50% (in-person/online), 25%/75%
 - ▶ 50%/50% Example: 8 Weeks, TR, 16 class sessions, 50% Online
 - ▶ 25%/75% Example: 8 Weeks, T, 8 class sessions, 75% Online

Late Start, 8-Week Session SPRING 2025

DATE	COURSE		MODALITY	CAP	#
03/20/25	ART	102	OLH online	35	35
03/16/25	COMM	130	OMH online	35	34
03/18/25	ENGL	100	HAA TR 9:45	26	26
03/20/25	ENGL	100	OSH online	26	26
03/20/25	ENGL	110	OSH online	26	26
03/20/25	ENGL	110	OTH online	26	26
03/19/25	ENGL	110	HAA MW 11:10	26	26
03/20/25	ENGL	110	HAB R 6:10 PM	30	10
03/18/25	ESL	836	HAA TR 11:10	35	34
03/19/25	ESL	837	HLA MW 5:00 PM	35	35
03/18/25	HIST	245	HAX TR 12:45	38	35
03/18/25	MUS.	100	HLA T 6:10 PM	35	20
03/19/25	PSYC	100	HAB MW 12:45	38	38

Late Start, 8-Week Session Data Basics, Like to Like

Success: 64%

Control: 66%

Retention: 85%

Control: 85%

Course	Modality
ANTH-125	ONLINE
ART-102	ONLINE
COMM-130	ONLINE
ECE.-313	ONLINE
ENGL-100	ONLINE
ENGL-110	ONLINE
ESL-921	FACE TO FACE
KINE-109	ONLINE
PSYC-100	SYNCHRONOUS
PSYC-200	ONLINE

HSS, By the Numbers . . .

Fall 2022 Reg to Start: 3,252	96.8%
Start to census: +108 enrollments	3.2%
At census: +37	1.1%
Total sections, Fall 2023:	190
Withdrawal rate (avg 5 years):	15%
Retention rate:	85%
Success rate:	70%

James shared that the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan focused on piloting eight-week late-start classes to enhance student access and completion rates. Initially launched in Fall 2023, the initiative targeted students who registered late, dropped courses, or needed additional credits for financial aid and degree completion. The pilot involved a mix of online, in-person, and hybrid courses across various disciplines. Preliminary data indicated that these condensed courses had comparable success and retention rates to full-semester classes, demonstrating that they did not negatively impact student outcomes. While enrollments remained strong at around 85-90% capacity, concerns arose regarding faculty assignments and whether these short courses limited traditional course offerings. Discussions continued on refining the scheduling model, with considerations for expanding or restructuring the mini-mester format to better serve the college's unique enrollment patterns and faculty resources.

Chialin Hsieh spoke to 2.1.4 and 2.1.6, with Deans and responsible parties advised to contribute relevant information to the working document before its submission to PBC. A key action step involved assessing course offerings for the feasibility of online degrees and certificates, with approximately 70% of the work completed. An analysis of 27 ADTs using a dashboard created by Karen and Alex revealed that two ADTs lacked necessary course offerings, preventing students from completing them within two years. In response, Deans collaborated with sister colleges to develop a plan for course rotation to avoid cancellations. The analysis confirmed that 14 ADTs could be fully completed online.

The dashboard played a crucial role in evaluating course offerings and scheduling decisions, with ongoing refinements based on Dean feedback. A district-supported survey was also available for students to provide input. The team continuously assessed the feasibility of offering ADTs online while balancing student demand and minimizing course cancellations. Maintaining course availability and collaborating with sister colleges will be crucial.

Focusing on 2.1.6, the discussion highlighted instructional modality diversity, ensuring students had multiple options for completing courses. Fill rates were monitored, with an increase from 70% to 75%, aiming for 80%. The scheduling process incorporated counselor and program supervisor feedback. Additionally, it was suggested that faculty be informed about how fill rates impact course offerings to encourage more add codes.

Mayra Arellano discussed 5.1.2. She discussed her role in supporting the expansion of the Promise Scholars program for part-time students. She explained that the program was piloted three years ago to accommodate the

many part-time students at the college. While the full-time Promise program was well known, the part-time program aimed to include students taking fewer than 12 units. In Spring 2025, the program had 80 part-time students, though the goal was to reach 100. A significant challenge was that many part-time students had not completed the required financial aid application, which prevented them from joining the program. To address this, the team conducted outreach efforts, including evening and weekend counseling, workshops, and financial aid assistance. Students who participated in workshops received a \$50 incentive. Despite these efforts, some students still did not complete their financial aid applications, even after being contacted directly.

Mayra also highlighted the need for continued collaboration with financial aid services and other campus programs to support part-time students, particularly those attending evening and weekend classes. She emphasized the importance of monitoring students' academic progress, as they were required to complete a certificate or associate's degree within three years, necessitating continuous enrollment and passing grades. Staffing limitations posed another challenge, as the program's expansion was hindered by the lack of a full-time tenure-track counselor. Although the program underwent a review to document its growth and challenges, additional resources were needed to scale up its support for part-time students. Despite these obstacles, Mayra remained committed to increasing enrollment and enhancing services for part-time students.

Ameer Thompson discussed 5.2.3. He provided an update on the Program Improvement and Viability (PIV) process, specifically focusing on its pilot implementation with the Funeral Service Education program. He kept the discussion brief, noting that the process was still ongoing and more details would be available upon its completion. The initiative aimed to revitalize instructional programs in alignment with goal 5.2.3. Meetings began in the fall and continued into the spring, with a scheduled presentation to IPC on February 21. One major challenge encountered was the original 90-working-day timeline, which proved insufficient to complete the process and conduct necessary presentations. As a result, an extension was requested and granted by the Academic Senate, pushing the deadline to the end of the spring semester.

G. Feedback on Instructional Program Review Process

- Soliciting feedback from IPC members (and any guests) that we weren't able to do in our December IPC meeting.

IPC members were invited to share feedback on areas of strength or improvement. Karen Engel provided an update on the PBC Program Review Subcommittee, stating that they planned to review feedback from a survey that received about 15 responses. Their goal was to implement any necessary changes before spring break. Additionally, it was noted that previous feedback suggested a preference for moving the review timeline to a later week, allowing more time for committee work. Diana Tedone-Goldstone had also received positive feedback on the new review structure, with many members favoring it over the previous format. Since no negative feedback was received, the suggestion was made to maintain the current structure for the next fall program review. The structure involved pre-assigned groups reviewing materials ahead of time, completing individual scoring before group discussions, which streamlined the process.

H. Curriculum Report

To: IPC

From: Lisa Palmer, Curriculum Committee Chair

Re: Curriculum Committee Report

Date: February 7, 2025

Welcome to our new articulation officer, Trang Luong, who comes from CSM and has already jumped in with both feet to ensure that we're meeting state mandates such as ABs 928 (Associate Degrees for Transfer) and 1111 (Common Course Numbering) as well as taking care of all of our regular articulation issues.

At the CC meeting yesterday, we discussed and approved Funeral Service Education (FSE) catalog language changes, pre-vetted by the FSE faculty and program director, so that even as FSE continues to undergo the PIV process, we're conveying accurate information to students and not running afoul of Ed Code or the American Board of Funeral Service Education (ABFSE) regulations.

I am Cañada's new CCN (Common Course Numbering) coordinator, working with colleagues at CSM and SKY to ensure that our district creates and sustains an effective process for implementing CCN revisions. We had our first meeting last week, during which we assessed lessons learned last semester and plans for creating a backwards timeline to comply with Phase II, the templates for which we're expecting any day, and then for Phase III, F 25/SP 26.

Faculty who work on CCN updates are eligible for up to 3 hours of pay, at the special rate, for each COR they modify. This is retroactive to F 24, as well. Time sheets should be sent to the office of the VPI.

Curriculum on the review cycle continues to come in; please remember to check the curriculum review cycle to ensure that any courses up for review this academic term are reviewed and updated as necessary.

I will be terming out of the chair position at the end of the semester so will be sending out a request for nominations for faculty interested in becoming the next curriculum chair. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Additional points were raised by Chialin regarding updates to the funeral services program catalog. It was noted that counselors would communicate these updates to students to ensure they were aware of the language changes in the program description. Counselors also had productive discussions within the Curriculum Committee about how to provide students with the most accurate information. Chialin also added information regarding the implementation of common course numbering. Faculty working on this in the fall faced challenges, but the three colleges' Vice Presidents of Instruction (VPIs) collaborated to ensure consistency in faculty support, as each college had received a grant for this initiative. The decision to coordinate efforts across all three institutions was agreed upon by the VPIs.

I. IPC's Role in the Program Improvement and Viability Process

- Cañada's [Program Improvement and Viability Process](#)
- Familiarizing ourselves with IPC's role in the PIV process, since the Funeral Services PIV committee will be coming to IPC on February 21.

David Eck emphasized the importance of the committee familiarizing themselves with the Program Improvement and Viability (PIV) process. The process requires multiple steps, beginning with the PIV

Committee drafting a recommendation, which would first be introduced to IPC, followed by a second meeting for feedback. This feedback would then be incorporated into the Academic Senate's review before progressing through further institutional approvals (PBC and college president) ultimately reaching the Board of Trustees. Members were encouraged to review the PIV website, which housed agendas, public comments, and prior discussions, to stay informed. Additionally, past materials, including presentations and meeting minutes shared with the Board over the summer, were highlighted as key resources. The importance of IPC's role in providing informed feedback at each stage was stressed, and members were urged to review all relevant documents in preparation for upcoming discussions. The final committee report was expected to be on the agenda soon, depending on the pace of the committee's progress.

J. Reassigned Time Accountability and Reporting Framework

1. Feedback from faculty and administrators on possible improvements for reassigned time positions.
2. Starting conversation based on the feedback that has been shared thus far.

A discussion took place regarding reassigned time, accountability, and the reporting framework. Chialin Hsieh shared that faculty and administrators had provided feedback on potential improvements for reassigned time positions, emphasizing the importance of documenting and celebrating the outcomes of these roles. It was noted that while the reassigned time process at our college was transparent and well-structured compared to other institutions, there was a gap in showcasing faculty accomplishments. Given the significant investment in reassigned time—\$1.9 million annually, with 50% from Fund 1, 30% from grants, and 20% allocated to Academic Senate and AFT (still Fund 1)—ensuring visibility for faculty contributions was deemed important. A proposal was made to form a small workgroup to brainstorm solutions. Lisa Palmer, Paul Roscelli, and Erik Gaspar volunteered to join. Additionally, there was interest in comparing funding and resource allocation for reassigned positions at other institutions, particularly Skyline and CSM, to determine whether our college was underfunded or overfunded in this area.

K. Program Review Questions Work Group update

David Eck reminded the committee that Academic Senate formed a work group regarding program review questions. These questions were last updated in spring of 2020 for the following academic year, and the workgroup, including David, Kiran, Lisa, and Gampi Shankar, developed an initial draft for the latest revision. Their next step was to ensure the questions would yield useful data. The revisions aimed to maintain the integrity of past deliberations while incorporating an equity lens. Changes included refining the order of questions and removing redundancy.

It was additionally discussed that IPC needed a representative on PBC. David asked the committee to consider representing the group. Erik and Lisa expressed potential interest and would confirm with David and Gampi.

L. Important Dates:

March 21st Instructional Program Review Presentations

M. Adjournment

Motion – To adjourn the meeting: M/S: Lisa Palmer, Paul Roscelli

Discussion – no additional

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously, meeting adjourned at 11:18am