



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES OF

March 21, 2025

9:00 am-11:30 am, Zoom/9-154

Members Present: David Eck, Lisa Palmer, Kiran Malavade, Paul Roscelli, Chialin Hsieh, Jose Zelaya, Lindsey Irizarry, James Carranza, Nicolette Gualino, Erik Gaspar, Julie Luu, William Tseng, Maribel Zarate

Members Absent: Karen Engel, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau

Guests: Alex Claxton, Anniqua Rana, David Gainey, Jaleh Naasz, Gampi Shankar, Ameer Thompson, Emanuela Quaglia, Kim Lopez, Susan Mahoney, Doug Hirzel, Elsa Torres, Nada Nekrep, Ludmila Prisecar, Hyla Lacefield, Jasmine Jaciw, Megan Rodriguez Antone, Frank Nguyen Le, Ramki Kalyanaraman Gina Hooper, Hyla Lacefield, Ameer Thompson, Doug Hirzel, Jason Wendt, Mayra Arellano, Gampi Shankar

A. Adoption of Agenda –

Motion – To adopt the agenda. M/S: Lisa Palmer, Paul Roscelli

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

B. Approval of Minutes – March 7, 2025

Motion – To approve minutes of March 7, 2025: M/S: Chialin Hsieh, Paul Roscelli

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

C. Funeral Services Program Improvement and Viability (PIV) - IPC Feedback

- a. IPC will provide its feedback on the [Funeral Service Education Program Improvement and Viability Task Force Report](#)
- b. Once IPC's feedback on the report is officially adopted, then it will be forwarded to Academic Senate for consideration along with the original Task Force report.

David Eck shared the feedback that was received by IPC members on the Program Improvement Viability report for Funeral Services. Committee members submitted comments on the document prior to the meeting, and questions or areas of confusion were summarized for further discussion. Initially, the discussion centered around the viability and implications of offering different types of certificates, particularly the certificate of specialization versus the certificate of achievement. It was clarified that certificates of specialization are local, not recognized by the State Chancellor's Office, not eligible for financial aid (but are eligible for SB 893 tuition waiver for county residents), and cannot be listed on transcripts, while certificates of achievement are significantly more rigorous to establish but offer those benefits. Lisa Palmer questioned that given the complexity and requirements, pursuing a certificate of achievement might not be advisable, though it could provide advantages to students. David Eck acknowledged that while it would be difficult, it might still be

worthwhile depending on feasibility and outcomes. Karen Engel's written feedback in the document was noted, specifically that there is no formal requirement for students to obtain a certificate in order to be hired in the field, and most students were enrolled for AS degree programs rather than certificates. Concerns were raised about the low job security and high mobility in funeral service careers, particularly for embalmers. It was mentioned that some programs exist with only certificates of specialization, though they are rare. Around 55% of students in these courses are primarily pursuing AS degrees, and it remained unclear whether students would be interested in certificates alone. Finally, the question of whether certificates of specialization lead to better job prospects or wages was deemed uncertain due to a lack of data, with only anecdotal employer feedback suggesting potential hiring benefits.

Erik Gaspar raised a question about student enrollment figures, which was addressed by referencing the enrollment history report. It was noted that funeral service courses averaged around 20 to 21 students per section, aligning with other CTE programs. David explained how the feedback had been categorized—grouped by future recommendations for the discipline, general comments, and feedback on the process or new program development. Among the key suggestions were (1) discontinuing the associate degree, (2) discontinuing certificates of specialization, and (3) exploring alternative pathways. There was a clarification that “explore” is not considered a direct recommendation but can still be included as general feedback. Discussion followed on whether to list combined options, such as recommendations one and two together, and whether to include a third general suggestion. The group then reviewed general comments related to the discipline, with some members agreeing to exclude a comment about funeral parlors being family-run, viewing it as anecdotal and lacking relevance compared to data-driven insights. There was consensus that such anecdotal content should be omitted to maintain a data-focused approach.

The council discussed feedback regarding a task force's process, offering both praise and suggestions for improvement. Comments highlighted the importance of gathering feedback and ensuring strong college support for new program development. Lisa Palmer noted that while she agreed with ensuring support, the situation stemmed largely from changes in accreditation standards, which were not anticipated. Doug Hirzel and others emphasized that even if accreditation standards were a major factor, the lack of institutional support for the new program also contributed to its challenges, including a rough launch. A clarification followed, distinguishing between college expectations and accreditation requirements. Ultimately, the group agreed that clearer commitments—such as length and level of college support—are needed for future program sustainability. Karen Engel, who was unable to attend, expressed via email opposition to continuing the certificates or degree based on labor market data and accreditation concerns.

Gampi Shankar, although not a member of IPC, asked for clarification on the specific recommendations that had just been approved. It was confirmed that all of the content in the shared Google Doc had been forwarded without conflict. The approved recommendations included discontinuing both the Funeral Services degree and the certificates of specialization, as well as exploring alternative pathways. It was emphasized that these actions were not presented as either/or options, but rather as a collective set of recommendations to be pursued together.

After reviewing all comments and proposed edits, the council voted to approve the feedback document as the official response, with a few abstentions noted.

Motion – To submit the following document regarding the PIV Process for Funeral Services as the official feedback from IPC to Academic Senate: [IPC Feedback on the Funeral Services Education Program Improvement and Viability Task Force Report](#) M/S: Chialin Hsieh, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – no additional

Abstentions – 2 members abstained

Approval – approved by majority

D. Program Review Presentations

The following programs presented their six-year program review presentations to IPC:

*Note, due to size limitations within this document and the large file sizes of the presentations, presentations are available online at <https://canadacollege.edu/ipc/current-meetings.php>. To review/download copies, please reference the IPC website, 2024/2025 Academic Year Meetings and the 'Materials' section of the 3/21/25 meeting for all presentations.

If viewing minutes post-AY 24/25, please reference presentations here: <https://canadacollege.edu/ipc/past-meetings-members.php>, select Fall 2024-Spring 2025, and review the 'Materials' section of the 3/21/25 meeting.

1. Fashion Design

- a. Presenter: Jaleh Naasz

2. Distance Education

- a. Presenters: Nada Nekrep and Lindsey Irizarry

3. Interior Design

- a. Presenter: Elsa Torres

4. College for Working Adults- note, due to the presenter experiencing technical difficulties, the CWA presentation will take place at a later date.

- a. Presenter: Jose Zelaya

5. Earth Science

- a. Presenter: Susan Mahoney

6. Digital Art and Animation

- a. Presenters: Emanuela Quaglia and Hyla Lacefield

Presenters were applauded for their hard work and thorough presentations, and programs were celebrated by those in attendance.

E. Important Dates:

- a. Our next meeting is scheduled for April 18 since the first Friday in April is during Spring Break.

F. Adjournment

Motion – To adjourn the meeting: M/S: David Eck, Chialin Hsieh

Discussion – no additional

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously, meeting adjourned at 11:33am