



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES OF October 3, 2025 9:30 am-11:30 am, Zoom/9-154

Members Present: David Eck, Chialin Hsieh, Erik Gaspar, Karen Engel, Alex Claxton, Jinmei Lun, Allison Hughes, William Tseng, Marco Raymundo, Adriana Lugo, Kiran Malavade, Lindsey Irizarry, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Lisa Palmer

Members Absent: Jose Zelaya, Paul Roscelli

Guests: Ameer Thompson, Alex Kramer, Nada Nekrep, Michiko Kealoha, Gampi Shankar, Ellen Young, Doniella Maher

A. Adoption of Agenda –

Motion – To adopt the agenda. M/S: Alex Claxton, Chialin Hsieh

Discussion – It was announced that the November 7 meeting would be canceled, and while the October 31 meeting remained tentative, there were enough responses to potentially proceed with it. Committee members were informed that the November 7 meeting would be removed from calendars. As the agenda for the current meeting was reviewed, attendees were invited to request changes in order or removal of items. Kiran Malavade requested to move item D- SEAP Review of Draft Plan, up in the schedule to accommodate Michiko Kealoha, who had to leave early for another meeting she was leading. The group agreed to move this item up in the agenda, after the approval of minutes.

Abstentions – William Tseng

Approval – approved

B. Approval of Minutes – September 19, 2025

Motion – To approve minutes of September 19, 2025: M/S: Alex Claxton, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Lisa Palmer (not present at the 9/19 meeting)

Approval – approved

C. Student Equity and Achievement Plan (SEAP) - Review of Draft Plan

- Cañada College is developing its new three-year SEAP plan (2025-2028).
- This agenda item is an opportunity for IPC to provide feedback on the [draft Student Equity and Achievement Plan 2025-2028](#).

Kiran Malavade and Michiko Kealoha presented a draft of the Student Equity and Achievement Plan (SEAP), inviting feedback from the group. They reminded the group that the SEAP is a state-funded, three-year initiative

aimed at addressing equity gaps among disproportionately impacted student populations through six metrics. They reviewed several action items under each metric, including efforts to increase outreach to underrepresented groups, support students in completing Math and English within one year, enhance persistence through early alert systems and campus employment, and improve completion and transfer rates with targeted interventions. A new metric focused on students completing comprehensive education plans was also discussed. Attendees were encouraged to use the meeting time to review the live draft and leave comments. Lisa Palmer raised a suggestion to include support for the COLTS Learning Community in the plan, noting its alignment with equity goals and the need for institutional accountability, even in the absence of funding. Kiran and Michiko acknowledged the funding challenges but agreed that including COLTS in the plan was important for long-term visibility and potential future support. The committee was in agreement to add this suggestion to the document and invited Lisa to provide suggested language. Erik Gaspar was appreciative of this inclusion.

Additional suggestions were made to strengthen the document. Doniella Maher suggested to include the Umoja program, highlighting that even if it had alternate funding, its omission from the plan created a noticeable gap. Kiran proposed including Umoja under a broader action item supporting current and emerging learning communities, aligning with earlier suggestions about incorporating the COLTS program. Rebekah Sidman-Taveau praised the clarity and focus of the plan despite funding limitations. The group discussed the importance of action items specifically connecting with disproportionately impacted populations. Kiran offered a reminder that the document remained open for feedback, and asked for all comments to be submitted by October 16 so the team could finalize the draft before submitting it to the board in early November.

D. Faculty Teaching and Learning Center – Highlights

- a. Highlights from the ongoing workshops, resources, and website that our Faculty Teaching and Learning Co-Coordinator have been working on.

The Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC) coordinators provided a comprehensive update on recent projects and ongoing initiatives. They began by explaining that their work from the previous semester, including a [major website revamp](#), was largely completed but would remain an ongoing effort. The revamped website aimed to improve accessibility and organization, modeled in part after sites from Skyline College and Stanford University. A key improvement was moving a previously hard-to-find teaching resource repository from Canvas to SharePoint and integrating it with the main FTLC site. This consolidation also included merging numerous separate teaching-related sites into one central hub, where faculty could now access a comprehensive calendar, past session recordings, and resources like the equitable syllabus guide.

Allison Hughes highlighted the contributions of team members and emphasized that the platform remains open for continued input and development. The coordinators also showcased a new calendar widget featuring upcoming teaching sessions—many focused on AI—and other department events. They shared that a faculty survey was being circulated to gather input on preferred session formats and topics, although response rates were still low. In addition, they described the successful rollout of the new faculty orientation, which included a newly developed handbook and live Q&A sessions to address practical issues like WebSmart and Canvas usage. The session also served as an opportunity for community building. They planned to hold a follow-up orientation in January with more campus engagement and information on student services. A peer mentorship program was also launched, with full-time faculty already matched and efforts underway for part-time hires.

Karen Engel acknowledged the team's work, noting that it was being documented as evidence for the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER). Finally, it was mentioned that WebSMART would soon change its faculty services interface, including the grade submission process. Faculty were advised to attend upcoming trainings to prepare for the new system. Rebekah Sidman-Taveau brought up the Coordinator Handbook, which had been initiated about a year or two ago. The project had been on the back burner but was recently revived. The team had started compiling completed resources and was considering turning the handbook into a dynamic, web-based document rather than a static PDF, to accommodate ongoing updates. Rebekah also noted that some

existing resources, like those on field trips and marketing support for faculty, had already been developed by contributors.

The committee expressed appreciation for the evolution of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center since its inception by Lezlee Ware and Jessica Kaven in 2022. What began as a small initiative had grown significantly, offering valuable and substantive support for faculty. The group discussed the need for institutionalizing many of the center's initiatives, especially in light of the end of AB1705 funding and uncertainties around FLP funds. The team was now focusing on how to integrate and sustain these programs long-term, potentially by aligning with existing services and groups. Lastly, Kiran suggested better integration of EAPC professional development resources directly within the FTLC site rather than keeping them separate. The group thanked all the contributors for their efforts.

E. Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Survey Results

- Review of annual survey results given to graduating students that asks them to rate their achievement of our Institutional Learning Outcomes.
- [Institutional Learning Outcomes \(ILO\) Survey Results](#)

Karen Engel presented the annual Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) survey results, beginning with a recap of the five aspirational ILOs at Cañada College: critical thinking, creativity, communication, community, and quantitative reasoning. The 2024 survey had a 39% response rate—a 9-point improvement from the previous year—with respondents skewing slightly older, more female, more Latinx, and primarily degree-seeking rather than certificate earners. Karen reviewed and summarized the data slides linked above with the group.

After reviewing the data, Karen highlighted open-ended student feedback, which consistently pointed to common challenges such as balancing work, family, and school, language barriers, and institutional/academic obstacles. Positive experiences often focused on impactful relationships with faculty, counselors, and mentors, with students reporting growth in confidence and resilience. Karen encouraged everyone to read these reflections, calling them both moving and insightful.

Rebekah Sidman-Taveau raised a concern that while students may possess the skills being assessed, the academic language used in the survey might be unfamiliar or unclear—particularly for multilingual students. She suggested including clickable examples to clarify terms, especially for outcomes related to math, such as “representing complex data,” which students might interpret too narrowly. Karen supported the idea and proposed forming a small, faculty-led group to explore alternative phrasing or explanatory examples.

Chialin Hsieh agreed with Rebekah's suggestion. Chialin also wished to highlight a specific slide showing student growth in confidence expressing ideas orally and in writing. This outcome had improved steadily over three years—from 75% agreement to 90%—and was celebrated as a notable success. Kiran Malavade volunteered to join a future working group to help revise the language and suggested possibly involving STEM and math faculty to ensure accurate and accessible explanations. Rebekah mentioned potentially adding the item to the Academic Senate agenda to broaden faculty involvement. The committee thanked Karen for the presentation and acknowledged the work of student assistant, Nheeda Enriquez, for her efforts.

F. Reassigned Time Budget Update

- Annual update on the budget for reassigned time positions.
- [Reassigned Time Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 FTEF and Expense](#)

Chialin Hsieh presented an update on the reassigned time budget, an annual practice shared with IPC to review reassigned full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) hours and budget estimates for fall of 2025 and spring of 2026. She explained that while IPC governs reassigned time for college and department positions, Academic Senate and grant-funded positions follow different processes, although grant-funded time is still reported to IPC for informational purposes. Chialin noted changes in the proportion of reassigned time by position type and acknowledged the valuable feedback from IPC members in shaping the reassigned time process. Specific numbers can be viewed in the link above. Chialin shared that she would confirm the faculty salary schedules that are posted online by HR to ensure accuracy.

G. Reassigned Time Position Application Form

- Review of [draft application form](#) that will be used for individuals applying to renew a position or create new reassigned time positions. (This form concerns the positions themselves, not individuals seeking to fill the positions.)
- Opportunity to provide feedback on the layout of the application form.
- Discussion of Appendix D duties and how this impacts what responsibilities can be part of reassigned time.

The group reviewed a draft version of the reassigned time position application form, which was shared both as a Google Doc and a PDF for easier reference. David Eck explained that the form was largely similar to last year's and included added details to clarify the application process, particularly distinguishing between applying to create or renew a position versus applying as an individual for a position. He highlighted a new section breaking down funding sources—general college funds versus grant funds—to guide applicants and IPC's role in reviewing and making recommendations based on funding. Members were encouraged to provide feedback, especially those with prior application experience. The discussion also addressed how IPC can offer nuanced feedback rather than just approve or deny applications, including comments to contextualize their decisions. Additionally, David emphasized clarifying the duties list, cautioning applicants against listing duties already covered as part of full-time faculty roles. Examples and narratives were added to help applicants distinguish reassigned duties from regular faculty responsibilities. David shared that he hoped these changes would reduce confusion and streamline deliberations on applications.

Chialin Hsieh stressed the importance of strictly following the AFT contract and audit procedures related to reassigned time, emphasizing that annual audits required full compliance to avoid issues. The application process for reassigned time had been reviewed and updated, including removing confusing examples from the form to make it clearer for applicants. There was a suggestion by Lisa Palmer and David Eck to link examples rather than embedding them directly to reduce confusion, which the group supported. The committee also discussed ensuring that official duty lists were accurate and accessible, especially for college-wide and department-level positions, to prevent miscommunication or delegation errors. The conversation acknowledged the ongoing refinement of these processes over the past few years, credited to previous leaders, and highlighted their "culture of continuous improvement." Lastly, the group reviewed the timeline for the application process, aiming to open applications in October with a mid-November deadline for submission, followed by reviews in December. David discussed plans to communicate deadlines and updates effectively to applicants.

H. Updates to the Distance Education Handbook

- Proposed updates to [Distance Education Handbook \(2025-2028\)](#)
- This agenda item is an opportunity for IPC to offer feedback on the Handbook

The Distance Education (DE) team, represented by Allison Hughes and Nada Nekrep, presented the updated Distance Education Handbook. They highlighted that the handbook had not been updated since 2013 and emphasized its importance as a comprehensive resource for faculty teaching online courses. The handbook covered various topics such as the process of course approval, certification requirements, technology competency, accessibility, and the integration of RSI. The presenters invited feedback and discussion, encouraging participants to provide input during and after the meeting. Questions arose about how to manage future updates to the handbook, with suggestions that minor changes might not require full reapproval but substantial ones should be reviewed by committees like IPC or Academic Senate. Kiran Malavade provided feedback on the “fair use” section, stating that she felt it was too legalistic and could benefit from more practical, faculty-friendly examples and FAQs. Rebekah Sidman-Taveau suggested making the handbook easier to navigate with a linked, clickable tables of contents. David Eck recommended to supply links to general, changeable content (like copyright law) externally to keep the handbook current and focused on DE-specific issues. The group emphasized keeping the handbook a living, actionable document to support online teaching. The handbook would be presented to Academic Senate next Thursday.

I. Draft Rubrics for Comprehensive Program Review

- Academic Senate has provided some suggested revisions to the rubric. This item is an opportunity to provide feedback on the revisions or suggest new revisions.
- The two draft rubrics:
 - [Draft Rubric - Feedback Form - Instructional Comprehensive Program Review](#)
 - [Draft Rubric - Feedback Form - Library and Learning Center Program Review](#)

David Eck led a discussion which focused on updates to the rubric used for program review, which had been presented multiple times at Academic Senate but had not yet been finalized due to feedback received. One key clarification added to the rubric was making it clear that when programs respond to IPC recommendations, they are not necessarily agreeing with the feedback or recommendation. Changes to the action plan section were also discussed, especially concerning whether goals needed to be set for every specific question in the rubric. It was agreed that programs should have overall goals, with action plans supporting those goals, rather than needing granular goals for each section. The inclusion of a “reason given” box was debated to allow programs to explain why they might not set a goal or action plan for certain areas, which was intended to alleviate concerns about being forced to respond unnecessarily. The importance of documenting clear action plans was emphasized to meet accreditation requirements and ensure accountability in responding to peer feedback. The group also considered whether program review writers should be given access to the rubric beforehand to better understand the evaluation criteria. This was seen as a positive idea, though it was noted many faculty focus mainly on completing the review itself. Overall, the updates aimed to improve clarity, equity focus, and the usefulness of feedback in the program review process.

J. Curriculum Report

Adriana Lugo reminded everyone that all CAL-GETC course outlines and curriculum changes needed to be submitted to CurricUNET by October 16th to be included in the Fall 2026 catalog. Additionally, she announced upcoming support sessions for Common Course Numbering, scheduled for the following week on Thursday from 10 to 12, Friday from 9 to 11, and the next Tuesday from 11 to 1, encouraging anyone needing assistance to attend.

K. Important Dates:

October 17th - [Comprehensive Program Reviews](#) due

November 14th - New, revised, and renewed [reassigned time](#) position applications due

November 21st - IPC will review comprehensive program reviews, extra-long meeting

December 5th - IPC votes on reassigned time position (new, revisions, and renewals)

David Eck highlighted important upcoming dates related to program review, noting that the deadline was approaching quickly on October 17. David and Chialin clarified the process for reassigned time applications, explaining that while technically out-of-cycle requests could be submitted at any time, it was strongly discouraged unless there was an emergency, as the preferred approach was to submit requests on cycle to ensure smoother review and processing. David advised reaching out for guidance if out-of-cycle requests were considered. He clarified that even programs not undergoing a comprehensive program review still needed to complete a smaller set of questions and submit resource requests by the same deadline, to keep the process consistent. David again confirmed the schedule for upcoming meetings, with the next meeting planned for October 17 and future plans to decide on an October 31 meeting. There would be no meeting on November 7.

L. Adjournment

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

Discussion – no additional

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously, meeting adjourned at 11:19am