



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES OF September 19, 2025 9:30 am-11:30 am, Zoom/9-154

Members Present: David Eck, Paul Roscelli, Chialin Hsieh, Erik Gaspar, Karen Engel, Alex Claxton, Jinmei Lun, Allison Hughes, William Tseng, Marco Raymundo

Members Absent: Lisa Palmer, Jose Zelaya, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Kiran Malavade, Lindsey Irizarry, Adriana Lugo

Guests: Ameer Thompson, Alex Kramer, Sarah Harmon, Gampi Shankar

A. Adoption of Agenda –

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

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

B. Approval of Minutes – September 5, 2025

Motion – To approve minutes of September 5, 2025: M/S: Paul Roscelli, Chialin Hsieh

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

C. Trabajo Faculty Sponsor Reassigned Position Out-of-Cycle Request (Grant-funded)

- [National Science Foundation Trabajo Faculty Sponsor Position Request](#)
- Since the reassigned position would be fully grant-funded, it is an information item only. If you have any questions or comments, please email one or both of the IPC co-chairs.

David Eck shared an informational only item regarding this out-of-cycle reassigned time position request, which was noted to be fully grant-funded. The position details were provided via the shared link above. Because the funding came entirely from a grant, IPC did not issue a recommendation on the request. However, attendees were encouraged to reach out to Dean Ameer Thompson with any comments, questions, or concerns. Ameer was present at the meeting for support and the item was acknowledged for the record.

D. ISER Draft for ACCJC Standard 2 – Student Success

- Accreditation Standard 2 is Student Success

- Closer-to-final draft of our college's answers to Standard 2 for [our Institutional Self Evaluation Report \(ISER\)](#)
- As IPC members, please take a close look at:
 - Substandard 2.1's final section: "Programs of study reflect appropriate breadth, depth, and expected learning outcomes"
 - Substandard 2.2's final section: "Academic programs support attainment of learning outcomes and goals for all students"
 - Substandard 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 different viewpoints."
 - Substandard 2.6: "The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that meet student and curricular needs and promote learning and achievement for all students."
 - Substandard 2.9: "The institution conducts systematic review and assessment to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs and implements improvements and innovations in support of student achievement for all students."
- This agenda item is an opportunity to review the nearly final draft and suggest corrections and clarifications, especially on the above items.

The committee focused on reviewing and discussing ACCJC Standard 2 as part of the college accreditation process. The group clarified that ACCJC stands for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges and confirmed that the document under review was tied to eligibility requirements (ERs) that must be addressed with hard evidence. Karen Engel shared her screen to show a working draft of the document, noting that she could make live edits as suggestions came in. The discussion centered on which parts of Standard 2 were most relevant to IPC, particularly those related to program review, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

The team reviewed specific substandards 2.1 and 2.2, ensuring they aligned with the college mission and met expectations for academic breadth, depth, and learning outcomes. They also examined examples from the math and art history departments, with committee members suggesting language revisions to more accurately reflect improvements while acknowledging ongoing equity gaps. The group emphasized the importance of clear and evidence-based explanations. Gampi Shankar suggested enhancing the narrative by indicating that the program improvement process is dynamic and continually refined through reflection and updated practices.

The group then shifted to discussing section 2.3, which addressed general education (GE) frameworks across degree programs. Karen Engel noted the feedback that the section had too many voices and lacked conciseness. She acknowledged the complexity of editing it and questioned whether the explanation of the evolving GE framework—particularly in light of CalGETC changes—was clear and accurate. The discussion revealed a need for clarity. Committee members clarified that both the local GE and CalGETC frameworks served different purposes. For example, local GE could be used for local AA degrees, but not for ADTs, which required CalGETC. The group agreed that documentation like the course catalog and official approval records (e.g., from curriculum committees) could serve as evidence of the GE framework. Karen requested that clearer, more concise language be shared with her to improve the explanation in the documentation. Paul Roscelli proposed a more audience-based explanation, distinguishing between students pursuing local degrees and those transferring with ADTs. Karen agreed this would help clarify the requirements and sought input on how to address different student groups within the document, particularly whether she needed to differentiate among local degree seekers, Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) students, and transfer-only students. Paul Roscelli confirmed that transfer-only students were a distinct group, leading Karen to commit to revising the draft for three specific audiences. She planned to consult with curriculum experts and counselors, including Lisa Palmer, David Eck, and Trang Luong, to ensure accuracy.

The group discussed the relationship between GE frameworks and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), particularly in light of changes brought by CalGETC and Common Course Numbering. Allison Hughes raised

questions about whether assessing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) was required in this context, and to what extent the GE framework impacted SLO assessment. The group engaged in a discussion on how curriculum changes—particularly those stemming from CalGETC and Common Course Numbering—had influenced SLOs across departments. Communication Studies was cited as a notable example, with Paul Roscelli explaining that GE-driven changes, such as those affecting the COMM C1000 course, had required course resubmissions and updates to SLOs. However, these revisions typically occurred during the curriculum review process rather than during routine SLO assessment. Allison emphasized the distinction between reviewing and assessing SLOs, noting that while updates to GE requirements might lead faculty to revise SLOs, the actual assessment of whether students meet these outcomes during instruction remains a separate process.

Jinmei Lun provided broader context, explaining that the implementation of CalGETC merged the CSU and IGETC GE patterns into a unified pathway, bringing previously CSU-only requirements into the UC transfer framework. As a result, courses like COMM C1000 had to undergo changes in course numbering, content, and outcomes to align with the new standards. The group acknowledged that such curriculum changes were not universally required and tended to be discipline-specific. Karen Engel highlighted the importance of clearly documenting this relationship between state-level GE revisions and their impact on course-level outcomes. She highlighted the COMM C1000 update as a useful case study to illustrate how curriculum changes can occasionally trigger revisions to SLOs. The group agreed that examples like these should be captured in meeting minutes or Curriculum Committee records. Karen concluded by expressing appreciation for everyone's contributions and shared her intent to follow up with Jinmei, Allison, and others via email to refine the narrative and gather additional documentation for this section of the report.

The group then transitioned to discussing Standard 2.6, focusing on how the college evaluates teaching methodologies and delivery modes. They discussed updates to survey data and agreed to include more recent information. Allison Hughes raised a question about a comment referencing "iterative training" for online educators, which Sarah Harmon clarified had been discussed over the summer as part of potential updates to the Distance Education handbook. However, it was confirmed that while professional development is recommended—such as completing QOTL trainings every three years—it is not currently required. Allison also described the college's process for onboarding new instructors, including welcome letters and orientation sessions, and agreed to share those materials with Karen. Additional evidence, like faculty forms that reference training history, was requested.

Lastly, the group reviewed Standard 2.9, which addresses program review and assessment of academic and student services. Karen outlined how these assessments are conducted and how they inform improvements, referencing tools like SLOs, ILOs, and the recent SLO Retreat. The team confirmed that they feel confident about this section. Karen reminded everyone that final revisions must be completed soon, as the ISER report is scheduled for board review on November 19, with a PBC presentation on November 5.

E. Data on Student Degree and Certification Completion and Related Metrics

- This agenda item builds on a presentation from the annual leadership retreat.
- [Data on Student Degree and Certification Completion and Related Metrics](#)

Karen Engel presented data on student degree and certification completion and related metrics. Notable areas of focus included the data showing that Cañada College's degree and certificate completions had dropped significantly during the pandemic and had not recovered at the same pace as sister colleges, CSM and Skyline. While Cañada experienced a 22% decline in degrees awarded since before the pandemic, the other colleges showed a strong recovery. Karen acknowledged feedback from colleagues and noted the data was still being finalized, with some awards pending validation. She explained that certificate trends were relatively stable but

highlighted discrepancies in practices—CSM used to auto-award certificates until 2019, and Skyline currently performs degree audits that prompt students to apply for certificates they may have earned. These practices may contribute to the differing completion rates at those schools. Several committee members raised concerns about whether procedural differences—like additional steps required for Cañada students or lack of proactive student nudging—might be contributing to the gap. Others suggested factors like the proportion of full-time students and students using Cañada as a secondary campus which might also influence the data. Karen emphasized the focus was on identifying trends rather than raw numbers, and the discussion helped generate hypotheses for further investigation.

Jinmei Lun discussed changes in how students apply for degrees and certificates. Previously, students were required to meet with counselors to ensure they had applied for their degrees. This sometimes led to students discovering they qualified for multiple degrees or certificates without realizing it. However, under the new system, students now apply on their own through Banner. This can lead to confusion as they may not be aware of the extent of certificates/degrees for which they qualify. Jinmei expressed concern that although barriers have been removed, many students still do not understand the process or miss opportunities. Karen followed up with data on statewide degree trends. The conversation highlighted the complexity of tracking award trends and the administrative hurdles students face, prompting a request from Erik Gaspar for a clearer, step-by-step process comparison between Cañada and other colleges to identify potential inefficiencies. The committee acknowledgment that legislative changes could further impact the awarding of local degrees in the coming years.

F. Highlights from the Spring 2025 Survey of Student Modality Preferences

- CCSSE is a nationwide survey tool that Cañada College participated in last academic year.
- Results include student responses on their class modality preferences.
- [Spring 2025 Survey of Student Modality Preferences](#)

Karen Engel presented survey findings regarding student preferences and experiences with various course modalities at Cañada College, based on a statewide survey administered district-wide. She focused on key takeaways relevant to course delivery. The survey revealed that part-time students outnumbered full-time respondents, with many enrolled in science, math, and healthcare programs. A consistent theme was that both part-time and full-time students preferred in-person classes, though part-timers were more open to asynchronous online learning, likely due to external responsibilities. Students living farther from campus showed a stronger preference for online modalities, especially asynchronous, while those closer preferred in-person formats. The group reviewed the reported challenges students selected regarding online learning as well as the support resources they selected as utilizing. AI use was limited at the time of the survey, though has likely increased since. The data also suggested that while Canvas is widely used, fewer students engaged with other available technology to support learning in classes. Karen emphasized the importance of sharing these findings with other committees, like SSPC, and Paul Roscelli raised a suggestion for future surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of required online engagement activities from the student perspective. Overall, the data indicated a need to maintain flexibility in course offerings to meet varied student needs.

G. Draft Rubrics for Comprehensive Program Review

- This item is an opportunity to provide feedback on the Draft Rubrics that IPC uses to review Instructional Comprehensive Program Reviews.
- It is also an opportunity to review already submitted feedback
- The two draft rubrics:
 - [Draft Rubric - Feedback Form - Instructional Comprehensive Program Review](#)
 - [Draft Rubric - Feedback Form - Library and Learning Center Program Review](#)

David Eck reviewed the draft rubrics that had been included on the previous meeting's agenda and invited feedback, clarifying that no vote was being taken at that time. These rubrics were intended for use in upcoming program reviews scheduled for just over a month later. Attendees were encouraged to review the rubric columns—rather than the questions themselves—and report any errors, such as typos, via comments on the Google Docs. Academic Senate was expected to discuss and potentially approve the rubrics at their next meeting to ensure readiness.

H. November 7 Scheduled IPC Meeting

- We might cancel this meeting, in part because of a schedule conflict.
- Three options: keep the November 7 meeting, move it to October 31, or cancel.
- This agenda item will cover the different options.

The committee discussed the possibility of canceling the first November meeting as Co-chair David Eck will be attending a conference. Alternatives included keeping the meeting as scheduled, moving it to the last Friday in October (Halloween), or canceling it altogether if deemed unnecessary. The group took a "temperature check" to gauge preferences, with many favoring moving the meeting to October 31st, and others not holding strong opinions.

I. Curriculum Update

The Curriculum Chairs were unable to attend the meeting, but they sent the following report which was presented at the meeting:

Curriculum Report

- The curriculum committee is ready to start reviewing submitted proposals for CRER, IDST and INDV courses so please start rolling those in. ART and MATH can also start working on proposals and submitting them whenever they're ready.
- Districtwide, ALL of Phase IIB (in addition to the IIA) courses will be submitted on CurricUNET by October 30th for Title V and District alignment.
- There is a Request for Proposal (RFP) to replace CurriCUNET, our current Curriculum Management System. All feedback will go through our VPI and Faculty will have the opportunity to be present for the various vendor presentations. It is due to go live by Fall 2027.

J. Important Dates:

September 25th – Academic Senate will consider action on an RSI resolution. (An initial draft was reviewed in the September 3 IPC meeting.)

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 highlighted the resolution on regular and substantive interaction brought by the Distance Ed team. This resolution had been discussed at the last Academic Senate meeting, and a writing group—of which Allison Hughes was a member—had been formed to draft it. The resolution was scheduled for consideration and potential action at the next Academic Senate meeting on September 25. The rest of the dates were routine reminders related to IPC.

K. Adjournment

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

Discussion – no additional

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously, meeting adjourned at 11:20am