



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES OF September 5, 2025 9:30 am-11:30 am, Zoom/9-154

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

Members Absent: none

Guests: Anniqua Rana, Alex Kramer, Kristina Brower, Gampi Shankar, Nada Nekrep

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 – May 16, 2025 (final meeting of last academic year)

Motion – To approve minutes of May 16, 2025: M/S: Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Alex Claxton

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Alex Claxton (not a member of the committee at the time of the May 16 meeting)

Approval – approved

C. Instructional Planning Council (IPC) Bylaws Review

- Brief review of our Council's Bylaws, which tells us: who we are, what we do, and some basics about how we do it
- [Current IPC Bylaws](#) (last revised in September 2024)

The group focused on reviewing the council bylaws to clarify their role, responsibilities, and composition. Emphasis was placed on understanding what the Instructional Planning Council (IPC) does, particularly in relation to instructional program review—a key task assigned by the Academic Senate around 2014. Chialin Hsieh highlighted the importance of feedback on the development and discontinuation of instructional programs, noting this would be a major focus for the year. Accreditation was also a critical topic, with Karen Engel speaking about IPC's role in finalizing Standard 2 for the 7-year institutional self-evaluation report. Other duties such as reviewing and providing feedback on reassigned time applications and meeting attendance expectations were addressed, including clarification of membership terms, removal policies for excessive absences, and co-chair election procedures. The council clarified that the faculty co-chair must come from the

broader group of nine faculty positions within the committee. It was noted that the current co-chair, David Eck, was completing his term and that elections for the next co-chair would take place at the end of the spring semester.

Rebekah Sidman-Taveau raised a question about whether the council was still involved in evaluating material requests, such as equipment for academic programs. David Eck clarified that while such requests appear in program reviews, the council no longer provides feedback on resource requests; instead, they focus on the narrative components. Resource allocations are handled by other bodies, like the Planning Budgeting Council or the Senate. Rebekah also questioned the consistency of membership terms, noting that while the bylaws state two-year terms, many roles tied to specific coordinator positions (such as Equity or Honors Coordinator) result in members serving much longer. The chair acknowledged this and explained that term limits apply only to at-large roles, while position-based seats are ongoing. The group discussed the potential for revising bylaws to address workload and refresh membership, possibly by allowing substitutes. It was confirmed that the two-year term still applied to roles like classified staff, counselors, librarians, and instructional deans, while role-specific positions were implicitly long-term. David encouraged further discussion if members felt any changes were needed.

D. IPC Goals for 2025-2026

- Discussion of annual goals for IPC.

For reference: IPC Annual Goals from 2024-2025 academic year

- Provide feedback on instructional program review narratives in accordance with the Academic Senate guidelines. (Fall)
- Review and provide feedback on reassigned time applications. (Fall)
- Evaluate the instructional program review process yearly. (Spring)
 - Collaborate to make recommendations to Academic Senate to update instructional program review questions to infuse equity into program review

The council reviewed goals from the previous year as a starting point for setting new annual goals. David Eck emphasized that while it was an action item, no immediate decision was required unless the group felt ready. David clarified that the “collaborate to make recommendations to Academic Senate to update instructional program review questions to infuse equity into program review” goal could be removed from the list as the program review questions had been changed. Alex Claxton suggested a wording revision of “*providing substantive and constructive feedback*” on instructional program review narratives rather than simply *feedback*. Chialin Hsieh introduced two specific Educational Master Plan (EMP) objectives that IPC will support: ensuring academic program viability (EMP 1.8) and creating and scaling the first-year experience program (EMP 1.15). These were proposed as additions to the council’s goals to help align with broader institutional priorities. Karen Engel and Kiran Malavade expressed support for including these items. After a brief discussion, the group agreed that even if they adopted goals now, changes could still be made later.

Proposed new goals for 2025/2026, with revisions in bold:

- Provide **substantive, constructive** feedback on instructional program review narratives in accordance with the Academic Senate guidelines. (Fall)
- Review and provide feedback on reassigned time applications. (Fall)
- Evaluate the instructional program review process yearly. (Spring)
- **Provide assistance on EMP 1.8: Ensure program viability**
- **Provide assistance on EMP 1.15: Create and scale the first-year experience program**

Motion – To approve the IPC 2025/2026 goals as written above: M/S: Chialin Hsieh, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

E. Membership Update

- Who would be available and willing to serve as IPC’s representative on the Planning and Budgeting Council?
- PBC meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays, 2:10-4:00pm. Joining via Zoom is an option.

David Eck explained the college’s participatory governance structure, noting that the council's recommendations are forwarded to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC), making it important to have a representative present there. Lisa Palmer volunteered to serve as the IPC representative on PBC, although she mentioned she might have scheduling conflicts. It was agreed that substitutes could be arranged when necessary. The group then took time to review member roles and complete introductions, particularly to welcome new members.

F. Education and Human Development Department Coordination and Partner Alignment Reassigned Position—Out-of-cycle Request

- Request for out-of-cycle reassigned time position
- This position is a modified version of previously approved reassigned position that expired last year

David Eck introduced an out-of-cycle reassigned time request, acknowledging that the agenda's structure placed the topic ahead of a full explanation of what such positions entail. Reassigned time positions allow faculty to shift part of their workload from teaching to other duties. In this case, the request was a renewal for the Education and Human Development Department Coordinator position, previously discontinued due to leadership transitions and reevaluation of departmental needs. Since then, two new tenure-track faculty had joined, the Child Development Center (CDC) was opening, and there was increased engagement with Strong Workforce initiatives.

Alex Kramer and Kristina Brower presented the request, noting that while the position had formerly been funded at 0.2 FTE from Fund 1, the new proposal reduced the Fund 1 ask to 0.1 FTE, with the remaining 0.1 to be covered by categorical Strong Workforce funds. The revised role would span through Spring 2027 and focus on department coordination, support for new faculty, curriculum alignment with evolving state requirements, and external partnerships.

Kristina highlighted the need for departmental leadership, including managing program reviews, onboarding new faculty, maintaining community and county partnerships, adapting to new state credentialing requirements, supporting the CDC launch, and overseeing grants. She emphasized that the coordination role was vital given the program's size, external obligations, and the complexity of dual enrollment and outreach efforts.

Concerns were raised regarding the overlap with contractual “D1” faculty responsibilities, which cannot be compensated through reassigned time. Alex and Kristina clarified that the role focused on facilitating and coordinating tasks rather than directly performing D1 duties like curriculum development. Additional input supported the need for reassigned time, especially given the scale of operations in CTE programs like Education and Human Development.

Motion – To approve the out of cycle reassigned time position of Education and Human Development Coordinator: M/S: Karen Engel, Lisa Palmer

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously

G. The Progress on RSI (Regular and Substantive Interaction)

- Update on our Distance Team's work to ensure all of our Distance Education courses meet the new RSI standard.
- [Presentation on RSI](#)
- [Draft resolution on RSI](#) that Academic Senate will be considering

The Distance Education (DE) team provided an update on their progress toward meeting Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) standards in online courses, which are critical for upcoming accreditation. Nada Nekrep led the presentation, explaining that the team had been working for over a year to support faculty and had recently seen significant success in increasing faculty engagement. Following a well-attended RSI showcase and the release of a helpful “Quick Cuts” video summary, the team raised engagement levels from 60% to nearly 90% by reaching out individually to faculty and conducting surveys. They emphasized that resources, including training materials and self-assessments, were available on their RSI website, and office hours would continue throughout the fall.

The presentation prompted praise for the DE team's efforts and the faculty's responsiveness, but also raised concerns about workload, particularly for adjunct instructors. Several faculty members, including Kiran Malavade, Gampi Shankar, and Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, voiced concerns about the pressure faculty (including adjuncts) may feel, the volume of communication, and the lack of compensation for the extra work involved in meeting RSI standards. Suggestions included institutionalizing support and offering more targeted email communications based on engagement level. The DE team acknowledged these concerns and emphasized their efforts to minimize faculty burden by using flexible, low-impact methods like self-assessments and one-on-one support. Allison Hughes reiterated that RSI is not an extra requirement, but a core element of quality online teaching. The group offered their continued support for faculty and shared a reminder that accreditation demands visibility of RSI in online course shells.

H. Educational Master Plan (EMP) Annual Plan Update

- Update from the August leadership retreat on Annual goals related EMP Goal 1
- College-wide [Annual Plan for EMP Implementation](#)

Chialin Hsieh presented the Educational Master Plan (EMP) Annual Update for the 2025–2026 academic year. A leadership retreat had taken place, during which approximately 50–60 members reviewed the progress on EMP objectives and identified key initiatives to prioritize. The focus for the year included five prioritized objectives, with two under Goal 1 (Student Access, Success, and Completion)—specifically:

- 1.8 Ensure academic program viability and
- 1.15 Create and scale the First-Year Experience Program.

For objective 1.8, a workgroup—led by the Academic Senate President and the VPI—was tasked with developing a work plan and reporting progress to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) by May 2026. Discussion also addressed how this initiative would interface with the Academic Senate's Program Improvement and Viability (PIV) process. Recent experiences with the Funeral Services Education Program were used as a reference to fine-tune the process

For objective 1.15, Ron Andrade and Myra Arellano were named as leads. They were expected to share progress with IPC and report formally to PBC in late 2025 and again by spring 2026. IPC committed to supporting both initiatives as part of its annual goals.

I. Program Review Support

- Updates on supports available this year and reminder about the new Comprehensive Program Review Questions
- [Program Review Templates and Forms](#)

David Eck discussed program review support, emphasizing that it remained one of the most important responsibilities of IPC. Members were reminded that Cañada College's program review website had been updated and was a valuable resource, featuring templates, updated questions, and a searchable archive of past submissions.

Karen Engel noted that a Flex Day session on program review had already been conducted and recorded, and that she and Alex Claxton had reached out to all programs scheduled for comprehensive review to offer one-on-one support. Additionally, Karen planned to speak at the upcoming SSPC meeting. Council members were invited to request additional support during IPC meetings if needed. Karen was recognized and appreciated for maintaining and improving the program review website, while Karen, Alex, and the marketing team were also acknowledged for their roles in organizing and archiving program review data. Chialin offered gratitude for the well-structured support system, which was praised as more organized than what some members had experienced at other institutions.

J. Draft Rubric for Comprehensive Program Review

- With the change in Instructional Program Review Questions, IPC needs a new rubric for providing feedback on Program Reviews. This agenda item will share draft rubrics that Academic Senate will need to approve this semester.
- [Draft Rubric - Feedback Form - Instructional Comprehensive Program Review](#)
- [Draft Rubric - Feedback Form - Library and Learning Center Program Review](#)

The council discussed the need for a revised feedback form to align with the newly updated program review questions. Since the questions had changed, a new draft form was created for IPC members to use when reviewing comprehensive instructional program reviews. Two slightly different versions of the form were presented—one standard version and another adapted for the Library and Learning Center, which included two additional questions specific to their program's needs. These extra questions had existed prior to the 2020 updates and were based on past departmental feedback. Members were encouraged to review the draft forms and provide any suggestions for revisions. It was clarified that while the core questions themselves were already finalized, IPC's feedback was being sought specifically on the structure and content of the feedback form used to assess the program reviews. Chialin offered a reminder that Academic Senate would ultimately approve the updated feedback form, but IPC's input was essential, given their role in evaluating the reviews.

K. Reassigned Time Position Request Positions and Process – 2025-2026

- [List of reassigned positions up for renewal](#)
- Information about [renewal and new reassigned position request process](#). This year's position application form will be ready by October.
- [Reassigned time position list](#): spreadsheet that provides complete list of all current reassigned time positions in the college.

David Eck provided an overview of reassigned time positions and related processes, emphasizing the council's role in facilitating and reviewing these requests. The relevant pages on the IPC website were updated for the current academic year, including a list of positions up for renewal—categorized by college-wide and department-level roles due to their differing application and review processes. The timeline for applications was also updated, with the goal of making the application form available by early October. Instructions for both fall (request process) and spring (filling approved positions) were outlined clearly.

Additionally, Cañada College maintains a comprehensive and transparent list of all reassigned time positions on the IPC site—which was believed to be unique among colleges. This list served as a valuable reference, showing past submissions and position descriptions. Members were encouraged to alert colleagues whose positions were up for renewal. Additionally, the council reviewed the process for out-of-cycle requests, which could be submitted any time during the year if justified as urgent or exceptional. The council clarified that IPC only reviewed and provided feedback on Fund 1 positions—those funded by the general college budget. Grant-funded positions followed a separate process and were listed for informational purposes only. However, for positions funded by both sources, IPC would still provide feedback.

L. Enrollment Update

- [Fall 2025 Enrollment and Modality Data](#)

Chialin Hsieh presented the enrollment update, outlining the most recent data which had been made available. The report aligned with specific EMP objectives and ACCJC standards. Chialin showed comparisons of college goals against actual census day results, highlighting metrics such as course enrollment, headcount, fill rate (percentage of class capacity filled), full-time equivalent students (FTS), and faculty load. Chialin reviewed various data trends surrounding enrollment modality, a three year comparison of sections by modality and fill rate, a point in time comparison, and general enrollment trends.

Chialin also addressed program completion, identifying certain degrees (e.g., geography, music, studio arts, theater arts) that students could not complete within two years due to course offerings, prompting ongoing faculty discussions about revising courses.

Discussion followed regarding enrollment trends, noting that although overall student headcount was high, students were enrolling in fewer courses, which increased the demand on student services. Analyses suggested that many less-than-part-time students (fewer than six units) were older, part-time learners, with concentrations in specific fields. The impact of a new gym and related fitness courses on enrollment patterns was also considered. Finally, questions were raised about how free or discounted admission policies and cross-college enrollment influenced these trends, with ongoing efforts to understand these effects more fully.

M. Curriculum Report

Adriana Lugo presented the curriculum report, sharing the committee's new approach to managing updates related to common course numbering changes. To avoid overwhelming the committee members and technical reviewers, the committee planned to space out course submission deadlines throughout the year. The deadlines had been shared previously with faculty, with some submissions already received but many still pending. The goal is to prevent last-minute submissions and ease the review workload. Additionally, Adriana announced that Trang Luong had volunteered as the Common Course Numbering Coordinator for Fall 2025, replacing Lisa Palmer who is serving as Interim Dean of HSS. A coordinator is still needed for semesters beyond fall of 2025.

N. 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)

O. Adjournment

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

Discussion – no additional

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved unanimously, meeting adjourned at 11:28am