Cañada College

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES OF
October 17, 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, Jose Zelaya, Paul Roscelli
Members Absent: Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Lisa Palmer
Guests: Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez, Gampi Shankar, Maria Lara, Wissem Bennani, Nada Nekrep, Ron Andrade

___

A. Adoption of Agenda –

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

Discussion – none
Abstentions – none
Approval – approved unanimously

B. Approval of Minutes – October 3, 2025

Motion – To approve minutes of October 3, 2025: M/S: Adriana Lugo, Chialin Hsieh

Discussion – none
Abstentions – none
Approval – approved unanimously

C. Updates to the Distance Education Handbook
- This item follows-up on our October 3 discussion.
- Current draft of [Distance Education Handbook (2025-2028)](#)
- This agenda item is an opportunity for IPC to recommend a new Distance Education Handbook.

The council continued a previous discussion regarding the Distance Education Handbook. The Distance Education team, led by Allison Hughes and Nada Nekrep, presented updates made in response to previous feedback from the council and the Academic Senate. They explained that the handbook would now exist as a static PDF with annual updates each spring, ensuring both accuracy and version control. The team clarified distinctions between required and recommended training for faculty, specifically noting that QOTL1 was mandatory while recertification every three years was a recommendation. Accessibility standards were expanded with additional details and resources, and the copyright and fair use section was thoroughly rewritten to reflect the team's own voice and better address online teaching contexts. Technology requirements were refined, with links to tools and tutorials made more prominent. During discussion, members praised the revisions, especially the improved accessibility and recertification sections. Adriana Lugo raised a question

regarding whether library technology requests were included, leading to agreement that a link to the library request form should be added under the "Selecting and Adopting Online Materials" section. The council commended the Distance Education team for their thorough and collaborative work.

> **Motion** – To approve the Distance Education Handbook, with the addition of adding a link to the library request form under the "Selecting and Adopting Online Materials" section: M/S: Paul Roscelli, Chialin Hsieh
>
> **Discussion** – none
> **Abstentions** – none
> **Approval** – approved unanimously

D. **Process for Students to Apply for Degrees and Certificates**
- Following up on our discussion of Degree and Certificate trends at the September 19 IPC meeting, Wissem Bennani, Maria Lara, Jinmei Lun, Sarah Aranyakul, and Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez will present on the new process for students to apply for degrees and certificates.

Wissem Bennani, joined by Maria Lara, Jinmei Lun, and Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez presented an overview of the degree and certificate application process. The group was invited to provide clarification after a previous IPC presentation revealed a dip in degree and certificate trends and raised faculty questions about the application process. Wissem explained that the process had recently changed, allowing students to submit applications for graduation directly through WebSmart beginning in Spring 2025.

Counselor Jinmei Lun described the previous system, in which students met with counselors to review degree requirements and submit petitions together through WebSmart. This ensured accuracy and allowed counselors to identify additional degrees or certificates for which students qualified. Registrar Maria Lara then outlined how the admissions office reviewed petitions and notified students of approvals or denials. Under the new system, students now complete applications independently online, with counselors still strongly recommended for guidance. Students may submit up to five applications, and confirmation emails and FAQs now support them through the process.

The team compared the old and new systems, noting key differences: counselor meetings were once required but are now optional, submissions are student-initiated online, and the maximum number of applications is now 5 (additional applications require meeting with A&R). Counselors emphasized continuing to encourage student meetings to ensure eligibility and identify additional credentials. They also discussed support measures, including online guides, FAQs, and multiple help channels, and committed to monitoring the new system's effectiveness, gathering feedback, and refining it collaboratively across departments.

Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez highlighted several challenges, such as students declaring their program of study early on, and restrictions allowing only one catalog year and one campus to be selected, which complicate cases for students pursuing multiple degrees or certificates. She and Jinmei urged faculty to encourage students to meet with counselors early to avoid missed opportunities. Maria added that when incomplete applications are received, admissions will collaborate with the Dean of Counseling and counselors to assist students rather than denying petitions outright.

The group concluded by discussing data tracking and research to analyze degree and certificate trends, catalog year usage, and student outcomes under the new process. Future follow-up and collaboration with the PRIE Office were planned to assess the system's long-term impact once sufficient data is available.

E. **Student Learning Outcome Assessment Discussion**
- Discussion of multiple points related to assessment: Canvas integration with Nuventive; aligning the SLO cycle with Curriculum Cycle; reframing the SLO questions in Nuventive so as to better support Program Review.

The council next discussed Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessment, led by SLO Coordinator, Paul Roscelli. Paul shared his observations based on several years of experience and collaboration with colleagues, various administrators and deans. He explained that as the college approached the end of its current assessment cycle, it was an ideal time to evaluate and possibly realign processes before the next cycle began. Paul identified three overlapping but misaligned systems influencing SLO and Program Learning Outcome (PLO) work: Nuventive (the SLO/PLO data repository), Program Review, and Accreditation. He noted that compliance and data consistency varied across these platforms because their questions and required reporting language did not match. This misalignment created redundancy and frustration among faculty, who often had to record similar information multiple times in slightly different formats.

Paul suggested that the college could streamline these processes by aligning the language used in Nuventive and Program Review with that of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), reducing duplication and improving data integration. Discussion followed about the logistics and timing of implementing such changes. David Eck pointed out that the current three-year assessment cycle had never aligned perfectly with the staggered program review schedule, making full synchronization difficult. He suggested simplifying assessment reporting in program review to ease the burden on faculty. Paul agreed that constraints existed but encouraged revisiting which were flexible and which were fixed by regulation.

Karen Engel added that the ACCJC had updated its accreditation standards in 2024, making it a timely opportunity to review and align assessment language. She also questioned whether programs could match their three-year SLO cycles to their individual program reviews. to which Paul shared that he was open to studying whether flexibility could be introduced. Allison Hughes supported aligning the three systems and noted that the college had never fully mapped the connections between them. She believed individualized cycles might be possible with proper tracking in Nuventive and emphasized retaining Nuventive as the central data tool, citing the previous challenges faced by CSM who removed the tool and is now readopting it.

The group then discussed the relationship between curriculum, assessment, and program review cycles. It was noted that curriculum review followed state-mandated cycles (and different cycles for CTE courses), which further complicated alignment. David Eck highlighted that the syncing of all cycles could create heavy workload peaks. The group was in agreement that while regulatory and practical limits existed, there was strong support for exploring better alignment among Nuventive, program review, and accreditation requirements, reducing redundancy, and ensuring faculty assessment work remained meaningful and efficient.

F. **Instructional Program Review Peer Review Feedback Process**
- Reminder that the program review questions have been revised for this academic year.
- Review of the new rubric that IPC will be using in its November 21 meeting to provide feedback on comprehensive program reviews.
- General guidance on how to apply rubric to review program reviews.
- Process for forming groups to provide feedback on program reviews.

David Eck introduced the topic of Program Review, noting that reviewing and providing feedback on program reviews was one of the Instructional Planning Council's core responsibilities and one of the reasons the council was originally established. He presented a set of slides—largely adapted from the prior year's presentation—to remind members of the process and expectations. The presentation covered the purpose of program review feedback, which was to ensure that questions were adequately answered, to acknowledge areas of success or needed improvement identified by the program, and to offer constructive suggestions. Reviewers were reminded that their primary audience was the program authors, so feedback should be clear, respectful, and focused on content—not grammar or style. Examples of effective feedback included asking programs to expand on missing data, reflect on staffing changes, or discuss trends in course success rates, especially in relation to equity.

David also explained that the program review format had been redesigned for the current cycle: narrative sections now appeared earlier, and all proposed recommendations or changes were moved to the final section. Because of these revisions, a new feedback rubric was introduced—similar in appearance to the old rubric but updated to align with the revised questions. Reviewers were advised not to request resubmissions of program reviews unless major sections were missing; instead, they should note improvements to address in the next cycle.

The discussion then turned to logistics and participation. There would be 14 program reviews this cycle, requiring seven mixed groups of three reviewers each—composed of faculty, staff, administrators, and at least one experienced reviewer per team. Members were encouraged to recruit colleagues outside IPC to participate. Adriana Lugo shared a past experience as a new faculty member who had joined a feedback session without preparation and urged the council to provide training or orientation materials for new reviewers. Several members, including David and Kiran Malavade, supported this idea, suggesting that a brief guide be developed and that each group include at least one returning reviewer to provide guidance.

Karen Engel contributed by sharing a link to the [PRIE Data Dashboards and Packets website](#), which provided programs with extensive data for their reviews. She noted that programs were not expected to analyze all of it but should use relevant data, especially in discussing equity. David agreed to include this resource in future reviewer guidance. Members then discussed how much time new participants should expect to commit; it was estimated that reviewers would spend time reading the program documents in advance and about 1.5 hours per program completing the feedback during meetings.

Allison Hughes added an important clarification that feedback should target the program review document, not the program itself, to avoid misunderstandings or unproductive criticism. She also noted that program review meetings had sometimes been open to the wider campus, which could lead to untrained participants joining unexpectedly. Chialin Hsieh agreed that preassigned groups with basic training would help maintain structure and quality.

David outlined next steps: group assignments would be finalized about a week before the November 21st meeting, ensuring each group had a mix of roles and experience. Participants could email preferences if they wished to review specific programs. He reminded everyone to read assigned reviews in advance to allow meeting time for discussion rather than document reading. Finally, he shared the list of 14 programs up for review, confirmed that faculty could not review their own programs, and thanked everyone for their participation and suggestions to improve the process.

G. Program Completability and High Impact Low Success Courses

Chialin Hsieh and Ron Andrade presented on program completability and high-impact, low-success courses. They explained that this discussion built on a presentation from the previous year, aimed at monitoring key courses that had a significant effect on student progress but lower success rates. Chialin defined *high-impact courses* as those required for multiple degrees or certificates and serving as essential "gateway" classes across disciplines. She defined *low-success courses* as those with a success rate below 65%, acknowledging the threshold was somewhat arbitrary but useful for identifying areas needing support. Data showed that high-impact courses, Economics 100 and Physics 250, had success rates of 57% and 49% respectively, making them top priorities for intervention. Statistics C1000 was considered on the watch list, with an average success rate of 64%. Enrollment data revealed further context: for example, while Physics 250 had about 122 enrollments over two years, Statistics C1000 had more than 5,000, influencing how resources were prioritized.

Ron then discussed the rationale and strategy behind the college's focus on these courses. He emphasized the financial and motivational impact on students who failed and had to repeat gateway courses could significantly delay degree completion. The Learning Center used success data, enrollment size, and trends over time to determine where tutoring and academic support would have the greatest effect. Ron highlighted faculty collaboration as essential, noting that tutors were only hired upon instructor recommendation to ensure alignment with course needs. However, he acknowledged challenges in recruiting enough qualified tutors and maintaining consistent communication with faculty. The team offered varied support models—such as embedded tutors within labs (used effectively in Chemistry), drop-in tutoring, and workshops for exam preparation—depending on what best fit each discipline's structure.

Kiran Malavade suggested collecting student feedback to understand what types of support students preferred and when they most needed it. Ron and others agreed, proposing that the Learning Center could include a student input component in its outreach or faculty survey process. Paul Roscelli supported this idea and added that faculty might appreciate receiving individualized reports showing their course success data, even for high-impact, low-success classes, as such information could prompt reflection and improvement without being punitive. He also raised a broader question about whether the "Free College" initiative might influence drop or withdrawal rates, wondering if reduced financial risk led some students to disengage more easily. The group acknowledged that this was an intriguing area for further study, though difficult to isolate from other factors.

Jinmei Lun asked whether there was existing data or surveys identifying why students struggled in these specific courses—such as course difficulty, lack of preparation, or external pressures. Ron responded that most insights were anecdotal, gathered through faculty interactions and informal student conversations, though past withdrawal surveys had captured limited data. Faculty shared that common reasons included time constraints, work obligations, and underestimating course rigor. The group was in agreement on the need for deeper analysis of student experiences, continued data-driven prioritization of support resources, and stronger collaboration between faculty and the Learning Center to improve success in high-impact, low-success courses.

H. Update on IPC Meeting Schedule
- Reminder: our November 7 meeting date has been cancelled.
- By the end of this meeting, we will share with you whether or not we are meeting on October 31.

The committee confirmed plans for an upcoming IPC workshop on October 31st, which would focus on providing guidance for reassigned time applications. David Eck explained that he and Chialin Hsieh were organizing the session to assist faculty and staff with the application process. He clarified that this would be a workshop rather than a regular IPC meeting, meaning there would be no action items requiring formal votes. The existing calendar invite would remain in place, and updated details would be shared once finalized. David

added that while there might be one or two informational items included, there would be no decision-making or quorum requirement. Finally, it was confirmed that the November 7th IPC meeting was cancelled, and the October 31st workshop would serve as the committee's activity in its place.

I. Curriculum Report

Adriana Lugo shared upcoming procedural updates regarding course inactivation. The committee noted that the district had identified a number of courses that had not been offered for many years—some dating back to the 1980s—and would soon begin a standard operational process for reviewing and inactivating these outdated courses. The process would involve collaboration among the VPI, curriculum chairs, faculty, and deans, ensuring that any inactivation decisions were reviewed across all campuses and did not negatively impact existing programs, certificates, or degrees. Faculty who believed a course should remain active would be able to submit an exemption form, which would be discussed at a district curriculum meeting.

The report also included updates on Common Course Numbering (CCN). Faculty who had completed their assigned CCN work were reminded to confirm their completion with Alessandra to ensure payment. An upcoming CCN working session was announced for October 30th from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. in room 9-154 and via Zoom. Adriana encouraged faculty to attend and share the information with colleagues still completing CCN updates.

J. Important Dates:

October 17th Comprehensive Program Review due
November 14th New, revised, and renewed reassigned time position applications due
November 21st IPC will review comprehensive program reviews, extra-long meeting.
- Reminder: Our November 21 IPC meeting starts at 8:30am.
December 5th, IPC votes on reassigned time position (new, revisions, and renewals)

K. Adjournment

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

Discussion – no additional
Abstentions – none
Approval – approved unanimously, meeting adjourned at 11:31am