



## INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

### MEETING MINUTES OF October 31, 2025 9:30 am-10:45 am, Zoom/9-154

**Members Present:** David Eck, Chialin Hsieh, Karen Engel, Alex Claxton, Jinmei Lun, Allison Hughes, William Tseng, Marco Raymundo, Adriana Lugo, Kiran Malavade, Lindsey Irizarry, Lisa Palmer, Paul Roscelli

**Members Absent:** Jose Zelaya, Erik Gaspar, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau

**Guests:** Gampi Shankar, Lynette Garcia

---

#### A. Adoption of Agenda –

**Motion** – To adopt the agenda. M/S: Lisa Palmer, Chialin Hsieh

**Discussion** – none

**Abstentions** – none

**Approval** – approved

#### B. Digital Art and Animation Department Apprenticeship Coordinator - Out-of-Cycle Reassigned Time Position Request (Grant-Funded)

- 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.

The first agenda item was an informational update regarding grant-funded reassigned time. David Eck noted that Dean Alex Kramer was unable to attend due to a hiring committee commitment but explained that the purpose of this item was simply to share information with IPC for transparency. The reassigned time cycle had already begun, and the intent was to formally acknowledge the work for the committee's awareness. David referenced the linked form associated with the item and invited members to reach out to Dean Kramer or the IPC co-chairs with any questions. The item was presented for information only, with no action required.

#### C. EMP 1.8 Program Improvement and Viability Process - Draft Revisions

- Academic Senate formed a workgroup (Doug Hirzel, Gampi, Shankar, and Dave Eck) to suggest possible updates to our college's Program Improvement and Viability Process.
- This agenda item will be a first review of the suggested updates. Any changes to the process would be approved at Academic Senate.
- [Fall 2025 Draft Updates to Program Improvement and Viability Process](#)

The committee then engaged in a substantive discussion regarding the Program Improvement and Viability (PIV) process. David Eck and Gampi Shankar explained that, based on prior experience with the Funeral Services Education Program, they had proposed clarifying and fine-tuning the process rather than making major changes. Most revisions focused on procedural clarity, such as replacing calendar or business days with primary academic terms (fall and spring) to better reflect the process's longer timeline of up to two semesters. Minor

adjustments included allowing IPC and Academic Senate feedback to occur simultaneously before going to PBC, and clarifying recommendation terminology to include continuance, revitalization, suspension, and discontinuance. The discussion also addressed technical distinctions, such as differentiating between revitalizing an instructional program versus creating a new program, and the potential curriculum implications of program suspension. Committee members provided feedback on wording for clarity, ensuring the revised document would be easier to understand and use.

Alex Claxton discussed the PIV process and its applicability to both instructional programs and individual programs of study. There was some confusion over whether certain recommendations applied to instructional programs, programs of study, or both. Gampi Shankar clarified that while one sentence initially excluded programs of study, the intent was to cover both. The group also addressed when the PIV process needed to be triggered, noting that it was not necessary if there were no concerns about an instructional program's vitality. Changes were made to clarify terms, simplify indicators, and distinguish between essential curriculum updates and the PIV process. Allison Hughes asked why the PIV process was being revised again, and it was explained that the process had only been recently finalized after a several-year long creation process, and refinements were based on lessons learned, particularly from the recent experience of implementation with the Funeral Services Program. The discussion also covered the procedure for discontinuing programs, including submission to PBC, presidential approval, curriculum changes, board approval, and the ACCJC teach-out policy. The discussion concluded with instructions to monitor upcoming Academic Senate feedback and potential follow-ups at IPC. The team expressed appreciation for everyone's thorough work on this complex project.

#### **D. Drop-In Workshop for Reassigned Time Position Application**

- This agenda item is an opportunity for anyone completing a reassigned time position application to get assistance with [completing a position application](#). This includes anyone who wants to apply to create a new reassigned time position or renew an existing position.
- A brief overview will cover the difference between reassigned time duties and Appendix D duties.
- All college community members are also welcome to come and ask questions about [the reassigned time process](#).

David Eck explained that the remainder of the meeting was intended as a workshop for those working on reassigned time position applications. He and Chialin would be present for the remainder of the meeting to assist those who may need drop in assistance. The remainder of the council members were then released so the workshop could begin for drop in visitors.

#### **E. Important Dates**

- **November 14<sup>th</sup>** New, revised, and renewed [reassigned time](#) position applications due
- November 21<sup>st</sup> IPC will review comprehensive program reviews, extra-long meeting
- December 5<sup>th</sup>, IPC votes on reassigned time position (new, revisions, and renewals)

#### **F. Adjournment**

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

**Discussion** – no additional

**Abstentions** – none

**Approval** – approved unanimously, meeting adjourned at 9:55am, workshop adjourned at 10:45am