



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES OF October 2, 2026 9:30 am-11:30 am, Zoom/9-154

Members Present: Allison Hughes, Chialin Hsieh, Anniqua Rana, Neve Willis, Adriana Lugo, Paul Roscelli, Jessica Marshall, Roz Young, Sarah Cravy, Nick Martin, Karen Engel,

Members Absent: Ron Andrade, Lindsey Irizarry, Kiran Malavade

Guests: Amira Alkeswani, Ameer Thompson

A. Approval of Agenda

Allison Hughes shared that Item C. Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC) CTE Outcomes Data would be tabled and brought back at a future IPC meeting.

Motion – To adopt the agenda with Item C removed. M/S: Anniqua Rana, Chialin Hsieh.

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – unanimously approved

B. Approval of Minutes

- September 18, 2026

Motion – To approve minutes of September 18, 2026. M/S: Chialin Hsieh, Adriana Lugo.

Discussion – none

Abstentions – Anniqua Rana, Jessica Marshal

Approval – approved

~~C. Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC) CTE Outcomes Data~~

- ~~• Review how CTE program outcomes align with regional economic realities and needs.~~
- ~~• Discussion: What surprises you about this data? What questions do you have about it?~~

D. New Format for IPC Program Review Rubric

- Lindsey has created a test Smartsheet version of our program review rubric. What do we think?

Allison Hughes presented a draft Smartsheet version of the IPC Program Review Rubric, developed by Lindsey Irizarry to address challenges with the current fillable PDF format. To

provide context, Allison reviewed the current rubric, available through [Program Review > Templates & Forms > Feedback Forms > IPC Feedback Form](#). The current process requires reviewers to download and complete a separate fillable PDF for each program reviewed. Challenges with some of the form fields prompted Allison and Lindsey to explore an online alternative using Smartsheet.

Allison demonstrated how the proposed Smartsheet form would allow reviewers to identify the division and program, select applicable criteria from dropdown menus, and provide comments for each rubric category. The format would retain the existing rubric criteria and response options. Depending on the category, reviewers could select multiple criteria to reflect both the evidence provided and areas where additional information or analysis may be needed, screenshot example included below:

Articulation *

Are there changes in curriculum or degree requirements at high schools or 4-year institutions that may impact your program? If so, describe the changes and your efforts to accommodate them. If no changes have occurred, please write "no known changes."

Provided: Evidence Provided: Analysis Information Needed: Impact on program

☐ Information Needed: Analysis

☒ Information Needed: Impact on program

☐ Information Needed: Efforts to make changes

☐ No recommendation or No change needed

☐ Not Applicable

advisory group's recommendations for your program.

Members expressed support for the proposed format, noting its potential to improve efficiency, readability, and the overall review process by reducing the need to exchange completed forms via email. Members emphasized the importance of expanding the comment fields to accommodate longer responses and allow reviewers to view their comments in full. Additional suggestions included configuring the form to send reviewers a copy of their submission, confirming the appearance of the exported report used to communicate feedback to programs, and providing an explanation of what constitutes an exemplary example. Allison noted that the dropdown options would reflect the existing rubric and that the proposed format would not alter the established evaluation criteria. However, reviewers would also be able to use the comment fields associated with each criterion to provide additional context or feedback beyond the listed options. Chialin Hsieh clarified that one feedback form would be submitted per program review, regardless of the number of reviewers. Anniqua Rana further clarified that the form is intended for use by program reviewers, rather than by the programs being reviewed.

Motion – To accept the use of form with edits requested. M/S: Chialin Hsieh, Paul Roscelli.

Discussion – none

Abstentions – none

Approval – approved

E. Exemplary Program Reviews

- Updating the [Exemplary PRs page](#) - suggestions for recent exemplary PRs

Allison Hughes highlighted the existing exemplary program review webpage, which provides examples of strong submissions for reference and inspiration. She noted that the webpage, last updated around 2018, contains outdated questions and requested that members identify exemplary program reviews from the past one to two years to help refresh the resource. Allison explained that the proposed Smartsheet format would make it easier to identify exemplary submissions without manually reviewing individual PDF forms. Allison also noted the importance of developing a definition of what constitutes an exemplary program review. Anniqua Rana suggested highlighting exemplary submissions during the spring meeting to provide programs preparing for fall reviews with examples to reference. Allison also shared plans to include the webpage in a program review support email outlining available resources and assistance, with the goal of updating the resource for future review cycles.

F. Inquiry Group: Student Journey and Beyond

Chialin Hsieh and Ameer Thompson presented on the [Inquiry Group: Student Journey and Beyond](#) that focusing on evaluating student outcomes and whether the college effectively meets students' needs throughout their educational journey, from entry through enrollment and completion. The group will develop a plan over the coming months, beginning with a literature review of research and practices at other institutions, followed by data collection and analysis of traditional success metrics, such as completion and transfer rates, as well as potential new measures of student success. The group will discuss findings and develop recommendations to identify service gaps, clarify educational pathways and employment outcomes, and better respond to students' evolving needs. As an example of current research, Ameer highlighted the [HEA Group study](#) examining the return on investment of higher education across 327 institutions in California, noting that Cañada College ranked fifth, Skyline College ranked first, and College of San Mateo ranked eighth. The study was presented as one example of how institutions assess their value to students, rather than as a definitive measure for the inquiry group.

Anniqua Rana asked how the inquiry group would engage a diverse range of students and capture a mix of student perspectives over the next year. Ameer shared that data collection would include surveys and engagement with student representatives through ASCC to help ensure the findings reflect students' needs. He also noted that the group would collaborate with PRIE to ensure survey questions are relevant. Anniqua suggested leveraging existing survey data, including feedback gathered by the Distance Education and Technology Committees, as well as insights from student workers in the Library and Learning Center. Paul Roscelli emphasized the importance of accounting for factors such as students' potential earnings without attending college and the influence of regional employment markets when evaluating institutional value and return on investment. Ameer acknowledged the limitations of existing metrics and the need for a nuanced review of research and assessment methods.

Chialin introduced draft questions for alumni interviews to explore students' initial goals, how those goals changed, what college experiences or resources helped them progress, and what they wished the college had helped them understand or prepare for before leaving. The questions were shared to draw on IPC's expertise and gather feedback to inform PRIE's work. The draft questions include:

Student Journey and Beyond: Interviews with Alumni

1. When you came to Cañada, what were your goals? Did those goals change along the way?
2. What helped you move toward your goals at Cañada, if anything? This could be a class, faculty or staff member, service, or experience. Could you share an example?
3. What do you wish Cañada had helped you understand or prepare for before you left?
4. What has your journey been like since leaving Cañada? Tell us about your further education, employment, or career.
5. How prepared did you feel for your next step since leaving Cañada? What went well, and what was challenging?
 - For transfer: university coursework, transferring credits, and completing your degree.
 - For employment: finding a job, using your skills, and growing in your career.
6. How do you feel about your progress today, and what is one thing Cañada could do to better support students after they leave?

Feedback included:

- Question 1: Members noted that asking about students' initial goals and whether they changed could help identify experiences, programs, or new insights that influenced students' educational paths.
- Question 2: Neve Willis suggested providing checkbox options alongside an open-ended comment field so alumni could identify helpful classes, faculty, staff, campus services, and programs. Adriana Lugo inquired if "service" could further be clarified, as it could be viewed as a resource, such as Library or Learning Center, versus a program, such as Puente, Umoja, and TRIO.
- Question 3: Karen Engel noted that existing graduation survey responses could provide useful information to inform the inquiry group's work. Paul Roscelli and Jessica Marshall recommended exploring areas where students felt least prepared upon entering college, including academic and practical skills such as essay writing, developing a thesis statement, typing, note-taking, and working with others. Identifying these gaps could help the college better understand barriers to student progress and areas where additional preparation or support may be needed.
- Question 4: Members discussed revising the question about alumni experiences after leaving Cañada to more clearly explore the college's impact on their future. Allison

Hughes suggested clarifying the meaning of “journey” in the question and whether it refers specifically to alumni’s educational and career experiences or encompasses their broader life experiences. Adriana Lugo suggested asking whether Cañada had impacted alumni’s futures and, if so, how. Paul Roscelli emphasized keeping the question open-ended and allowing alumni to indicate that the college had little or no impact, rather than presuming a positive outcome. Members also noted that alumni experiences may include effects on family members and broader life outcomes, beyond education and employment. The group discussed potential overlap between this question and the following question about preparedness for next steps, including transfer, employment, and career development.

- Question 5: Open thoughts on how to combine question 4 and question 5. To be mindful of the council’s time, Chialin moved to question 6.
- Question 6: Karen Engel and Anniqua Rana recommended framing it around areas where the college could realistically take action, such as strengthening transfer transitions, providing resume support, and helping students prepare for employment or further education. Members also suggested examining responses by students’ goals, particularly those pursuing transfer versus employment, and considering challenges such as students who intend to transfer but do not enroll at their destination institution. Nick Martin recommended allowing alumni to identify multiple suggestions rather than limiting responses to one.

Chialin thanked members for their feedback and invited them to submit any additional comments by email to VPI Hsieh and Dean Thompson.

G. Reassigned Time Application & Forms Review

- [Reassigned Time Online Application](#)
- [Reassigned Time Online Application Template](#)
- [Reassigned Time Supervisor’s Final Recommendation Form](#)
 - i. Discussion: Review the forms to make sure they’re accurate and updated, and to understand the applications we will be reviewing on 12/4.

Allison Hughes presented on the Fall 2026 reassigned time process and application materials, which are published on the college website. Updates include a separate link to the duties list, a Google Docs template for drafting responses, and an updated supervisor recommendation field. The group reviewed positions due for renewal and encouraged members to notify eligible coordinators and report outdated information or broken links. Several college-wide and department/program positions are up for renewal for Fall 2026, as shown in the screenshots below.

Reassigned Time Renewal Schedule

Reviews Due Fall 2026	Reviews Due Fall 2027	Reviews Due Fall 2028
College-Wide Positions	College-Wide Positions	College-Wide Positions
CTE Liaison	Dual-Enrollment Faculty Coordinator	Honors Transfer Program (HTP)
Faculty Equity Coordinator	Faculty Learning Program (FLP) Coordinator	<i>Also any 2-year positions approved in Fall 2026.</i>
Faculty Teaching and Learning Coordinator	Flex Day Coordinator	
Instructional Assessment Coordinator	Online Instruction Coordinator	
Department/Program Positions	Department/Program Positions	Department/Program Positions
Biology Department Coordinator	Business Department Coordinator	<i>Any 2-year positions approved in Fall 2026.</i>
CBOT Coordinator	Chemistry Department Coordinator	
Community Learning Through Sports (COLTS)	Controlled Digital Lending Coordinator	
ESL Coordinator	Digital Arts and Animation Department Coordinator	
Interior Design Coordinator	English Department Coordinator	
Instructional Planning Council (IPC) Faculty Co-chair	Fashion Design Department Coordinator	
	Human Services Coordinator	
	Math Department Coordinator	
	Medical Assisting Coordinator	
	Social Sciences Coordinator	
	Umoja Program Coordinator & Faculty	
	Writing Center Coordinator	
	On Hold - Dual-Enrollment - HIST Faculty (Pilot)	

The [application timeline](#) is as follows:

- November 13: Applications due.
- November 16: Applications forwarded to the appropriate dean or vice president.
- November 23: Recommendations due.
- December 4: IPC reviews applications and recommendations; applicants will be invited to attend and answer questions.

IPC will review the application evaluation process at its November 6 meeting. Allison clarified that applications establish the need for reassigned time positions, while selection for approved positions occurs separately in the spring. College-wide positions are coordinated through the Academic Senate, while department- and program-level positions are coordinated by the respective dean.

H. [Student Equity and Achievement Plan \(SEAP\): Metric 3](#)

- MALE CAREER INTEREST FOCUS GROUPS/ASSESSMENT + FUTURE PLANNING:
- "Determine the current college instructional programs with largest equity gaps for male students

Chialin Hsieh and Karen Engel presented preliminary findings related to the Student Equity Achievement Plan objective of improving male students' persistence and completion. From 2023–2024 through 2025–2026, male students represented 36% of enrollment but 29% of degree recipients, a seven-percentage-point gap. The largest disparities in male degree completion were identified in four programs:

- Early Childhood Education (ECE): 8 of 192 graduates (4%)
- Interior Design: 8 of 139 graduates (6%)
- Medical Assisting: 9 of 135 graduates (7%)
- Psychology: 27 of 155 graduates (17%)

The group discussed further investigating when male students become underrepresented, whether disparities emerge at entry, during enrollment, or before completion, and what factors contribute to students stopping out. Potential next steps include examining national completion trends, comparing degree and certificate completion, reviewing workforce demographics, and gathering student perspectives through focus groups and surveys.

Karen Engel noted that preliminary observations suggest underrepresentation may begin at program entry and emphasized examining students who stop out. Members discussed whether outreach to increase male enrollment in traditionally female-dominated programs would be effective or whether resources should instead focus on supporting persistence and completion more broadly. Sarah Cravy shared that male representation in Interior Design varies across colleges, suggesting that institutional and program-specific factors may influence enrollment.

The group also reviewed the reverse pattern of female underrepresentation in male-dominated programs, including Engineering (5 of 27 graduates), Computer Science (9 of 46), and Mathematics (9 of 30). The discussion emphasized that further inquiry and student feedback are needed to understand these patterns and inform future planning.

I. Curriculum Report

Adriana Lugo reviewed the [Local Process for Evaluating CORs for Principles of IDEA and UDL](#) adopted by all three colleges in April at the Curriculum Committee meeting on October 1, 2026. The process will be revisited at Academic Senate to ensure faculty are aware of the expectations for the current academic year.

Upcoming COR Submissions to Deans deadlines:

- i) 09/10/26: CIS, MEDA
- ii) 10/01/26: RADT, ASTR, HSCI, BUS
- iii) 10/15/26: BUS, CBOT, ENGL
- iv) 10/29/26: ACTG, INTD, LCTR

A Flex Day support session on October 7 will provide assistance with course submissions. Faculty should bring their laptops, and deans were encouraged to promote the session at division meetings. Members were also reminded that program reviews are due October 16.

J. Important Dates:

- October 16th - [Comprehensive Program Reviews](#) due
- November 6th – IPC Program Review Feedback and Reassigned Time Application Review Prep Meeting
- November 20th - New, revised, and renewed [reassigned time](#) position applications due
- November 20th - IPC will review comprehensive program reviews, extra-long meeting
- December 4th - IPC votes on reassigned time position (new, revisions, and renewals)

K. IPC Goals (2026 – 2027)

- ❖ Standing Goals:
 - Provide feedback on instructional comprehensive 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)
 - Host instructional program review presentations. (Spring)
- ❖ Proposed Goals for 26-27:
 - Participate in Instructional Inquiry Groups as needed
 - Regularly invite groups for updates and feedback throughout the year.
 - Invite reassigned time applicants to join our 12/4 meeting to be available if questions come up.
 - Support Academic Senate Cycle Alignment Work Group
 - Support the New Program Development Process as needed
 - Review and Offer Feedback on the Faculty Handbook

L. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:53am.