Cañada College

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES OF
November 6, 2026
9:30 am-11:30 am, Zoom/9-154

Members Present: Chialin Hsieh, Anniqua Rana, Ron Andrade, Allison Hughes, Neve Willis, Adriana Lugo, Sarah Cravy, Jessica Marshall, Nick Martin, Paul Roscelli, Kiran Malavade, Lindsey Irizarry, Roz Young
Members Absent: Karen Engel
Guests: Nadia Biglari, Alex Kramer, Ameer Thompson

A. Approval of Agenda

Allison Hughes requested one change to the agenda: moving *Item H. PBC IPC Representative Coverage – 11/18 & 12/2* to an earlier discussion time as Item C.

Motion – To adopt the agenda as amended. M/S: Anniqua Rana, Chialin Hseih.
Discussion – none
Abstentions – none
Approval – unanimously approved

B. Approval of Minutes

- October 16, 2026

- **Motion –** To approve minutes of October 16, 2026. M/S: Anniqua Rana, Adriana Lugo.
  Discussion – none
  Abstentions – none
  Approval – unanimously approved

C. PBC IPC Representative Coverage – 11/18 & 12/2

Allison Hughes requested a volunteer to cover the IPC representative role at PBC meetings on November 18 and December 2, as she has been asked to support the Faculty Learning Program's online learning group, which meets at the same time. She noted that the November 18 meeting will include discussions of position and resource prioritization. Anniqua Rana volunteered to serve as the IPC representative at the PBC meetings on November 18 and December 2. Chialin Hsieh volunteered to serve as a backup for December 2 meeting, if needed.

D. Committee Prep - Let's Get Ready to Give Feedback on Instructional Comprehensive Program Review Narratives!

- IPC's role in program review feedback (Presentation)

- Guidance for how to give appropriate and helpful feedback
- Review the new feedback rubric format

Allison Hughes presented an overview of the Instructional Program Review (IPR) feedback process, reviewing the purpose of IPC feedback, the evaluation rubric, and expectations for constructive comments. She emphasized that feedback should focus on whether required questions have been adequately addressed and should recognize program successes while responding to areas for improvement identified by the programs themselves. Comments should be constructive and support further reflection and improvement of the program review document, rather than evaluate program decisions or performance.

Allison introduced the new Smartsheet version of the IPR feedback rubric, which will be piloted this year in place of the fillable PDF. The new format retains the existing criteria and includes options for "No Recommendation/No Change Needed," "Not Applicable," and "Exemplary Response" for each question. Members were invited to test the form and share any technical or formatting issues before the November 20 meeting.

Allison outlined the November 20 review process, which will cover 11 program reviews. Members will be organized into approximately six groups of at least three participants, with each group reviewing one or two programs. Groups will include a mix of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, with at least one faculty member and one experienced reviewer per group. Members may indicate program review preferences in advance, provided they are not reviewing their own program. Program review authors may also be invited to attend to answer questions, depending on their availability.

Kiran Malavade suggested clarifying communications to programs about who reviews their program reviews, emphasizing that IPC feedback comes from faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Members discussed clarifying this information in communications to programs and encouraging IPC representatives to invite interested colleagues from their constituencies to participate in the November 20 review session. Allison confirmed that additional participants are welcome and requested advance notice, when possible, to assist with group assignments, although members may also attend without advance notice.

Members expressed appreciation for the presentation and the revised feedback form.

E. Committee Prep - Let's Get Ready to Review Reassigned Time Applications!

- Quick review of what reassigned time is and why it exists
- IPC's role in reassigned time application review (Presentation)

Allison Hughes presented an overview of the faculty reassigned time application review process in preparation for IPC's December 4 meeting. She explained that reassigned time allows faculty to take on responsibilities outside their regular contractual workload, with assignments funded by the college or grants. Regular faculty responsibilities are often backfilled by another faculty member.

Allison clarified IPC's role in reviewing applications, focusing on three areas:

- Whether proposed duties extend beyond responsibilities outlined in Appendix D of the faculty contract.

- Whether the requested reassigned time is appropriate for the duties described.
- Whether the work is most appropriately performed by a faculty member.

Allison emphasized that IPC provides feedback and recommendations to the VPI, including support, suggested revisions, or concerns, but does not determine whether a position is needed. Certain established assignments, including Academic Senate positions and the Curriculum Committee Chair, fall outside the regular IPC review process.

During the discussion, Nadia Biglari asked whether changes to the Academic Senate Treasurer's reassigned time allocation required IPC review. Allison clarified that the Senate may redistribute its existing allocation among positions through its own governance process, provided the total allocation remains unchanged, that process can be reviewed via the Conditions in which Reassigned Time is Awarded page.

Allison outlined the December 4 review process, noting that applications and supervisor feedback will be shared with IPC members in advance. Members will discuss their feedback and develop recommendations during the meeting. Application authors and deans will also be invited to answer questions and clarify proposed duties. Allison added that materials would be compiled into an accessible, formatted document.

Paul Roscelli suggested reviewing the application questions for potential redundancy, particularly between the initial general prompt and subsequent questions. Allison agreed to revisit the application structure and consider streamlining it in the spring.

F. Reassigned Time Budget Update

- Annual update on the budget for reassigned time positions, as the deadline for reassigned time applications approaches (11/13/26).

Chialin Hsieh presented the annual Reassigned Time Budget Update, reviewing historical reassigned time allocations and estimated expenses for 2024–2025 through 2026–2027. She explained that the report tracks college department positions, Academic Center and AFT allocations, and grant-funded reassigned time. AFT allocations are provided through the established AFT/HR process and are tracked by IPC for budget and recordkeeping purposes rather than through the IPC review process.

For budget estimates, the college uses Grade 3, Step 18 of the faculty salary schedule, including benefits, as an average cost of approximately $199,000 per FTEF. Based on this calculation and updated salary schedules, estimated reassigned time expenses were approximately $3 million for 2024–2025, $3.1 million for 2025–2026, and $3 million for 2026–27. Chialin noted that these are estimates rather than actual individual salary and benefit costs.

Chialin emphasized the importance of continuing to monitor reassigned time allocations and associated expenses during the upcoming academic year and invited individuals to submit any questions to her via email.

G. 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?**

Dean of the Business, Design, & Workforce Division, Alex Kramer, presented regional, sub-regional, and statewide Career Technical Education (CTE) outcomes data from the Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC), highlighting demographic trends, educational attainment, cost of living, enrollment, and student persistence. The presentation identified several regional trends, including an aging population, increasing racial and ethnic diversity, and rising living costs. Alex noted that the estimated living wage for a single adult with no children in San Mateo County had increased to approximately $80,000 annually and emphasized the importance of using living wage data when developing CTE programs, certificates, degrees, and career pathways.

The data showed that Bay Area CTE enrollment was recovering more slowly than statewide enrollment trends, remaining approximately 7% below pre-pandemic levels. However, Cañada College's CTE headcount increased by approximately 28% between 2020 and 2025. Regional CTE persistence rates also increased by approximately 2%, while dual enrollment participation grew across the region. The San Francisco Peninsula sub-region saw dual enrollment participation increase from 7% to 11% during the same period.

During the discussion, IPC members considered how the region's high educational attainment might inform future degree and curriculum offerings. Paul Roscelli suggested comparing enrollment trends across other sub-regions to determine whether educational attainment levels correlate with enrollment challenges. Alex highlighted opportunities to develop programs that support incumbent workers seeking to upskill or transition careers. Kiran Malavade noted that the "some college" category does not necessarily indicate degree completion and may represent potential students, while Jessica Marshall added that some community members enroll in courses for personal interest rather than degree attainment. The discussion highlighted the importance of considering diverse student goals and workforce needs when planning future CTE offerings. Nadia Biglari suggested a faculty-focused Flex Day session to share the data and explore its implications. Alex expressed interest in developing a session, potentially incorporating more detailed completion-rate data, and noted that the findings could also inform future college planning and discussions within IPC inquiry groups.

Alex thanked IPC members for their engagement, confirmed that the presentation would be shared with the committee, and welcomed any additional questions via email.

H. Inquiry Group Updates

- **Work-Based Learning**
- **Regional Workforce Alignment**

Alex Kramer provided updates on the two IPC inquiry groups currently underway: Work-Based Learning and Regional Workforce/CTE Program Alignment.

The Work-Based Learning Inquiry Group has begun discussions about the continuum of work-based learning opportunities, ranging from career awareness and exploration (e.g., speaker series and job shadowing) to direct engagement (e.g., externships, internships, and job placement). The group is working to inventory existing college activities and identify opportunities across

programs. A survey has been developed and shared with campus constituency groups for feedback. Once finalized, it will be distributed to faculty and staff through division meetings to document current work-based learning activities.

The Regional Workforce/CTE Program Alignment Inquiry Group is examining how Cañada College's programs align with regional employer needs and where opportunities exist to better serve employers and students. The group plans to use regional data to identify emerging workforce needs and collaborate with industry partners to better understand in-demand skills.

Alex encouraged broader participation to bring diverse perspectives to the discussion and invited interested members to email him for the next meeting invitation.

I. Curriculum Report

Adriana Lugo reminded faculty who have received feedback from the Technical Review Committee or deans to complete their Course Outline of Record (COR) revisions and resubmit them by November 20, 2026, to be included on the final Curriculum Committee agenda of the semester, scheduled for December 3, 2026. Courses submitted after the deadline will not be included in the Fall 2027 Class Schedule and Catalog. She clarified that many suggested revisions reflect the IDEA mandate adopted last year, which was not in place during some courses' previous review cycles. Courses with substantive changes will be presented at the December 3 meeting, while courses that do not require substantive changes may be submitted the following semester. Adriana noted that she had sent faculty instructions for requesting assistance with revisions and encouraged faculty to contact the Cañada College Curriculum Committee at cancurriculum@smccd.edu to schedule support. For technical issues with accessing editing functions, faculty may contact Curriculum Specialist, Frank Nguyen Le, and copy the Cañada College Curriculum Committee email.

J. Important Dates:

- November 13th - 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. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:05am.

IPC Goals (2026 – 2027) Standing Goals:

- Standing Goals for 2026-2027:
  - 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 2026-2027:
  - 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