



PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

In-Person and Via Zoom

Regular Meeting: 2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Members present: Maria Huning, Lisa Palmer, Nick Carr, Alicia Aguirre, Julie Luu, Jose Zelaya, Alex Kramer, Megan Rodriguez Antone, Lizette Bricker, Ludmila Prisecar, Olivia Cortez-Figueroa, Roz Young, Rosie Mendoza Morrison, Diana Tedone-Goldstone, Chanel Meanor, Julian Taylor, Chialin Hsieh, Kassie Alexander, Christopher Wardell, Chantal Sosa, Karen Engel, Kim Lopez

Members absent: Shanda DeRosans, Denise Erickson

Guests and others present: Robyn Ledesma, Allison Hughes, Anniqua Rana, Maria Lara-Blanco, Dave Eck, Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, Wissem Bennani, Ariela Villalpando, Mary Ho, Max Hartman, Jasmine Jaciw

AGENDA ITEM	CONTENT
<p>Welcome, Introductions and Approval of Consent Agenda</p>	<p>Maria Huning began the meeting and confirmed that quorum had been established. She reviewed the Consent Agenda, which included approval of the March 18 PBC Meeting minutes and staffing updates from the March 25 Board Meeting.</p> <p>The PBC consent agenda included the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 18, 2026 Meeting Minutes • Board-approved staffing updates: • 03/25/26 Meeting <p>Motion: A motion to approve the Consent Agenda was made by Roz Young and seconded by Chialin Hsieh</p> <p>Discussion: none</p> <p>Abstentions: none</p> <p>Approval: all present members voted in favor of the motion; motion passed</p>
<p>REGULAR AGENDA</p>	
<p>2026 Annual and Annual Fiscal Reports Submitted to the ACCJC presented by Karen Engel, Dean of PRIE, ALO and Ludmila Prisecar, VPA</p>	<p>The group moved into the regular agenda and received a presentation from Karen Engel and Ludmila Prisecar regarding the 2026 Annual and Annual Fiscal reports submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). Karen explained that these reports were required each year in addition to other accreditation materials and were publicly posted on the institution’s accreditation webpage. She noted that the annual report compiled key institutional data—such as enrollment and performance metrics—drawn</p>

	<p>directly from the institution’s set standards, including baseline thresholds, aspirational goals, and actual outcomes, and presented trends over a three-year period. Ludmila added that the fiscal report similarly included three years of district-wide financial data, focusing on financial statements and ratios to demonstrate the college’s fiscal stability and ensure it was not at risk of financial distress, with data largely provided by the district. She also clarified that these reports were submitted to meet statewide requirements and typically did not receive direct feedback from the commission. During the discussion, Chialin Hsieh highlighted the notable improvement in course success rates shown in the annual report, emphasizing that such gains were difficult to achieve and nearly met the institution’s stretch goal. The group took a moment to celebrate this progress and expressed appreciation for the collective efforts of the college, particularly teams involved in monitoring outcomes and supporting professional development initiatives.</p>
<p>Update to Cañada’s Quantitative Reasoning Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) and ILO Four Additional Presentation presented by Diana Tedone-Goldstone, Academic Senate President, David Eck and Rebekah Sidman-Taveau, IPC Representatives and Michael Hoffman, Mathematics Representative</p> <p>Proposed Action: adopt changes to the Quantitative Reasoning ILO as approved by Academic Senate</p>	<p>The group moved to an agenda item on updating the college’s Quantitative Reasoning Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO). Rebekah Sidman-Taveau explained that a small workgroup—including Kiran Malavade and Michael Hoffman in consultation with Ray Lapuz—had reviewed prior assessment results after they were shared in earlier institutional discussions and noticed that this particular ILO had the lowest student self-assessment score (84%) compared to other outcomes. The original wording asked students to “represent complex data in various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, statistics, and words) and analyze these data to make judgments and draw appropriate conclusions.” The group found this result surprising, as students graduating from the college were generally expected to have these skills. They concluded that the phrasing—especially terms like “complex” and “various mathematical forms”—may have been unclear or intimidating, potentially affecting how students interpreted and responded to the question rather than accurately reflecting their abilities.</p> <p>To address this, the workgroup revised the ILO to simplify and clarify the language by removing potentially confusing terms, broadening “mathematical forms” to “various forms,” and reordering examples to highlight more familiar representations like graphs, diagrams, and tables before equations. The revised outcome emphasized representing data in multiple forms and analyzing it to draw appropriate conclusions. Rebekah noted that the proposal had already been reviewed and approved by both the Instructional Planning Council and the Academic Senate, and she acknowledged that while changing the wording could impact consistency in longitudinal data comparisons, the group believed the improvement in clarity would lead to more accurate and meaningful assessment results over time.</p> <p>During discussion, David Eck, who had also participated in earlier review stages supported the revision, agreeing that removing “complex” would help focus on the skill itself and likely produce more reliable student responses. Kim Lopez raised a question about whether the updated wording would be implemented in time for the current graduating class, and it was confirmed that, pending</p>

	<p>approval, it would be included in the graduation survey that was about to be distributed.</p> <p>Motion: A motion to adopt changes to the Quantitative Reasoning ILO as approved by Academic Senate was made by Chialin Hsieh and seconded by Alex Kramer</p> <p>Discussion: The workgroup was thanked for their thoughtful analysis and documentation, and members expressed interest in seeing future data to determine whether the revised wording improved assessment outcomes.</p> <p>Abstentions: none</p> <p>Approval: all present members voted in favor of the motion; motion passed</p>
<p>PBC Program Review Subcommittee request to approve Academic Senate’s request for a Spring Submission Option for Tenure-Track Faculty Doing Comprehensive Program Review presented by Diana Tedone-Goldstone, Academic Senate President and David Eck, Philosophy Professor</p> <p>Proposed Action: approve the Spring Submission Option for Tenure-Track Faculty Doing Comprehensive Program Review</p>	<p>The group considered a proposal from the Program Review Subcommittee to approve an Academic Senate request creating a spring submission option for comprehensive program review in narrowly defined situations involving tenure-track faculty. The proposal, which had already been approved by the Academic Senate, specified that departments would be eligible only if their sole full-time faculty member was on the tenure track and simultaneously undergoing tenure evaluation during the same academic year. In such cases, departments would be given the option—rather than a requirement—to submit their comprehensive program review in the spring instead of the traditional fall deadline. The intent was to alleviate the significant workload burden on newer faculty who would otherwise be required to complete both tenure evaluation and a full program review in the same semester.</p> <p>Further clarification was provided that the option could also apply in situations where tenured faculty were unavailable, such as being on leave, leaving only tenure-track faculty responsible for departmental responsibilities. While an existing one-year deferral option for program review was acknowledged, it was explained that this approach was not ideal because tenure evaluations always occur in the fall, meaning a deferral would simply shift the conflict to the following year or delay program review for several years. Members shared concrete examples of new faculty who had been required to complete comprehensive program reviews during their very first semester while also navigating the demands of tenure evaluation, illustrating how frequently this issue had arisen and why a more flexible solution was needed.</p> <p>The group also discussed how the proposal would intersect with budgeting and resource request processes, emphasizing that those timelines would remain unchanged. Departments would still need to submit resource requests in the fall if they wanted them considered in the standard cycle, though completing a smaller annual update was noted to be far less burdensome than a full comprehensive review. It was acknowledged that this change would affect only a small number of departments but could have a meaningful impact on workload balance, faculty experience, and potentially retention. Members also noted that similar discussions had already taken place in other governance bodies, helping</p>

	<p>to build awareness and consensus, and that some areas might still handle such situations on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Motion: A motion to approve the Spring Submission Option for Tenure-Track Faculty Doing Comprehensive Program Review was made by Chialin Hsieh and seconded by Lisa Palmer</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion focused on appreciation for the collaborative process and recognition that the adjustment provided a practical, targeted solution to a recurring challenge faced by tenure-track faculty.</p> <p>Abstentions: none</p> <p>Approval: all present members voted in favor of the motion; motion passed</p>
<p>Distance Education Plan Update presented by Anniqua Rana, Dean of Academic Support and Learning Technologies and team</p>	<p>The group transitioned into plan updates. Anniqua Rana requested that the DE Plan Update and the Technology Plan Update be moved earlier in the agenda due to a team member having to leave early.</p> <p>Motion: A motion to reorder the agenda and move the DE Plan Update and the Technology Plan Update prior to the Transfer Plan Update was made by Roz Young and seconded by Chanel Meanor.</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion focused on appreciation for the collaborative process and recognition that the adjustment provided a practical, targeted solution to a recurring challenge faced by tenure-track faculty.</p> <p>Abstentions: none</p> <p>Approval: all present members voted in favor of the motion; motion passed</p> <p>The Council received a detailed presentation on the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) plan from Anniqua Rana and Allison Hughes. They explained that the plan, originally submitted in 2024, focused on strengthening professional development, expanding equitable support, and improving the overall effectiveness of distance education. The presenters emphasized that a significant portion of the student population—over a third fully online and additional students in hybrid formats—relied on these efforts, making the work critical. They highlighted that online course success rates had been improving, though equity gaps persisted among certain student groups, reinforcing the need for targeted support.</p> <p>The update outlined major accomplishments, including a comprehensive overhaul of the Faculty Distance Education Handbook to provide clearer, up-to-date guidance, and an extensive institutional effort to meet Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) standards required for accreditation. The DE team had engaged individually with approximately 95% of online faculty to ensure compliance and improve course quality, which was a major undertaking. They also described ongoing professional development efforts such as trainings, peer online course review processes, and continuous Canvas and instructional support, all coordinated through a collaborative structure involving instructional teams, student services, and IT. A strong current focus was on accessibility, driven by updated federal requirements, with plans to provide proactive, hands-</p>

	<p>on support to faculty using a “progress over perfection” approach to reduce stress while improving course accessibility for all students.</p> <p>Looking ahead, the team planned to strengthen assessment of the DEAC plan in preparation for developing the next iteration, expand work on universal design and accessibility, and address emerging issues such as artificial intelligence by offering flexible, faculty-centered support that accounted for varying levels of interest and comfort. They also intended to gather updated data through surveys to better guide future efforts and continue prioritizing the reduction of equity gaps in online learning environments. Anniqua and Allison concluded with an invitation for broader participation in this work.</p> <p>During discussion, Chialin Hsieh and Kim Lopez praised the DE team’s efforts, particularly their success in addressing high-stakes accreditation requirements related to RSI, noting that failure in this area could have serious institutional consequences. The team’s behind-the-scenes work was recognized as essential to ensuring compliance and supporting faculty. A student-related concern was raised about the lack of clear communication regarding how students should report accessibility issues in online courses. While it was explained that students could contact instructors, the Disability Resource Center, or escalate concerns to deans, it was acknowledged that this process was not always clearly or consistently communicated in syllabi or institutional materials. A suggestion was made to improve visibility and clarity of these pathways for all students.</p>
<p><u>Technology Plan Update</u> presented by Anniqua Rana, Dean of Academic Support and Learning Technologies and team</p>	<p>The group received a detailed update on the college’s Technology Plan from Anniqua Rana and Allison Hughes, who explained that the plan, developed as a three-year initiative and submitted in 2024, focused on ensuring reliable, equitable access to technology for all members of the campus community, including students, faculty, staff, and administrators. They emphasized that the plan extended beyond classroom technology to encompass campus-wide systems and relied on close collaboration with the district IT team. Key priorities included providing not only access to devices and internet resources—such as laptops and hotspots through the library—but also building digital literacy by offering training and support structures to help users effectively utilize available technologies.</p> <p>The presenters highlighted several accomplishments under the plan, including updates to the technology refresh process to reflect newer classroom technologies and ongoing demonstrations of emerging tools, particularly artificial intelligence applications, during Technology Committee meetings. A major achievement was the development of a centralized, searchable resource repository that consolidated previously scattered materials—such as guides for Canvas, Zoom, Pronto, and instructional design—into a single accessible platform for faculty. This repository was described as an evolving resource that would continue to expand based on user feedback. They also emphasized the committee’s intentional use of meeting time for hands-on learning, demos, and knowledge-sharing, which were then disseminated through divisions across campus.</p>

	<p>Looking ahead, the team planned to gather broader feedback to inform the next iteration of the technology plan, expand training opportunities, and continue addressing digital equity by reducing barriers to access and improving awareness of available tools and resources for both students and faculty. They also noted alignment with other institutional plans focused on equity and access. Beyond technical achievements, the presenters highlighted a cultural shift within the Technology Committee itself, explaining that it had evolved from a previously stressful environment into a more collaborative, supportive, and even enjoyable space, as reflected in positive unsolicited feedback from participants.</p> <p>During discussion, members commended the team’s progress, noting the significant transformation in both the effectiveness and atmosphere of the committee, and expressed appreciation for their leadership and innovation.</p>
<p><u>Transfer Plan Update</u> presented by Max Hartman, Dean of Counseling, Mary Ho, Director of Post-Secondary Success and the University Center, and Ariela Villalpando, Interim Program Supervisor Transfer Services</p>	<p>The meeting then transitioned to the transfer plan update, presented by Max Hartman, Mary Ho, and Ariela Villalpando. Max began by explaining the origins of the college’s Transfer Plan, noting that the Transfer Task Force had been formed in fall of 2020 to unify previously siloed transfer-related efforts across campus. This led to the adoption of the college’s first formal Transfer Services Plan in 2021, which was later revised to meet statewide requirements for ongoing transfer planning. A key development from this process was the creation of the Transfer Advisory Workgroup, a collaborative body responsible for implementing the plan’s initiatives. Ariela described how this group met regularly and included a broad range of internal and external stakeholders—such as counselors, program representatives, and university partners from both UC and CSU systems—as well as student voices, ensuring diverse input into transfer strategies.</p> <p>Ariela and Mary then outlined several major strategies and accomplishments. These included the development of clearer transfer maps for students, designed with user-friendly visuals based on student feedback, and the integration of transfer considerations into program review processes with an equity focus. They also highlighted the establishment of consistent communication systems, such as Canvas updates and newsletters, to widely share transfer information, events, and deadlines. Additional progress included building data-sharing partnerships with universities, coordinating campus visits through collaborative working groups, and creating tools like a transfer engagement survey while continuing work on a more streamlined data system. Furthermore, processes had been implemented to ensure that students with transfer goals were placed into appropriate degree pathways, such as AD-T programs, in alignment with state mandates.</p> <p>During discussion, Chanel Meanor raised concerns about how transfer timelines and policies—particularly those tied to financial aid and course load requirements—might negatively affect students who needed more time, such as those in high-unit majors or with disabilities. Max responded that the Transfer Center prioritized supporting students based on their individual timelines rather than pushing rigid deadlines, emphasizing that the goal was to provide appropriate guidance and resources for successful transfer. He also noted upcoming improvements, including the addition of full-time transfer counselors,</p>

	<p>which would allow for more personalized advising. Acknowledging that new policies could impact students, he explained that the college would continue monitoring their effects and adapt accordingly, especially as more data became available after implementation.</p>
<p>Professional Development Plan Update presented by Anniqua Rana, Dean of Academic Support and Learning Technologies and team</p>	<p>The Professional Development Plan update was then presented by Anniqua Rana and Roz Young, with additional context noting that Ellen Young was absent due to preparation for the upcoming Flex Day. Anniqua emphasized that the update was closely tied to the institution’s broader professional development efforts, particularly Flex activities, and reminded participants to register for sessions. She explained that the plan, developed as part of a three-year cycle and accessible through the Professional Development Planning Committee (PDPC) website, had been informed by survey feedback from 2023. That feedback had identified key gaps, including insufficient support for classified professional development and the need for more sustained focus on equity and anti-racism. These priorities had since become central to the plan’s implementation over the past two years.</p> <p>Rana described the plan’s goals of not only increasing participation in professional development opportunities such as Flex Days, conferences, and workshops, but also evaluating their impact on employee growth and student success. She noted that efforts were underway to better assess how professional learning translated into practice and outcomes. Roz Young then reported that classified professional development funding had been institutionalized at approximately \$2,500 per employee, barring future budget constraints, and confirmed that classified staff now had dedicated time off to attend Flex activities. She also shared that there was increasing district-wide participation in professional development opportunities, including from facilities, public safety, and bookstore employees, reflecting broader engagement beyond the college.</p> <p>Anniqua added that recent Flex programming had incorporated more classified-focused sessions, particularly in April and October, and that the college aimed to strengthen shared learning across all employee groups. She highlighted ongoing integration of professional development efforts such as QOTL and POCR, and emphasized continuous learning through conferences and campus initiatives. A featured example was then shared by Lizette, who described her experience attending the Colegas conference for Latinx professionals. She explained that the conference was culturally affirming, energizing, and community-building, and inspired participants to create an Employee Resource Group (ERG) on campus. This group, modeled after existing ERGs, had begun meeting monthly and focused on sustaining culturally relevant dialogue and engagement while also supporting professional development.</p> <p>The presenters concluded by noting that this ERG development reflected broader goals of institutionalizing professional development as a collaborative and inclusive practice. Anniqua emphasized continued efforts to evaluate impact, improve access to funding processes, and ensure that professional development translated into meaningful workplace and student outcomes. The update closed with an invitation for broader participation in the Professional Development</p>

	<p>Planning Committee and a reminder of ongoing Flex Day activities, reinforcing the theme of professional development as a shared, campus-wide effort.</p>
STANDING ITEMS	
Associated Students of Cañada College	<p>Chanel Meanor reported on updates from Associated Students, noting that Shonda DeRosans and several student senators were traveling to Florida to attend a student leadership conference, with anticipation that they would return with new insights to share with the campus community. She also shared that she, and other students were scheduled to present at Flex Day the following day on how to be effective UndocuAlly supporters. The session would include discussion of real scenarios faculty and staff might encounter, guidance on appropriate responses, and opportunities for feedback. A key focus of the presentation was helping participants translate what they learned into immediate, practical actions in their interactions with students, particularly from a student-centered perspective.</p>
Classified Senate of Cañada College	<p>Maria Huning provided an update on Classified Senate activities, explaining that a previously scheduled meeting in early April had been canceled due to challenges, with the next meeting rescheduled for the following Thursday at 1 p.m., where interested participants were encouraged to attend. She reported that at the most recent meeting, the Senate finalized plans to order and install a memorial bench, with the selected color determined through group input as a pink bench. The group also received a presentation from Vice President of Administrative Services, Ludmila, regarding updates and changes to the field trip policy, which prompted additional questions and ideas for future discussion with the Business Office.</p> <p>Maria further noted that upcoming meetings would include voting on new Classified Senate leadership positions, as several roles were open and needed to be filled through elections, while she and Paul Gaskins remained in their positions. She indicated that nominations would be discussed at the next meeting and leadership selections were expected to be finalized in May, ensuring continuity of Classified Senate governance moving forward.</p>
Academic Senate of Cañada College	<p>Diana Tedone-Goldstone shared that at the last Academic Senate meeting, the body had voted on updates to instructional learning outcomes and had approved the option for a spring comprehensive program review timeline for departments with only tenure-track faculty. Members also received a presentation from the VPSS regarding potential commencement reader technology, which was discussed as a possible pilot for a future graduation cycle rather than immediate implementation. In preparation for the following week's meeting, several major discussion items were outlined, including recommendations from a Cycle Alignment Workgroup that aimed to better coordinate the Instructional Comprehensive Program Review Cycle, Student Learning Outcomes assessment, and curriculum updates. The Senate also prepared to review an initial draft of a revised Program Development Process, which was not yet slated for implementation but was being introduced for early feedback. Additionally, updates from District Academic Senate were brought forward, including proposed revisions to equivalency procedures intended to streamline and shorten lengthy approval timelines, as well as updates to faculty screening guidelines</p>

	<p>that would be taken up for district-level voting in May. Overall, the meeting had set up a robust set of upcoming discussions focused on structural academic processes and governance refinements.</p>
<p>Planning Council Reports: IPC, SSPC, EAPC</p>	<p>IPC:</p> <p>Lisa Palmer shared that at the most recent IPC meeting, the Council held a highly engaging and well-attended session in which Social Sciences faculty presented their program reviews. The presentations were described as particularly interesting and energizing, contributing to a positive and productive meeting atmosphere. The next IPC meeting had been scheduled for the upcoming Friday.</p> <p>SSPC:</p> <p>Lizette Bricker shared that at the most recent SSPC meeting, the Council reviewed and approved the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) critical questions proposal after it had been routed through governance groups. Additionally, they also discussed the CPR option submission that had been referenced in earlier reports. In addition, the group heard a presentation on EMP 3.11 focused on creating and expanding career exploration experiences, which had been shared by Max Hartman and members of the EMP task force. Juan Vera also delivered a detailed update on academic standing, including data on student progression and proposed language changes, which provided useful insights into student outcomes and policy implications.</p> <p>EAPC:</p> <p>Chris Wardell shared that EAPC continued to receive updates on the Student Equity and Achievement Plan (SEAP), including progress on new transportation alternatives and the updated comprehensive SEAP campaign, which were among the key metrics reviewed. The Council also examined potential equity training solutions by analyzing program review data across both instructional and student services areas. Following these presentations, the tri-chairs collaborated to synthesize the information and evaluate which types of equity-focused professional development would best support campus needs. The group concluded by noting that further updates and recommendations would be forthcoming as the work continued to develop.</p>
<p>President's Update</p>	<p>Kim Lopez reported that she and Karen Engel had recently met with ACCJC peer review team leadership to finalize the college's accreditation visit date, which had been set for Monday, September 28th. Because there were no core inquiries identified, the visiting team had not requested interviews with faculty, staff, or administrators. The planned visit would begin with a brief tour of the Menlo Park site, followed by activities on the main campus including meet-and-greets with individuals involved in the institutional self-evaluation report, an open forum, campus walkthroughs, and required compliance file checks. The team would have a designated room as their working space to complete report writing, and will conclude with an open exit interview where preliminary findings and any commendations would be shared with the campus community. Kim also noted that the visit was expected to be relatively short, lasting about</p>

	<p>half a day. In addition, she reflected that the academic year felt like it was rapidly progressing into May, highlighting several overlapping upcoming events and commitments across the district and county—including JobTrain’s Breakfast of Champions, the Progress Seminar focused on regional issues, and legislative advocacy efforts related to free community college—and emphasized the importance of staying aware of the busy end-of-year calendar, which included Earth Day activities, a fashion show, and the upcoming commencement ceremony.</p>
<p>Matters of Public Interest and Upcoming Events</p>	<p>At the end of the meeting, several matters of public interest and upcoming events were shared, beginning with a shout-out recognizing the successful Oye campus event held on March 28, which was praised for its strong community engagement, positive energy, and meaningful programming. It was described as a highly impactful gathering that brought the campus and community together in a celebratory and uplifting way.</p> <p>An announcement was made about the upcoming “Burning for Justice” film screening and discussion scheduled for April 23, which would feature Dr. Rob Alexander presenting documentary excerpts in response to student interest, with themes centered on justice and storytelling.</p> <p>Additional campus events were highlighted, including the postponed Star Party rescheduled for April 24th, the Student Recognition and Achievement Ceremony on May 15, the Honors Research Showcase, the Eco Elegance Fashion Show, and the overlapping slate of late-April activities such as research symposiums and cultural events. Reminders were shared about keeping the campus events calendar updated, improving visibility of events on the website for students, and ensuring broad awareness of the busy schedule leading into the end of the academic year.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>Meeting adjourned at 3:47pm</p>
<p>Next Meeting</p>	<p>The next meeting will be held on May 6, 2026</p>