Institutional Research and Planning Committee

MINUTES

Monday, October 19, 2026
10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. via Zoom

Committee Membership and Attendance
(P=Present; A=Absent)

Committee Chair:		Academic Senate President:		ASCC	
Lan Hao	P	Renee Liskey	A	Kimphing (Phing) Lov	P
Management:		**Faculty:**		**Guest(s):**	
Eric Calderon	P	Toros Berberyan	P	Dana Hester	P
My Chau	A	Dave Kary	A	David Rodriguez	P
Jeremy Clark	P	Michelle Plug	P	Xiaoran Yu	P
Jessica Lopez Jimenez	A	Levi Richard	P		
AnnMarie Ruelas	P	**Classified:**			
Ty Thomas	P	Anthony Delgado	P		
Supervisor/confidential:		Yueyi Huang	P		
Doug Schultz	P				

1. **September 21, 2026 Meeting Minutes Review and Approval**
   The minutes were approved as presented.

2. **BP/AP 3250 – Institutional Planning: Action to approve**
   - **Review and approve edits from the June 1 meeting**
   - **Next steps**

   A recap of the suggested edits to both the BP and AP discussed during the June 1 meeting were shared. The goal for today is to:
   a. Present and explain the edits
   b. Approve the final versions in order to begin the constituent review process

   For purposes of these minutes, only substantial edits are clarified.

   To validate the suggested edits, verifications were made where appropriate.
   - BP:
     - It has been confirmed that "Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) Plan" is no longer required by the CCCCO. This plan will be removed from the BP.

- AP:
  - References section – the ACCJC standards have been changed to reflect the newer, 2024 standards as opposed to the former 2014 version.
  - Item #1 Previous version:

    1. The Citrus Community College District, through established committees with representation from faculty, administration, classified staff, and students, will review and recommend planning decisions related to human, physical, technology, and financial resources.

    It was agreed that the use of the word "decisions" was not a good fit. The phrase has been changed to read: "will review and develop planning recommendations related to human, physical, technology, and financial resources."

  - Item #2 Previous version:

    2. Applying the criteria of applicable accreditation standards, the planning process will be guided by adopted vision, mission and core values statements and will develop specific goals, objectives and strategies, which have measurable outcomes and specific accountability. Action plans will be reviewed and revised periodically and approved by the respective planning bodies.

    The college does not refer to its values as "core values." Also, the term "measurable objectives" (not "measurable outcomes") is more appropriate because measurable objectives are a primary component of our strategic plan. The entire phrase has been changed to read: "will be guided by the adopted mission, vision, and values and will develop specific goals and strategies, which have measurable objectives with defined outcomes and transparent accountability."

  - Item #6 Two changes:

    Item #6 is meant to be a description of the college's integrated planning model which was very recently updated. The language should be in alignment with the new model.

    vision, and values. This sets the stage for the development of the Strategic Pla – a five-year plan identifying the overarching institutional goal, measurable objectives, and critical focus areas. The Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) is the college's long-term plan for Academic Affairs, Student Services

    There is no longer an "overarching institutional goal" with the adoption of the 2026-2031 Strategic Plan. This phrase has been changed to read:
    "-- a five-year plan identifying the focus areas and the measurable objectives"

    an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation. Assessment efforts focus on the Strategic Plan and guide the development of area program reviews and division plans to achieve the institutional goal and strategic objectives, and to inform resource allocations. Assessment findings then inform program improvement plans and the next cycle of planning begins.

    The sentence has been removed. It appears redundant. The beginning of item #6 sufficiently describes institutional planning at Citrus College.

- Item #7 – Student Equity and Achievement (SEA) Program
    i. Change the heading to the actual name of the plan "Student Equity Plan"
    ii. Remove the entire first sentence. The initiatives described are either no longer relevant or state mandated.
    iii. Add "/1705" after AB 705. These two assembly bills go hand-in-hand.
    iv. Replace "all" with "non-exempt." Some students are exempt.
- Item #7 – Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) Plan
  Remove this entire item to be consistent with the BP.

3. CCSSE Results Part B:

- **AI questions follow up**
- **CCSSE 2026 engagement profile**

As a reminder: The CCSSE results constitute 1,038 student responses. The results are weighted meaning the responses are statistically adjusted to reflect the demographic composition of Citrus College's enrolled student population — and are therefore representation of the Citrus College student population.

Xiaoran Yu, research analyst, provided a brief topical recap of the information shared at the September 21 IRPC meeting during the CCSSE discussion. This recap was meant to provide the foundation for today's discussion – Part B.

First, the survey results of the four AI-related supplemental questions was reviewed.

- Q1 — AI Familiarity: About 3 in 4 students (75%) reported familiarity with AI tools such as ChatGPT, Google Gemini, and Grammarly.
- Q2 — AI Use for Coursework: Nearly 93% of students reported using AI tools never or only sometimes. Just 7% said they use AI often or very often.
- Q3 — Who Taught AI Literacy: About half of students (49%) said no one at the college has taught them how to evaluate AI-generated content. Among those who did receive guidance, instructors were the most common source (35%).
- Q4 — AI Improved My Learning: Overall, 37% of students agreed that AI has improved their learning. This varies considerably by usage (Q2 and Q4 cross-tabulation): Among students who use AI frequently, 87% say it improved their learning — compared to just 34% among those who rarely or never use it.

Next, a disaggregation analysis was conducted to ascertain whether students' experiences with AI tools differ across the following student groups:

- race/ethnicity
- gender
- first-generation status
- enrollment status
- major

This may prompt targeted questions about equity and access.

Q1 – AI Familiarity

Overall, 75% of Citrus College students reported familiarity with AI tools. Familiarity was high across all demographic groups.

Group	Familiar with AI (%)
Overall	**75%**
Hispanic students	**77%**
First-generation students	**77%**
Male students	**73%**
Female students	**77%**
Physical Science & Math (major)	**93%**
Admin of Justice & Criminal Justice (major)	**92%**

Q2 – AI Use for Coursework

While familiarity is broadly distributed, frequent AI use for coursework remains limited overall (7%). Differences across groups are more pronounced here.

There is a significant difference between awareness and active use (Q1 vs. Q2).

Group	Often/Very Often (%)
Overall	**7%**
Male students	**10%**
Female students	**6%**
Hispanic students	**5%**
Computer Science (major)	**33%**
Physical Science & Math (major)	**20%**

Q3 – Who Taught Students About Evaluating AI Content

Across all demographic groups, the most common response was that no one at the college taught students how to evaluate AI-generated content.

Notable findings:

- Among part-time students, 55% said no one — slightly higher than full-time students (44%). Full-time students were also more likely to cite instructors (38% vs. 33%) and classmates or peers (16% vs. 10%) as sources of guidance.
- Instructors remain the most commonly cited source of AI literacy guidance across all groups, ranging from about 33% to 40% depending on the subgroup.

Q4 – AI Tools Have Improved My Learning

Overall, 37% of students agreed that AI has improved their learning, 42% disagreed. Responses vary across subgroups.

Greater familiarity (Q1) alone does not necessarily drive use (Q2) or perceived benefit (Q4).

Group	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)
Overall	**37%**	**42%**
First-generation students	**40%**	**37%**
Not first-generation students	**36%**	**44%**
Full-time students	**40%**	**43%**
Part-time students	**35%**	**41%**
Male students	**40%**	**39%**
Female students	**37%**	**43%**

A comment/question was made which may pose an opportunity for additional future data analysis:

> In terms of AI literacy among students – are they aware of how AI can be used to support their learning while not using AI to provide the answers. AI can be used ethically as a tool to support learning.
>
> A faculty workshop is being developed to take place in November. It will be a panel format. Positive stories will be shared about how industry relies upon AI, vs. the academic integrity issue.

Lastly, results from the main CCSSE survey were shared. They were categorized into themes. The intricate details shared can be found in Attachment One.

- Narrative: Who Are Our Students, and How Are They Engaging?
- Strengths – What is Citrus College doing well?
- Areas for Attention
- Summary: Key Findings by Theme

Meeting adjourned.

Remaining meeting date for 2026-27:

11/16/26
3/1/27
4/5/27
5/3/27
6/7/27

NOTE: This meeting's supporting documents including the recording and chat transcript are available upon request. Please email irpe@citruscollege.edu.

Citrus College — CCSSE 2026: Student Engagement Profile

Analysis of notable differences between Citrus College and the 2026 National Cohort | Internal Use
Threshold: differences of ≥5 percentage points are flagged as notable. Smaller differences are included where substantively meaningful. Comparison group: The 2026 Cohort. ***Green*** *(▲) =* ***Citrus higher****.* ***Red*** *(▼) =* ***Citrus lower****.*

Narrative: Who Are Our Students, and How Are They Engaging?

Citrus College 2026 CCSSE results paint a picture of a college serving a distinctive student population — younger, more likely to be taking face-to-face classes, less burdened by family caregiving responsibilities than the national cohort, and notably more engaged with career-related services. At the same time, the data surface meaningful gaps in academic preparation behaviors, proactive outreach, and participation in high-impact practices that deserve institutional attention.

A Younger, More Traditional Student Body — With a Diverse Linguistic Profile

Citrus College students skew younger and more traditionally configured than the national cohort. They are:

- far less likely to be married (Item 40; **8.8% vs. 18.1%**),
- less likely to have children living with them (Item 37; **13.4% vs. 23.0%**), and
- far less likely to be spending 30 or more hours per week caring for dependents (Item 10d; **8.0% vs. 17.5%**).
- also less likely to be working 30 or more hours per week for pay (Item 10b; **22.7% vs. 30.7%**).

This demographic profile suggests that our students, on average, carry fewer competing life demands than students at peer institutions — which could be an asset for engagement if the college creates the right conditions to draw students in.

One important counterpoint: Citrus College has a notably higher share of students for whom English is not their first language (Item 41; **24.8% vs. 19.3%; +5.5pp** above the cohort). Combined with a higher proportion of students whose highest credential is a high school diploma (Item 46; **73.9% vs. 67.1%; +5.9pp**), and a lower share of students reporting A-level high school GPAs (Item 30; **26.2% vs. 33.1%**), this suggests our students arrive with diverse academic backgrounds and varying degrees of prior academic preparation.

A Commuter Campus, Majority Face-to-Face

Citrus College is a commuter-oriented, in-person institution.

- Fewer students report taking less than one hour in a week commuting to classes compared to other colleges (Item 10e; **16.1% vs. 23.8%**).
- While 55.3% of Citrus students take no online classes (Item 32b) at all, only 39.4% of the national cohort can say the same — a **+15.9pp** difference.
- In addition, Citrus had a much less share of students who took online only classes (Item 32a; **10.7% vs. 23.4%**).

Students are also concentrated in daytime classes (Item 31; **83.6% vs. 78.2%**), with fewer evening students than peer institutions (Item 31; **14.8% vs. 20.2%**). This class schedule profile is consistent with a younger, less-employed student population — but it also means the college may be less accessible to working adults and evening learners than peer institutions.

Strengths

1. Career Counseling: A Standout Strength

The most striking positive finding in this dataset is career counseling use. Only 42.9% of Citrus students have never used career counseling (Item 12.1b), compared to 62.8% nationally — a **+19.9pp** difference in the favorable direction.

> Translated: our students are using career counseling at nearly twice the national rate. **35.9%** of Citrus students have used the service two or more times (Item 12.1b), compared to just **20.3%** nationally (**+15.6pp**).

This is not a marginal difference — it is one of the largest positive gaps in the entire dataset. It is reinforced by other career-related items:

- Citrus students are more likely to report that the college has contributed significantly to developing their career goals (Item 11h; **70.9% vs. 66.8%**) and
- gaining career information (Item 11i; **66.9% vs. 62.2%**).

Career readiness is clearly an institutional strength as the college is outperforming the other colleges in the nation.

2. Campus Climate and College Support: Consistently Positive

Beyond career services, Citrus College students report a broadly positive perception of the campus environment.

- A strong majority — **82.7%** — said the college provides strong support to help them succeed (Item 9b; vs. 80.8% nationally), and
- **65.1%** said the college actively encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds (Item 9c; vs. 63.2% nationally).

While neither gap is dramatic, both are consistently above the national cohort and point in the same direction: students experience Citrus as a place that is invested in their success and committed to an inclusive campus community.

These findings are worth naming explicitly because they provide important context for the gaps identified elsewhere in this report. Students are not disengaged because they feel unwelcome or unsupported — the data suggest the opposite.

The challenge is channeling that positive campus experience into stronger academic preparation behaviors, more frequent use of support services, and deeper faculty-student connection.

3. In-Class Collaboration: A Genuine Strength

One standout positive in the engagement data is in-class collaboration. Citrus students are more likely to report working with other students on projects during class (Item 4f; **56.2% vs. 47.7%**, **+8.5pp**). This is the largest engagement behavior lead in the dataset.

It is interesting to compare the student data with what faculty are reporting. Among faculty, **47.6%** reported that students in their selected course section work with other students on projects often or very often (54% and 42% for part-time faculty and full-time faculty respectively). Overall, both faculty and students confirm that in-class collaborative work is a common experience at Citrus College, though students appear to perceive it as happening even more frequently than faculty report.

In general, data suggests that faculty are creating structured collaborative learning opportunities in the classroom, and students are experiencing them. This collaborative spirit also extends outside the classroom: **24.7%** of Citrus students reported working with classmates outside of class to prepare assignments (Item 4g; vs. 22.9% nationally), a modest but positive lead that suggests in-class collaboration may be fostering peer connections that continue beyond class time.

This strength also shows up in outcomes: Citrus students report a significantly larger contribution from the college to their ability to work effectively with others (Item 11f; **72.3% vs. 66.4%**).

2026 CCSSE Results (Students)

CCSSE Item	Variable	Responses	All Students	
			Count	Percent
In your experiences at this college during the current academic year, about how often have **you worked with other students on projects** during class?	CLASSGRP	Never	144	13.9%
		Sometimes	309	29.9%
		Often	321	31.0%
		Very often	261	25.2%
		Total	1,035	100.0%

2026 CCFSSE Results (Faculty)

CCFSSE Item	Variable	Responses	Part-Time		Full-Time		All Faculty	
			Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
How often **do students in your selected course** section work with other students on projects during class?	STUGRPINCL	Never	16	15.2%	28	27.2%	44	21.2%
		Sometimes	33	31.4%	32	31.1%	65	31.3%
		Often	25	23.8%	13	12.6%	38	18.3%
		Very often	31	29.5%	30	29.1%	61	29.3%
		Total	105	100.0%	103	100.0%	208	100.0%

Areas for Attention

1. Academic Advising: A More Complex Picture

The academic advising data requires careful interpretation. On the surface, the numbers look concerning: 28.0% of Citrus students have never used academic advising (Item 12.1a), compared to 16.2% nationally — a **+11.8pp** gap in the unfavorable direction. Among those who have used advising, Citrus students are less likely to have gone two or more times (Item 12.1a; **47.8% vs. 62.3%**).

However, this finding should be read alongside the transfer counseling data, which tells a different story: Citrus students are actually more likely to use transfer counseling (Item 12.1j; **27.6%** have used it at least once, **vs. 21.0%** nationally), a **+6.6pp** difference. This may suggest that students who have clear transfer goals are seeking out the right advising channel, while general academic advising is reaching a smaller share of the student population than it should.

The finding is also consistent with the orientation data: **26.3%** of Citrus students were not aware of a college orientation (Item 14; **vs. 19.3%** nationally), and Citrus students are less likely to have attended an on-campus orientation (Item 14; **23.3% vs. 31.7%).** Together, these patterns suggest that some students may be arriving at Citrus without the early onboarding touchpoints that connect them to advising and support services from the start.

2. High-Impact Practices: An Enrollment Gap

Citrus College shows notably lower participation in *high-impact practices* compared to the national cohort, and this is one of the most actionable findings in the dataset.

- First-year experience programs (Item 15): **10.9% vs. 23.2%** — Citrus students are less than half as likely to have participated in an FYE program.
- Student success courses (Item 17): **15.3% vs. 32.8%** — Again, Citrus is roughly half the national rate.
- Learning communities (Item 16): **9.1% vs. 13.0%** — A smaller but consistent gap.
- Computer lab use (Item 12.1h): Nearly three in four Citrus students (**73.4%)** report never having used a computer lab, compared to 64.2% nationally (Item 12.1h) — a **+9.2 percentage point** gap. This finding is best interpreted cautiously: it likely reflects reduced awareness of lab locations and hours, or the growing prevalence of personal devices among students, rather than a student motivation issue. That said, for students who do not have reliable access to technology at home, the computer lab is a critical resource — and ensuring those students know it exists and can access it when they need it is worth examining.

These gaps matter because high-impact practices are among the most well-documented levers for improving student persistence, learning, and completion. The lower FYE and student success course rates in particular are worth examining: is this a program availability issue, a marketing and awareness issue, or a scheduling challenge?

3. Academic Preparation Behaviors: Room for Growth

In the area of Student Effort, Citrus students show a consistent pattern of lower academic preparation behaviors compared to the national cohort:

- Prepared 2+ drafts of paper before turning in (Item 4c; Often/Very often): **Citrus 40.5%** vs. Cohort 50.1% ▼ **-9.6pp**
- Integrated ideas from various sources (Item 4d; Often/Very often): **Citrus 62.6%** vs. Cohort 69.8% ▼ **-7.2pp**
- Worked harder than thought possible to meet standards (Item 4o; Often/Very often): **Citrus 46.8%** vs. Cohort 57% ▼ **-10.2pp**
- Spent 11+ hours per week preparing for class (Item 10a): **Citrus 24.6%** vs. Cohort 32.7% ▼ **-8.1pp**
- Assigned 5+ reading books in coursework (Item 6a): **Citrus 41.3%** vs. Cohort 49.2% ▼ **-7.9pp**
- Written zero papers during the year (Item 6c): **Citrus 20.8%** vs. Cohort 12.9% ▲ **+7.9pp**

The last item deserves particular attention: 20.8% of Citrus students reported completing zero written papers (Item 6c) or reports of any length during the academic year, compared to 12.9% nationally. That is nearly 1 in 5 students who did not write a single paper — a finding that may reflect course distribution, program mix, or instructional choices, and is worth discussing.

The preparation hours data is also telling. While fewer Citrus students work extreme hours for pay (Item 10b), they are also less likely to spend significant time preparing for class — **40.9%** report spending only 1–5 hours per week on class prep (Item 10a), compared to **33.8%** nationally, a **+7.1pp** difference. The time freed up by lower work and caregiving demands does not appear to be channeled into academic preparation at the same rate as peer institutions.

4. Student-Faculty Interaction: Consistent Gaps Across Multiple Items

Across Student-Faculty Interaction items, Citrus students consistently report less frequent contact with instructors than the national cohort:

- Used email to communicate with instructor (Item 4j; Often/Very often): **Citrus 63%** vs. Cohort 70.9% **▼ -7.9pp**
- Discussed grades or assignments with instructor (Item 4k; Often/Very often): **Citrus 41.6%** vs. Cohort 49.8% **▼ -8.2pp**
- Received prompt feedback from instructor (Item 4n; Often/Very often): **Citrus 63.8%** vs. Cohort 69.9% **▼ -6.1pp**

These gaps are consistent and collectively suggest that the quality or frequency of student-instructor interaction at Citrus may be an area for improvement — or that our students are less inclined to initiate that contact. Given the strong evidence that student-faculty interaction is one of the most powerful predictors of persistence and learning, this pattern warrants institutional reflection.

The question worth raising is probably not why aren't you giving feedback? but rather: what barriers exist that might be making it harder for students to seek or receive feedback from you? — and a potential point for reflection: are there structural or pedagogical changes that could close this gap?

5. Proactive Outreach: A Notable Gap

One of the most striking findings in the dataset is the early alert and outreach item. Only **22.0%** of Citrus students report that someone at the college contacts them when they are struggling (Item 21) — compared to 32.5% nationally (**-10.5pp**). Conversely, **42.1%** of Citrus students say no one contacts them when they struggle (Item 21), compared to 34.1% nationally (**+8.0pp**).

This is a considerable gap that has direct implications for persistence and equity. Students who are struggling and do not receive proactive outreach are at elevated risk of quietly withdrawing. We do have an "early alert" program, and it is undergoing a name change to be called "Owls Connect". As Owls Connect continues to develop, these data offer a timely opportunity to examine whether our early alert efforts are reaching all students who need them — and to have a robust and collaborative conversation about how to strengthen that reach.

6. Registration Timing

Citrus students are less likely to complete registration before the first class session compared to the cohort (Item 13; **81.6% vs. 89.1%**). While the majority of students do register on time, a meaningful share are registering late or in partial status. Late registration can limit course selection, delay financial aid disbursement, and reduce early connection to advising — all of which compound the onboarding gaps described above.

Overall Experience

Student Goals and Satisfaction

Citrus students are more likely to have certificate completion as a goal (Item 26a; **57.4% vs. 51.4%**) and slightly less likely to pursue an AA degree (Item 26b; **73.2% vs. 81.5%**). This goal distribution is consistent with our program mix and student demographics.

Despite the gaps identified in this analysis, Citrus students are overwhelmingly positive about their overall experience: **95.9%** would recommend the college to a friend or family member (Item 35) — identical to the national cohort — and **47.4%** rate their overall educational experience as excellent (Item 36; vs. 45.4% nationally). Satisfaction is not the problem. The question is how to translate that positive student experience into stronger engagement behaviors and more consistent connection to support.

Summary: Key Findings by Theme

Strengths — Areas Where Citrus Outperforms the Cohort

- **Face-to-face learning environment (Items 32a-32b)**: Citrus is a strongly in-person campus — consistent with a more traditional student profile.
- **Career counseling use (Item 12.1b)**: 35.9% used 2+ times vs. 20.3% nationally (+15.6pp) — largest positive gap in the dataset.
- **Career outcomes (Items 11h, 11i)**: Students report greater contributions to career goal clarity and career information.
- **College support perception (Item 9b, 9c)**: Students perceive Citrus as providing strong support to succeed and encouraging diverse contact.
- **In-class collaboration (Item 4f, 4g)**: 56.2% worked with students on projects in class vs. 47.7% nationally (+8.5pp). Similarly, 24.7% of Citrus students reported working with classmates outside of class to prepare assignments (vs. 22.9% nationally)
- **Transfer counseling use (Item 12.1j)**: Citrus students use transfer counseling at higher rates than the cohort.
- **Student satisfaction (Items 35-36)**: 95.9% would recommend; 91.2% rate experience as good or excellent.

Areas for Attention — Where Citrus Lags Behind the Cohort

- **Academic advising use (Item 12.1a)**: 28% have never used advising vs. 16.2% nationally — though transfer counseling use is higher.
- **Orientation awareness (Item 14)**: 26.3% not aware of orientation vs. 19.3% nationally.
- **High-impact practice participation**: FYE (**Item 15**; 10.9% vs. 23.2%), student success courses (**Item 17**; 15.3% vs. 32.8%), learning communities (**Item 16**; 9.1% vs. 13.0%). Additionally, 73.4% have never used the computer lab vs. 64.2% nationally (**Item 12.1h**).
- **Academic preparation behaviors (Items 4c, 4d, 4o, 10a)**: Consistent gaps in drafting, integrating sources, working harder, and hours spent preparing for class.
- **Written assignments (Item 6c)**: 20.8% of students report writing zero papers — nearly 8pp above the national cohort.
- **Student-Faculty Interaction (Item 4j, 4k, 4n)**: Consistent gaps across email, grade discussion, and feedback items.
- **Proactive outreach (Item 21)**: Only 22% report being contacted when struggling, vs. 32.5% nationally — a 10.5pp gap.
- **Completing registration before the first class session (Item 13):** Citrus students are less likely to complete registration before the first class session, 81.6% vs. 89.1%.