

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, April 22, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

City View Conference Room, B10-401

Members Attending: Juanita Celaya, Jia Chung, Michael Claire, Laura Demsetz, Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverly Madden, Mila McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, Ludmila Prisecar, Jan Roecks (co-chair), John Sewart, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Mary Vogt, Danuta Wang, Andreas Wolf

Guest: Theresa M. Martin

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Review of the Summary Notes from April 8, 2016

The summary notes were approved.

Classified Staff Process

President Claire presented on the classified position process from a financial perspective. High level information on funding sources were provided. Over the years, CSM has been fortunate as our funding sources have increased. Thus, there is a need to develop a more defined way of identifying the need for a new full-time or permanent part-time position. The current process does not fully address these new funding sources. Some new sources are the Student Equity and the Innovation Fund (District allocation model has shifted to funding innovative activities. Past model was based on growth). Last year, CSM received approximately half a million dollars which assisted in launching Year One. From International Education, we received approximately an additional \$2 million and an additional \$2.3 million from the District in one-time funds.

Previous funding model was simplistic. Fund 1, majority of positions are funded via this fund. It is ongoing and unrestrictive. Fund 3, majority of this fund exist in student services and tends to be restricted. It was noted that state funded sources are subject to economic circumstances, so we are fortunate to have Basic Aid to help stabilize our funding. Positions funded via fund 3 are problematic once the funding goes away. For example, if and when Student Equity funds disappear, how will we fund the positions? Some examples of position related situations and questions are below:

- Replacing a vacant position - Do we still need this position? Most of the time the position is filled.

- Increase in FTE percentage. How will we fund the increase?
- Reclassification of existing staff.
- New positions – Part of the Program Review process. If there is a need for a position, how will this position be funded and do we make this position contingent on the funding source?

Positions should be tied to stable reliable funding sources. We need to plan better in terms of identifying sources and shifting cost when funding run out. We need to strategize and prioritize positions based on the need and align it to the College and District Strategic Plan.

Michael, Jia Chung, Beverly Madden, Ludmila Prisecar, and Andreas Wolf to draft a new process for review at a later IPC meeting.

Three-Year Professional Development Plan

Theresa Martin presented the three year plan for professional development. She provided a brief overview on the multiple approaches to professional development on campus. The Basic Skills Initiative have put forth effort towards professional development, especially for student education success. There are professional development programs that fund conferences and workshops. DIAG has provided workshops and presentations over the years. Previously, the Scholarship Teaching and Learning Center provided opportunities for interdisciplinary dialogs and the Center for Teaching and Learning has provided professional development on technology and distance education. Presently, the Division of Academic Support and Learning Technologies handle distance education and the Center for Academic Excellence was brought in by Academic Senate to provide coordination and integration of professional development.

Theresa noted that professional development is designed to support the mission of the institution. The institutional priorities are listed below:

1. Improve Student Success
2. Promote Academic Excellence
3. Develop Responsive, High-Quality Programs and Services
4. Support Professional Development
5. Implement the Integrated Planning Cycle and Ensure Fiscal Stability and the Efficient Use of Resources
6. Enhance Institutional Dialog

The three year plan will be managed by the Center for Academic Excellence Committee. FY2016/2017 budget of \$184,500 was proposed. Priorities of the plan includes but not limited to:

- Priority A – Provide and facilitate professional enrichment that inspire, nurture, and reward faculty and staff efforts to achieve teaching excellence. This priority addresses institutional priorities 1-3 and 4. Some activities under this priority are

implementation of a New Faculty Institute and series of professional learning workshops; and offer more support to adjuncts.

- Priority B – Collaborate with programs to identify and overcome current teaching and learning obstacles including addressing the achievement gaps of underrepresented and underperforming students. This priority addresses institutional priorities 1-3. Main activity is to collaborate with Student Equity Plan and with other groups needing professional development support.
- Priority C – Create and implement a shared vision of best practices and innovative, inclusive pedagogy designed to achieve greater student success. This priority addresses institutional priorities 1-3 and 5. Some activities are to collaborate with different committees to have Below the Green Line dialogs to understand the different needs and offer seed grants to develop projects to enhance student success or assist in institutional advancement.
- Priority D – Provide a forum for sharing professional development experience and projects. This priority addresses instructional priorities 4 and 5.
- Priority E – Create an environment that encourages cross-discipline communication supports. This priority addresses institutional priorities 4 and 6. Main activity is to work with other groups to drive institutional change.

Draft of Mission Statement

Mila McConnell-Tuite distributed a draft of the IPC Mission Statement for review and discussion. Mila reminded the committee that IPC was founded in an Accreditation crisis to develop an integrated planning group with representation from different constituencies. IPC's role is to assess the "overarching" documents e.g. College Mission, Institutional Priorities, and Educational Master Plan. IPC is to ensure alignment of these documents to the SMCCCD strategic plan, Program Review, initiatives, and formal college-wide plans and to ensure that the College's Institutional Priorities reflect the mission. IPC is the entity that monitors institutional effectiveness through review and evaluation of the College Index, and other indicators aligned with Institutional Priorities and SMCCCD strategic goals. Planning decisions and program assessments should be based on quantitative and qualitative data and should be transparent. Budget allocation should reflect the college and district planning documents, Program Review goals, formal college-wide plans, assessment of program effectiveness and ongoing operational needs.

After discussion, some suggestions included:

- What is the committee's role in relation to decision making?
- What is IPC's role related to budget?
- Everyone should have baseline knowledge to facilitate better decision making.
- How should proposals, presentations, etc. to IPC be handled? How should the committee follow-up and communicate the outcome and/or questions to the respective party. What is IPC's role after feedback is communicated?

Mila, David Laderman, and Mary Vogt to provide a new draft for review at a later IPC meeting.

Next Meeting: TBD