

**Institutional Planning Committee [IPC]
Meeting Summary
Monday, April 27, 2009
12:45 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.
12-172**

Members Present:

*Rick Ambrose
Jeremy Ball
Megan Claire
Sandra Stefani Comerford
Laura Demsetz
Susan Estes
Joyce Heyman
Jennifer Hughes
Jing Luan
Milla McConnell-Tuite
John Sewart
Virgil Stanford
Martha Tilmann
Henry Villareal
Andreas Wolf*

Action on Agenda: Added Accreditation Documents (Susan)

Action on Meeting Summary: It was suggested that the information regarding CSM's Top 10 Priorities based on the District's Strategic Plan Recommendations be reworded.

Issues Discussed:

Institutional Priorities

The committee reviewed the draft document, Strategic Priorities 2008-2011, which had been prepared by PRIE in consultation with Jennifer Hughes and Henry Villareal. The document includes 6 institutional priorities based on the discussion at the last IPC meeting. For each priority, there are a number of strategies listed, all of which are measurable. In addition, for each priority, the

relationship to key planning efforts, including references to the College Strategic Plan, the Educational Master Plan and the SMCCCD Strategic Plan is identified. This reference will enable us to see how the identified institutional priorities are linked with other major planning documents. Suggested changes were made to the document, specifically to add additional references to strengthening the distance education program and to improve the viability of the Honors Transfer Program. Jennifer will incorporate these changes for the committee to review at the next meeting. Members of the committee requested a chance to review the document one last time, to ensure that the priorities demonstrate a relationship to the newly established integrated planning committees. Committee chairs will complete this review prior to the next meeting. It is hoped that the document will be finalized at the next meeting, so that it can be forwarded to College Council for adoption and to the Budget Planning Committee to guide their budget allocation decisions.

A draft of the "Scorecard" was attached, which includes each priority, the possible indicators that we can use, the baseline year (2008-09) and the targets for the following years, 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12. We will review this in more detail later, but it is clear that once we finalize the institutional priorities, we will be very near the completion of the scorecard. The purpose of the scorecard is to provide a snapshot of CSM's progress toward meeting established targets for each of the institutional priorities.

District Strategic Plan Recommendation: Identification of Top 10 Priorities for CSM

The minutes of the April 17 meeting reflect the Top 10 Priorities that IPC identified for CSM. These are very similar to the priorities adopted by Canada and Skyline. They are also in alignment with our draft institutional priorities. The priorities identified are outlined below.

- 1.2b: Develop a holistic delivery framework that supports the access and success of diverse student populations, promotes institutional vitality and viability, and serves all students equitably.
- 2.2a: Identify gaps in student educational achievement. Develop holistic approaches designed to retain students, including approaches in teaching intervention, learning styles, financial aid and counseling.
- 2.2b: Build more partnerships and bridges with Pre-K through 16 educational leaders and strengthen the College Connection program in a way to encourage high school students to attend College.

- 2.4c: Identify strategies for understanding and addressing the decreasing trend in transfers to CSUs.
- 3.1c: Strengthen course offerings, services and workplace opportunities that prepare students for the demands of the contemporary workforce.
- 4.1. Fiscal Environment (We did not specify which of the three recommendation under 4.1 would be our priority. We may need to do this at the next meeting, although all three are important.)
- 4.5a: Strengthen professional and academic development opportunities for faculty and staff.
- 4.5b: Strengthen faculty and staff development that supports activities to meet accreditation standards.
- 4.5c: Continue to raise cultural awareness and to provide diversity training.
- 5.1a: Establish policies and planning activities that are coherent, transparent, and available to all stakeholders.
- 5.1c: Provide extensive, integrated and coordinated research and planning efforts and resource allocation framework to support the improvement of teaching and learning.

Jennifer will forward these to Jing. It was also requested that Jing provide us with a copy of Canada's Top 10 priorities. The committee had already received a copy of Skyline's priorities.

Review Role Of PRIE

Due to time constraints, this item was tabled until the next meeting.

Accreditation References

Susan distributed the sections from the August, 2008 Accreditation Reference Handbook which specifically relate Standard 1, Institutional Mission and Effectiveness. It is important to note that Standard 1.B.2, 1.B.3, 1.B.3, 1.B.4, 1.B.5, 1.B.6 and 1.B.7 directly relate to the work of the IPC. In summary form, they include the following key elements:

- The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed.
- The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation.
- The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-base, offers opportunity for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.
- The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.
- The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation process by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.
- The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Susan also distributed sections of the August, 2008 Guide to Evaluating Institutions which includes examples of sources of evidence for Standard 1. As the work of the IPC continues, it will be important that we continuously gather this evidence for accreditation purposes.

Actions Items:

Discussion	Action	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
Institutional Priorities	Finalize priorities	IPC Committee Members	May 4, 2009

Agenda for Next Meeting: Finalize CSM’s Institutional Priorities, Review the Role of PRIE

Next Meeting: Monday, May 4, 12:45 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

Summary Prepared by: Jennifer Hughes, April 30, 2009