

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC)
Meeting Summary
Friday, September 18, 2009
1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Members Present: Rick Ambrose, Jeremy Ball, Diana Bennett, Sandra Stefani Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Susan Estes, Kevin Henson, Joyce Heyman, Jennifer Hughes, John Sewart, Virgil Stanford, Huy Tran, Henry Villareal, Martha Tilmann, Andreas Wolf

Members Absent: Michael Claire, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Jing Luan, Steffi Santana

Review of Day's Agenda

One item was added to the agenda: Education Master Plan – Linking to Institutional Priorities

Review of September 4 Meeting Summary

The meeting notes were approved with one addition. Deborah Laulusa needs to be added to the list of committee members.

Accreditation Update

Susan distributed the CSM Planning Agenda designed to address the recommendations from the Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, 2007, which are part of next year's mid-term report. In preparing the 2007 Self Study, CSM had identified a number of plans for improvement. In order to make sure that these plans for improvement are addressed, the Planning Agenda document identifies each plan for improvement and the responsible person/committee to oversee the work regarding a response. It is important to note that we cannot modify or change the wording of the plans for improvement due to the fact that this was the wording submitted in the self study. Also, we cannot ignore the plans for improvement, but must respond to all of them. A response might be that we can no longer carry out the recommended plan for improvement because of lack of funds, lack of resources, etc., but we must provide a response. Susan has met with the majority of the person(s)/committees assigned to each plan for improvement and provided instruction on what they need to do. The responsible person(s)/committee identified may not be the person(s)/committee that actually does the work needed to respond to the plan for improvement, but

they are responsible for overseeing the process. Progress reports from the responsible person(s)/committee on the plans for improvement are due in December, 2009 and the final report is due May 10, 2010. Over the summer, the final written report will be prepared. It will be due October 10, 2011. By beginning this process now, we will not be rushed in responding to the Self-Study plans for improvement.

Revised Institutional Planning Documents

The Institutional Plan Relationship document has now been modified to include DIAG Plan with a reference to the Student Equity Plan.

The Committee Structure and Membership document needs to be reviewed for accuracy. Please submit any changes in committee membership to Jennifer by early next week. Changes to the IPC membership were noted as follows: Huy Tran replaces Eileen O'Brien as VP of Academic Senate; Steffi Santana replaces Megan Claire as President of Associated Students; Deborah Laulusa is to be added as the classified representative, and Robert Schwartz is to be removed as he is no longer serving as Technology Chair. It was suggested that only the chair of the Library Committee be listed, rather than the entire committee. This will create consistency in the information about the Academic Senate committees.

Proposed Revisions to Institutional Planning Calendar

The Budget Planning Committee has recommended modifications to the Budget Planning Activities outlined on the Institutional Planning Calendar. During the discussion of the proposed changes, other changes were recommended. Rick Ambrose, Chair of the Budget Planning Committee, will take the additional suggested changes back to BPC for their review and approval. Once approved, PRIE will update the Planning Calendar. Additional changes were suggested for the IPC activities. Furthermore, now that we have entered the 09/10 year, the Calendar will need to reflect the appropriate dates for 09/10.

Update on Committee Plans

Committee chairs were asked about the progress on the development of their Committee Plans. Most chairs indicated that they have met with their committees and work on the plans is underway. There was further discussion about the plan template and finding ways to strike a balance between reducing the section which references to key planning documents to a series of checkboxes and recording enough information to ensure that committees have reviewed these documents when developing their plans. It was suggested that committees might include information about the relationship of their plan goals, objectives and activities to the key documents in the narrative section of the

plan, in addition to including these references in the template itself. It was agreed to do the best we could this first go round before making significant changes to the template at this point. In addition, it was agreed that the division workplan template and the committee plan template be reviewed and modified before we begin a new cycle using these documents. Wherever possible, we should use technology to streamline these planning documents.

Role of IPC in Budget Process

Jennifer provided general information regarding the role of IPC in the budget process, especially as the College explores and adopts strategies for the necessary budget reductions. It has been stressed that we need to use our integrated planning processes and existing governance structures to vet various strategies.

Directing Institutional Issues to IPC

An idea for creating an informal mechanism for bringing forward institutional issues and ideas to IPC, especially as they relate to institutional priorities, was discussed. It was suggested that PRIE establish a mechanism for soliciting collegewide input regarding institutional issues. PRIE would be responsible for then screening these ideas/issues and forwarding them to appropriate planning committees for follow up. John agreed to work on this.

Other Items

Education Master Plan – Linking to Institutional Priorities – Laura reviewed all the Educational Master Plan recommendations and linked them with Institutional Priorities. It was not a clear one-to-one correlation and many recommendations could be linked with several priorities. Laura agreed to scan and send to committee members the recommendations so that those who wish could perform the same exercise that she did. John agreed to compile the results to see if we have general agreement. When we next update the EMP it was suggested that recommendations might be ordered in such a way to create a functional linking to the priorities. However, the EMP was developed before the plan template, making this not possible with this first plan template.

Next Meeting: Friday, October 2, 1:30-3:30, Building 16, Room 107

