

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC)

Friday, August 29, 2014

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, College Center, 10-468

**Members Attending:** Ron Andrade, Lana Bakour, Kathy Blackwood, Juanita Celaya, Michael Claire, Sandra Stefani Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Maggie Garcia, Fauzi Hamadeh, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Java Inatov, David Laderman (co-chair) Teresa Morris, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal, Andreas Wolf

**Meeting Summary**

**Review of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved. Item 6, Freshman Initiative, was moved up to occur after Item 3.

**Review Summary Notes from May 16, 2014 meeting**

The summary notes from the May 16, 2014 meeting were approved.

**Program Review Updates**

Jennifer Hughes informed the committee that the deans are in the process of collecting their division themes and trends from program review. These will be submitted to IPC for review and discussion at the September 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

There were several program reviews from the last cycle (March, 2104) that needed to be returned to the departments for resubmission. Jennifer Hughes and David Laderman will email the appropriate faculty identifying the areas of the program review that need to be strengthened and offer the faculty an opportunity to meet with them if they need any assistance in revising the program review. The revised program reviews will need to be submitted by the end of September.

There were a few departments that failed to submit a program review last March. Sandra Comerford is working with the deans to ensure that the faculty complete and submit their program reviews. Going forward it is very important that all departments submit the program review by the established deadline. We will enlist the deans' help in ensuring that all program reviews in their division are submitted.

## **Update on Student Equity Plan and SSSP Plan**

Jennifer Hughes provided an update on the status of the Student Equity Plan and the SSSP Plan. The Student Equity Task Force has been working over the summer and has developed a first draft of the plan. The draft plan will be sent out to the college community the week of September 2 with a request for feedback by September 12. The Task Force will incorporate changes, as deemed appropriate, and the report will be submitted for IPC review and approval at its September 19 meeting. Once approved, the plan will be submitted to College Council (September 24) and then to the Board of Trustees for approval at its October 22 meeting. The plan is due in the State Chancellor's Office by November 21.

In addition, it was agreed that the Diversity in Action Committee (DIAG) provide oversight for the implementation of the Student Equity Plan. Several members of the Task Force are already members of DIAG. Additional appointments to DIAG are needed as the committee is largely comprised of student services faculty and staff. Instructional faculty are needed on the committee. Currently, the faculty serving on DIAG are Sylvia Aguirre-Alberto and Makiko Ueda.

Finally, there is still a great deal of uncertainty about the state funding for student equity. 70 million has been approved with 40% of the funding being tied to FTES. The criteria for allocating the remaining 60% have yet to be determined. There is some statewide discussion that the criteria might focus on income levels of students at the colleges. For example, there might be a funding formula based on the number of Pell awardees, county households falling below the poverty line using 2010 Census data, and those "neediest" districts (similar to K-12 funding).

**Action: David Laderman will solicit additional faculty members to serve.**

The SSSP Plan is also underway. Marsha Ramezane is the SSSP Coordinator and has held several meetings over the summer with the SSSP Committee. The plan, which is due in the State Chancellor's Office by October 15, is scheduled for completion by the end of September.

## **Update on Classified Positions Requests**

Mike Claire provided an update on the new classified position requests that were submitted as part of program review. The positions were prioritized by the instructional and student services administrators using criteria established by IPC and supplemented by the deans. The prioritized list was reviewed by Cabinet and a determination made regarding the positions that could be funded this year (2014/15), based on a review of the college budget. Cabinet met with the CSEA leadership to review the positions to be funded and the rationale for each. The approved positions include:

- .48 Instructional Aide (Ceramics)

- .48 Instructional Aide (Photography)
- .48 Office Assistant II (Veterans Center)
- .48 Storekeeper (Cosmetology) – The current full-time Storekeeper position will be reclassified to a higher level position in order to assume additional duties currently being performed by a faculty member on reassigned time. The savings from the reassigned time will offset the salary differential of the higher level position. As a result of the reclassification, a .48 Storekeeper position is needed. CSEA has been notified of this reclassification.

Mike mentioned that this is a conservative number. Part of the reason for that is that with the end of Measure G funds, the college is now covering the costs for several classified employees that had been funded out of Measure G (approximately \$400-500K).

Kathy Blackwood pointed out that one of the challenges with hiring new classified positions is the impact on the 50% law, an outdated regulation that requires college districts to ensure that 50% of all faculty and staff positions are directly related to instruction. Counselors, nurses, librarians, and numerous classified positions are not on the “right” side (instructional side) of the ledger. A district is subject to severe penalties if it doesn’t meet the 50% law. Thus, while colleges often need to hire non-instructional faculty and staff to provide critical services for students, the 50% law creates problems in doing so.

#### **Freshman Success Initiative – Establish Task Force**

Mike Claire provided an overview of the achievement gap data with respect to age which was shared at CSM’s Opening Day. Young students ages 20-25 comprise 57% of CSM’s student population and have the lowest success and retention rates of all enrolled students. Mike has convened meetings with select high school principals (i.e., Hillsdale, Sequoia, Half Moon Bay) to outline the issue and to identify ways to ease the transition of students from high school to college and improve students’ retention and success. During the meetings with the principals, several key items were discussed:

- Perception of parents/high school counselors – While many parents and counselors want students to be bound for 4 year institutions directly out of high school, data indicate that over 47% of all graduating seniors in SM County attend one of the three SMCCCD colleges. We need to take our services to the high schools to help students know about community college opportunities and the paths to CTE and/or transfer.
- Our high school partners identify early on those students that are planning to attend a community college – we need to reach out to these students in their junior and senior years.
- There are a number of barriers to entry/our processes are confusing– we need to streamline the transition.
- We need to share data – high schools know a great deal about our students that needs to be shared with us in order to better serve students.
- We need to be mindful of the high school to college pathway. We need to “walk- the-walk” of a high school student and think about our processes from their vantage point.

Additional brainstorming regarding ways to reach this student population and increase their success took place at the recent CSM managers retreat held in early August. It was noted that CSM already has many successful model programs; we need to find ways to take what works and scale it to reach more students. There are approximately 700-900 new high school graduates that attend CSM each year. Finally, Mike noted that approximately \$150K from San Mateo Athletic Club revenue has been earmarked for the initiative.

The committee agreed that the next step is to convene a task force to include high school personnel.

**Action: Each constituency will identify one or two individuals to serve on the task force and present these names at the September 19 IPC meeting. Jennifer and David will draft the charge and timeline for the task force.**

### **Budget Update**

Kathy Blackwood provided a brief update on the new allocation model. The model has been reviewed and agreed upon by all three colleges. The model includes 7 steps which include, but is not limited to, the relative size of each college, one time funds for Canada College (based on its small size), estimates for fixed costs (i.e. utilities), square footage for buildings, etc. The model eliminates funding for growth based on FTES. The model allocates the funds to each college and allows them the flexibility to serve students in whatever ways they wish based on their allocation. More detailed information about the model will be presented by Kathy at the October 17 IPC meeting.

Mike indicated that he and Jan Roecks are working on the budget planning calendar for 2014/15 and will bring it to the next meeting. Jennifer reminded the committee that we need to have additional discussion as to whether we want to establish a Budget Subcommittee of IPC.

### **Accreditation Follow Up Report**

Jennifer informed the committee that the Accreditation Follow Up report is nearly completed and will be sent out to the college community next week for feedback. The report will be submitted to the Board for approval at its October 8 meeting and submitted to ACCJC by October 15. A follow up visit is scheduled for November 12.

Next Meeting: Friday, September 19, 2014, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. College Center, College Heights Conference Room, 10-468