

# Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, February 27, 2015

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

City View, Bldg 10

Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Lana Bakour, Kathy Blackwood, Juanita Celaya, Mike Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Java Inatov, Maggie Ko, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Jan Roecks, Henry Villareal, Andreas Wolf

## MEETING SUMMARY

### 1. Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with changes to the order of the items discussed; in addition, the New Initiatives Assessment was pulled from the agenda at the request of President's Cabinet. IPC discussion about the document will be scheduled for a later date.

### 2. Feedback on Class Schedule Production

Lana reported discussion by student government affirming the value of the printed schedule in its current form; she also reported that as a participant in the First-Year Initiative she had heard from high school counselors that the printed schedule was a very important tool for them and they "couldn't do their jobs without it." David reported a similar reaction by the Academic Senate. Both groups voiced a need for some sort of printed schedule.

Sandra acknowledged the need for some type of hard copy, explaining that they could be located in student activities, division offices, and the library. What is proposed is two hard-copy publications—one "pretty" for the community, focused on CSM features and highlights, and one that would be a real-time printed class schedule.

Also proposed would be real-time information about classes online via Webschedule so that students could print a whole schedule if desired. Mike said he'd like to see an online and printed matrix for GE classes organized by time so that students could search, for example for a MWF class that fit a certain requirement. He also stated CSM must be "smart" about what is distributed to the HS communities.

A number of related issues were explored (Andreas, Mike, Jan, Lana, Sandra, Bev, Milla, David):

- The proposed changes are not due to cost, but due to the big staffing impact on the division offices in preparing info in the required format for the printed schedule. It takes a great deal of staff time to meet the many deadlines (in advance) required to meet the current print deadlines; then the result is a schedule that is out-of-date once the semester starts. This was confirmed by the recent Business Process Analysis conducted by an external consultant who identified the big impact and cost of division office staff time in preparing the schedule with all its deadlines.
- Some dissatisfaction was voiced with the current newsprint format of a printed schedule. Consensus was voiced that the schedule info ends up so "wrong" and out of date once it finally goes to press.
- The proposed schedule would likely be printed on regular paper, 8.5 x 11, and would be a "real-time" printing.

- One print run (to be determined later) would be designated the official copy which is needed for transcripts and other official purposes.
- The newsprint publication would be a better, more appealing community marketing piece if it were separated from the function and format of the printed schedule. In addition the View brochures are used as a marketing tool for high schools. These could also have a printed schedule insert. HS counselors could possibly provide feedback about what sort of scheduling tool might be helpful for them.
- Mike proposed that we eventually explore developing an app for hand-held devices.

The final consensus outcome is that we would “prototype” a new class schedule format and that would be separate from the community publication. David and Lana will report this back to their constituencies.

### **3. District Reserves Policy (Kathy Blackwood)**

Kathy distributed a proposed policy for Reserve Requirements for Unrestricted General Fund. The document is a result of her research on best practices, including those used by our neighboring town of Atherton. The policy was requested by the Board which has already seen a draft. This will need to go to again to District Shared Governance, which has previously seen a draft, as well as back to the Board for approval. The policy will also need implementation procedures to be drafted.

Three areas for reserve are proposed with 5%-10% (amount to be determined per category) of the annual operating expenses of the Unrestricted general funded. They include: Budget Stabilization Reserve, Emergency Disaster Reserve, and Working Capital Reserve.

Kathy explained the difference between ending balance and a reserve. She stated that the district ending balance is generally between 15% and 17%, mostly typical of the statewide of 17%. Our current reserve is 5-7%. David noted that the Senate is happy with the direction Kathy is taking, and would prefer that the procedure to accompany the policy puts some kind of restriction on the total amount (e.g., not to exceed 20 or 25%).

Jan raised the question of whether the colleges will each keep a reserve, as CSM already does. Mike noted that in the past the college has used reserves so that if there is an “altitude change” as there was in recent years’ lean times, we would not have to cut so deeply into the programs. On one occasion, the college used reserves to help stave some cuts until Measure G funds came through.

Next steps: procedures will be drafted by Kathy with new revisions to go to District Shared Governance and finally for the Board for review and approval.

### **4. College Index Update**

Milla McConnell-Tuite distributed a new version of the College Index with all the data populated as well as proposed targets for 2014/15. She provided a general overview, stating that discussion in depth will be postponed to the next meeting when John Sewart is present (who is familiar with the data on a very granular level.)

Overview issues:

- Data indicator definitions are being reworked and updated and will be posted very soon.
- Some indicators are defined by external entities (as indicated in blue).
- Financial aid data had to be reworked and is now updated.
- New indicators were added for professional development (as that is a relatively new institutional priority).
- All three colleges will identify some common core indicators that could be used as a one-page document for the general public.

Discussion:

- Henry raised the issue of whether we should have more ambitious targets; Milla responded that modest historical targets have not inhibited us from making program interventions.
- Andreas posed some questions about LOAD calculations and whether they are adjusted for late start courses. Milla said the discussion needs to occur when John can provide details.
- Kathy raised the issue of having a student equity indicator, given the importance of the student equity plans. She gave an example of an indicator that would delineate non-white students.
- Mike noted that in his “first look” at the data, he questioned why there is improvement in the student support indicators and yet the student success indicators have not proportionally improved.

Next Meeting Scheduled:

The next meeting is scheduled for only one week ahead, 3/7; there was some discussion about the reasons for this and whether it was to accommodate a later extra session on program review.

David said he would consult with Jennifer Hughes and then get back to the group confirming the next meeting time.

Meeting ended at 2:30 PM