

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, May 1, 2015

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Lana Bakour, Kathy Blackwood, Juanita Celaya, Jia Chung, Michael Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, Maggie Garcia, Kevin Henson, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Java Inatov, Maggie Ko, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, Kristi Ridgway, Stephanie Roach, Jan Roecks, John Sewart, Laura Skaff, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Review of Summary Notes from the April 17, 2015 meeting

The summary notes from the April 17, 2015 meeting were approved.

Puente Program Update

Lorena Gonzalez and Teeka James provided an update on the Puente Program, now in its third year. They reviewed the mission established by the statewide Puente office, which has remained the same for as long as Puente has been in existence. The focus of the program is to increase the transfer rates of Latino students to four year institutions. Instruction, counseling, and mentoring are the key components; the integration of these components is critical. Lorena provided information regarding the strengths of the program and the challenges they have faced since the program began at CSM. She also shared data regarding students' progression through the English sequence and retention in courses. For both progression and retention, Puente students have higher rates of progression and retention as compared to Latino students not enrolled in Puente and the general student population. To date, the program has accomplished the program goals outlined in the implementation plan. In the third year the focus is on developing the mentoring component. There are a number of mentoring models that Puente programs statewide have adopted. In addition, the faculty have incorporated many of the proven best practices into the curriculum and program activities. The Puente Club is doing well and provides an avenue for students in Phase 3 of Puente (i.e. those students who have completed the required counseling course and English course sequence) to remain connected to Puente. Teeka provided examples of students in the program, the challenges they face, and the success they have achieved. It is important to note that some of the students in the program are at high risk for dropping out. Thus, even if they do not pass their courses, the fact that they have been retained and will re-enroll is a positive outcome. The opportunity to "change the narrative" for students is very important. Many Puentistas have never imagined themselves as college students who could be successful. Four students are scheduled to graduate this May. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation will be posted to the IPC website.

College Index

Milla McConnell-Tuite and John Sewart provided information on the College Index. It was stressed that we need to view the Index as a way to get a “temperature check” regarding institutional effectiveness. Milla reminded the committee that the indicators are tied to each of the College’s Institutional Priorities and mentioned that a new priority, Support Professional Development, was adopted by IPC in 2014 and recently approved by the Board of Trustees earlier in the spring, 2015 semester. The specific indicators for Professional Development, 4.1 and 4.2, are taken from the annual campus climate survey. Indicators highlighted in blue are those with external definitions (e.g. defined by the State Chancellor’s Office or U.S. Dept. of Education.) When reviewing such indicators we need to be cautious because the definitions can be extremely convoluted and/or narrow in scope and representative of a small percentage of students. Finally, a couple of indicators have been removed as they did not provide useful information. The committee was reminded that we have come a long way with respect to the College Index. We now have nearly 7 years of trend data which allows us to have a better sense of how we are doing institutionally. Finally, we are still exploring the establishment of a “one page” snapshot of key indicators. We would still maintain the comprehensive Index, but the short list would be a more brief, at a glance, “fast-facts” document. Kathy Blackwood suggested that we should present the Index information at a Board meeting.

Budget Update

Kathy Blackwood and Jan Roecks provided an update on the District and college budgets. Kathy Blackwood recently presented information about the budget to CSM’s management council. While the budgets are more stable because we are a community supported district (i.e. basic aid), the additional money in the budget has been spent on compensation for all employee groups. In addition, the required contributions to the STRS/PERS retirement systems have increased which impacts the district budget. Also, with the end of Measure G, all of these expenses are now being absorbed by the general fund. There are some one time monies that we have from Prop 30 funds, but these are not funds we can count on in the future. Kathy mentioned that the state budget is looking more promising and there may be approximately \$300 million coming to the community colleges. However, this won’t be finalized until information comes out with the May revise. Many other groups (e.g. prisons, police/fire, etc.) are lobbying for this funding so it is too early to know what community colleges may receive. Most importantly, because we are a community supported district, we are not eligible for the majority of these funds.

Kathy talked briefly about the new allocation model which determines how funds are distributed to the three colleges. The new allocation model includes funds for innovation which the colleges may use for various innovative college projects. We may be able to use the innovation funds for various initiatives (e.g. Supplemental Instruction, First Year Success).

Kathy pointed out that we will be financially stable for next year (2015-16); however, if the District and three colleges continue spending as they are doing now, the following two years (2016-17 and 2017-18), the District will be in deficit. Thus, we need to be careful with expenditures and make changes where possible.

Jan noted that the college budget reflects the District trend; specifically, CSM will be ok for 2015-16, but the following two years will be in deficit if we don’t make some decisions about spending. Jan met with the

budget subcommittee/workgroup which is constituted with the following representatives from IPC: Henry Villareal, Laura Demsetz, Jan Roecks, and Mike Claire. Together, they reviewed the budget and conducted some budget forecasting for the next several years. We are trying to shift any general fund expenses that align with SSSP and Student Equity funding guidelines to these funding sources. Based on the information we are receiving from the state, these programs anticipated to be fairly stable for quite some time. We need to make sure that if we use these funds to fill any positions, we are making a commitment to fund them with in perpetuity. Given the forecast outlined by Jan, we can't think of using these funds now for personnel and then shifting them in a year or two or three to the general fund. Mike also mentioned that we are pursuing a variety of grant opportunities, including an ANNAPISI grant (targeted to improving the success of Pacific Island students) and a TRIO grant. We will apply for the ANNAPISI this year and TRIO when the next round of RFPs is released. Also, now that CSM has reached the enrollment threshold required to be classified as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) we will be pursuing an HSI grant. Any of these six figure grants will enable us to continue the work of many of our initiatives. Jan also reminded the committee that while the District did pass a bond that will fund a variety of capital improvement projects on the three college campuses, these funds cannot be used for operating expenses. Thus, these funds do not help us with the anticipated budget deficit forecasted for 2016-17 and 2017-18. Jan mentioned that the other two colleges have been very judicious in terms of hiring personnel. While they have not stated that they are not hiring or are in a hiring freeze, they are examining all personnel requests very carefully. CSM will need to the same. Jennifer asked that all IPC committee members help communicate the budget information to their constituencies, as we need everyone's help in dispelling the perception that we have lots of money. In addition, Kathy will provide a budget update to the entire college community sometime in May.

Complete Review Process for Program Review

Jennifer Hughes asked that all work groups submit their one page summaries for the program reviews assigned to them no later than Tuesday, May 5. Jennifer and David will then prepare emails to be sent to all departments. The email will include the one page summary, as well as information regarding when faculty might learn about the status of their various resource requests, including instructional materials, equipment/technology, and personnel (faculty, classified staff, and student assistants.) This process will help close the loop on the program review process. As we review our process for next year, we will need to establish a firm deadline for submission. Reviews submitted after a certain date will not be considered resource requests. In addition, the Academic Senate is exploring the idea of conducting program review every other year with some type of annual update for requesting resources. Should this be the decision, a variety of issues will need to be addressed.

Jennifer also mentioned that at a joint meeting of the instructional and students services administrators held early in the week, the deans completed the prioritization of the classified position requests that came through program review. This does not include position requests that will be obtained from the administrative units and division program reviews. The list should be complete and ready to distribute to IPC at its May 22 meeting. Cabinet will review the prioritized list and determine if any of the positions can be funded. At this same meeting of the instructional and student services administrators, instructional material requests were reviewed. Fortunately, we receive sufficient funds from the state to fund the majority of these requests.

Next Meeting: Thursday, May 7, 2015. College Heights Conference Room, Bldg. 10-468.