Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting
Friday, October 2, 2015, 1-3 PM
Meeting Notes
(prepared by Jasmine Witham, with David Laderman)

Attendees: Juanita Celaya, Michael Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverley Madden, Teresa Morris, Kristi Ridgway, Stephanie Roach, Jan Roecks, John Sewart, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Samantha Trump, Danuta Wang, Andreas Wolf

1:12pm - review and approve agenda
Jennifer will bring the summary notes for the previous meeting, to the next meeting.
Next meeting is in one month. Do not have an Oct 16th meeting. Do not want to conflict with OEI forum.
David requested switching item 3 and 4 on the agenda.

Update on the proposed changes to program review
-We prepared some proposed changes that need to be approved by the faculty. Division reps are taking the proposed changes to the faculty for feedback. All program reviews should be turned in together every other year. Moving submission deadline from Spring to Fall. Data will be available around Sept 1st. Reviewing programs much closer to the academic year being reviewed.   Also faculty position and resource requests will be done much earlier than they are now.

David's sense and impressions, based on some feedback, is that faculty feel the workload is more intensive in the Fall than the Spring. They would like the position/resource requests to be able to be submitted in fall, to get a jump on hiring, but have the program review document due in the Spring (maybe bumped up to end of Feb).

· Laura Demsetz -If we decouple the resource request from the PR, we should push the date because benefit of requests should happen after retirement season in May and summer.
· Mike Claire - Should honor faculty request due to workload. Either way, what the faculty want, we can make it work.
· David Laderman - If faculty turn in the resource request, they have to refer to the previous program review. That can complicate things if new needs are being addressed in the upcoming program review. It can be tricky to keep the program review and resource request tied together.
· Sandra Comerford - In the resource request there is a comment field for rationalizing the request. Concerned about when the program review is due and not having enough time before the end of the fiscal year to get everything processed and ordered.
· Kristi Ridgway - likes the idea of having it done as soon as possible (Nov 1st) while it's still fresh in your mind from that year. But many reports due in the Fall. How do we lighten the load in the fall so it can be done. Flex days? Maybe the first week of the semester where faculty have less grading to do?
· Bev Madden - The idea will be to advertise for hiring new faculty in January (need a year in advance - especially for faculty requests). The added value of doing the faculty request in the Fall instead of the Spring is because many faculty retire May-August
· Jan Roecks - Trying to understand why the faculty resources need to be requested after retirements, just assume those positions need to be filled. Response: It won't show up on the division and college prioritization list.
· Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza wondered whether the desire to separate the resource request and the PR is coming from just a few vocal faculty, or is it widespread? David is not sure.
· Teresa Morris - Gap between request for faculty and the retirement or need is longer. What if someone leaves in March? You did your resource request already and the next program review isn't until end of Feb? So there's a whole year.
· Mike Claire - Bottom Line - most important decision the college makes is around faculty hiring. We need to make decisions on faculty hiring in Fall. We need to be the first ones out the door in the hiring season. We need to ensure we close the gap and have faculty in positions rapidly, even if it deviates from Program

Review. Let's remove false barriers.

Program Review Themes

Seven submitted Division PR Themes. Game plan - we break up into 3 groups, each group discussing a handful of division theme docs - 15 mins. Then share out together. Summarize and synthesize.

Stephanie Roach
Kinesiology & Math/Science
Student success
Partnering with support services, such as availability of academic counseling
Importance of learning communities
Access to resources for distance education, need for technology support (for students) and software upgrades
Course scheduling should accommodate student need to efficiently structure their day--flexible scheduling, or block scheduling, hybrid courses
Gender equity across campus / Title IX--are we compliant? / STEM

Teresa Morris
Creative Arts/Social Sciences & Business/Technology
·   Progression in courses – how and whether students are able to progress in a sequence of courses, given enrollment pressures related to course offerings
·   Impact of programs with few full-time people, and burden on adjuncts. Adjuncts doing work outside the classroom, and how are they compensated.
·   Equipment - Having equipment purchased, maintained, and identification of funding, i.e., you get the building but you don't get the equipment you need.
·   SLOs and Training for SLOs
·   Learning Center and Tutoring centers are good resources

David Laderman
Language Arts, Library, ASLT
·   Need for more personnel, staffing, resources and services. Focused more on tutors and support, rather than new faculty. Supplemental support services emphasized as successful, but also needing more
·   Distance Education - need for more investment there and paying attention to underserved populations; needing more support than what they are getting on-campus
·   Professional Development - faculty wanting more training; how to make time, not overload
·   SLOs, wanting more training, support, revision to SLO processes
·   Cross-campus collaboration - doing more

David said he would prepare a document synthesizing our discussion, listing the dominant themes/trends, for more review at the next meeting.

Danuta raised a point/question about not cancelling low enrolled classes so students could join later in the semester.

Sandra Comerford - running a low-enrollment class is expensive for the college and it prevents us from running other things. If there isn't a good rational for a class not having 20 students in it, then it is taking away from opening a class with a high wait list.

Laura Demsetz - legally, by the state funding, you cannot have a student add in the middle of the course. If you keep the course open longer in hopes of keeping that course going, it can become a dis-service to the students because if the class doesn't go then they cannot add another course.

Sandra Comerford – we will be starting intensive 8 week courses mid-semester. That way students who want to take a class will be able to do it, the latter part of the term.

Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza - She oversees in her division SLOs, Distance Education, Learning Communities, Learning Support Centers, some of which do not currently submit a Program Review, so their areas are not reflected fairly. There was discussion/suggestion of devising a separate form, more simple, for learning communities to use for reviewing their programs, to get that into the PR.

Setting the IPC Goals for 2015-16

David: Items 2 and 4 on the word document are not on the CSM website IPC landing page. They deal with committees that no longer exist (Budget and College Council); need to line these up.

Proposed Annual Goals for this year

We have our IPC Goals and in addition we have annual goals

Andreas, Laura, Jan, Bev, Jennifer (group discussion)
Separate "approving" and "evaluating"
Establish process for adopting a new initiative
Develop criteria/guidelines so people are clear on what we expect (tying to strategic plan, sustainability, etc.)
Some word-smithing of language: "Establish process for development, approval and evaluation of their effectiveness"
Also evaluate if the granted resource request lived up to expectations. We need matrix through which to evaluate, and compare apples to apples. Maybe create task force out of this committee, to develop such an evaluation matrix.

David suggested combining some of the goals, which in places seemed redundant. Fewer annual goals, easier to achieve, more manageable.

Jan Roecks will send revised language to David.

Take out 3rd and 5th bullets because they are IPC's ongoing and not annual goals

Discussion to be continued with Jennifer Hughes present; David will prepare new draft of annual goals.

Meeting adjourned 2:40 PM.