Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Juanita Celaya, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, Ludmila Prisecar, Stephanie Roach, Jan Roecks, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Samantha Trump, Henry Villareal, Danuta Wang, Andreas Wolf

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Review of Summary Notes from the November 20, 2015 meeting

The summary notes were approved.

New Approach for IPC meetings – Implementing the Six Circle Model

At a previous IPC meeting, the Six Circle Model was introduced by committee members with the idea that IPC might incorporate some of the approaches into their structure and process. A discussion took place regarding how components of this model might be beneficial to IPC. As the discussion took place other suggestions were made that members thought would strengthen IPC meetings. A sampling of some of the suggestions presented included:

- Create clearer IPC agendas so that members will know what is expected when an item is placed on the agenda. Sometimes it is not clear when an item is informational only, for discussion only, for action, etc. Recent examples that created some confusion for some members included the presentation on the Center for Academic Excellence budget (was this intended as information only or for some action by IPC?), the presentation of the Student Equity Plan (was this for approval by IPC?), and the update on the International Education Program (was this intended as information only?)
- IPC has evolved over time since its establishment in 2008 subsequent to the 2007 Accreditation Visit in which we were required to create a more formalized, integrated, and transparent planning process. That has largely been accomplished now. Thus, we need to revisit the IPC Mission Statement and identified tasks and revise them to better reflect our focus, once determined.
- There is often not adequate time devoted to items that need discussion. We need to think about assigning more homework to committee members so that they are better prepared to have thorough and thoughtful discussion about various items. We may also want to think about developing a Sharepoint site for IPC (similar to Committee on Instruction) so that members may ask questions/seek clarification prior to discussion of an item at IPC.

- We need to be better about adhering to time limits for agenda items. Sometimes items are tabled when we run spend more time discussing other items, which results in a sense that the tabled items are not important.
- When adopting the Six Circle Model, we need to find a balance of those strategies "above and below the green line." It was noted that some of the best work of IPC occurs when we break into smaller groups, as this allows for some of the more quiet IPC members to voice their opinions and ideas. We often seem to have a clear sense of what is expected of members. The annual review of Program Reviews and the Education Master Plan update were cited as examples of this small group approach that are effective and ensure broad participation by all committee members.
- We may want to think about conducting small group activities (perhaps in a retreat format) to focus on some of the "below the green line" activities.
- We need a way to have IPC create priorities. When reviewing initiatives, the majority of which IPC has supported, we need to determine those that best meet identified college priorities. In times of limited resources, this would assist IPC in determining those initiatives that best align with established priorities and might have the greatest institutional impact. Our current process for reviewing initiatives doesn't adequately provide for this other than to tie the initiative to overarching Institutional Priorities which are extremely broad (e.g. Institutional Priority #1: Student Success) All initiatives could easily demonstrate their alignment with such an overarching priority.
- Now that IPC has assumed prior functions of College Council, it would be helpful to provide new member orientation at the beginning of each semester/year describing IPC's purpose and the role of committee members. This would help members better understand their responsibilities and what is expected of them.
- We may need to go back and look at the functions of College Council.
- We are now finding better ways to incorporate the budget information into IPC meetings. Because the Budget Subcommittee was disbanded (due to membership overlap with IPC, and other identified redundancies) we need to make sure that IPC members have a better understanding of the budget - how the funds are allocated from the district, the major funding sources we have, how the budget is established and monitored, what discretionary dollars are available, etc.. This will help IPC members better understand the limited funds that may be available for college initiatives they are reviewing/recommending for funding.

Commented [HJ1]:

Agenda: The group agreed to the following:

Jennifer and David will make the agendas clearer, so that members understand expectations (e.g. information item, specific action requested, etc.) In addition, better approximations for time limits for agenda items will be established to ensure that we can get through the agenda. The committee also agreed to conduct a focus group for IPC, similar to what was conducted previously for College Council. To prepare for this, Milla will review the IPC agendas for the last year, so that we better understand the types of items on the agenda, and whether they were informational, discussion, or action items. Finally, we will review the current Mission Statement and associated tasks for IPC. These activities might help us better determine the future purpose and structure for IPC.

-
-
-
-

Provide Approach for Budget Bootcamp and Quarterly Budget Updates to IPC

Jan Roecks and Ludmila Pricecar presented a high level overview of the budgeting process at CSM. They provided information on the various types of funds (general and categorical) and the approximate amounts received in these funding sources. For 2015-16, CSM has received 33 million in general funds, 3.2 million in categorical funds, and approximately 2.3 million in one-time funds allocated by the District to the colleges. The allocation of the 33 million is determined by a District allocation formula that has been established and is applied to all three colleges. Part of the formula is based on student headcount (FTES). Jan and Ludmila provided more detailed information as to the amount of the general funding that typically is allocated to position control (all permanent positions at the college). This accounts for approximately 74% of the total budget. The remaining funds cover other personnel costs (15%), summer school (4%), and other operating expenses and supplies. Employee benefits are also part of the budget. It was noted that they have continued to increase over time. A formula is used to determine the benefit costs for various employee groups (e.g. full time faculty, full time classified employees, adjunct faculty, etc.) For example, the benefits for full time classified employees is calculated at approximately 40-50% of the employee's salary. Thus, when hiring employees it is critical that we account for the salary and associated benefits. As noted, given that the bulk of the general fund budget is committed to personnel, there is very little in terms of discretionary dollars that the college has at its disposal. Finally, it was noted that categorical funds (restricted funds) can only be used for the purposes outlined by the specific categorical program. For example, Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) funds can only be used to support activities associated with the identified "core services" of the Student Success and Support Program which include assessment, orientation, and counseling activities. In order to leverage general funds, efforts are made to shift allowable expenses to categorical funds; thus freeing up general funds. For example, the college has provided general fund support for various learning communities (i.e. Mana, Umoja, and Puente). These expenses can legitimately be shifted and supported by Student Equity funds, since the purpose of the learning communities is to increase the completion and success rates of underrepresented student populations. These outcomes are aligned with the goals articulated in the College's Student Equity Plan. Thus, we have shifted the funding of the learning communities to Student Equity funds, which has freed up general funds for other purposes.

At a subsequent meeting, Ludmila will provide more detailed information about the budget, including the budget codes that have been established for each of the divisions. Committee members expressed appreciation for the overview and looks forward to obtaining more information about the budget at a subsequent meeting. It is anticipated that Jan and Ludmila will provide regular updates to IPC.

Next Meeting: The spring, 2016 meetings have yet to be determined. The majority will be held on the 1st and 3rd Fridays of the month depending upon scheduled holidays and spring break. The schedule will be sent out in early January.