

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, February 5, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

City View Conference Room, B10-401

Members Attending: Juanita Celaya, Jia Chung, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, Fauzi Hamadeh, Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverley Madden, Teresa Morris, Ludmila Prisecar, Kristi Ridgway, Stephanie Roach, Jan Roecks (co-chair), John Sewart, Samantha Trump, Henry Villareal, Danuta Wang, Jasmine Witham

MEETING SUMMARY

Member Introduction

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Review of Summary Notes from the December 4, 2015 meeting

The summary notes were approved.

Final Review of IPC Goals for 2015-16

David Laderman and Jan Roecks distributed draft three of the IPC Proposed Annual Goals for review (draft three is a result of discussion from draft two from previous IPC meetings). David noted that 2015-16 is midway completed, as such the goals should be looked at from that perspective. Number one states, IPC's goals align with the Institutional Priorities and the College Mission, no changes. Juanita Celaya noted that Michael Claire mentioned in a previous IPC meeting that the College Mission should be simplified. Jan shared, as the College Mission modifies, IPC's goals will also change to align with it. The College Mission and the District Strategic Plan will be discussed in an upcoming Board Retreat. IPC will be updated as information becomes available. Number two, after discussion, the following changes were proposed:

- Bullet point one, omit "their" to clarify the two separate ideas presented.
- Bullet point two, change "implementing" to "developing" as the new model for annual progress report will not be completed within the year.
- Bullet point three, no changes. The main purpose is to acquire feedback regarding the satisfaction of committee participants. There was a consensus among IPC members that the survey should be simple and meaningful. Stephanie Roach noted that this bullet should come from the participants' perspective as to if they felt

listened to as part of the process. If not, how can this process be improved? Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, David Laderman, Stephanie Roach, John Sewart, and Mary Vogt to provide a draft of survey questions and list of committees to IPC for discussion at a future meeting. This will aid in determining which committees to survey. This survey is intended for distribution to each member of selected committees.

Budget Boot Camp, Part 2

Ludmila Prisecar presented information on Accounting Methodology. Presentation was focused on Fund, Organization, Account, and Program codes, how these codes are used to construct the budget, and code descriptions. This presentation followed an earlier overview of the budgeting process presentation by Ludmila and Jan Roecks at a previous IPC meeting. Some main ideas from this presentation were, but not limited to:

- Generally, 1 describes the Chancellor's Office, 2 describes Skyline College, 3 describes Canada College, and 4 describes College of San Mateo.
- Summer School funding is not included in the annual budget. It is deposited in fund 17004 (CSM Summer School Fund code).
- Fund is the first five numbers. It describes the funding source.
 - Fund 1 – General Unrestricted
 - Fund 3 – General Restricted
 - Fund 4 – Capital Projects
 - Fund 6 – Special Revenue – Child development
- Organization is the next set of four numbers. It describes the division.
 - 4000's – General Administration
 - 4100's – President's Office
 - 4200's – Operations (Business Services)
 - 4300's – Student Services
 - 4400's – Instruction
 - 4500's – Broadcast Services
- Account is the next set of four numbers. It describes the type.
 - 1000's – Academic Salaries
 - 2000's – Non Academic Salaries
 - 3000's – Employee Benefits
 - 4000's – Supplies and Materials
 - 5000's – Other Operating Expenses and Services
 - 6000's – Capital Outlay
 - 7000's – Other Outgo & Transfers
 - 8000's – Revenue and Other Financial Sources
- Program is the final set of six numbers. It describes the department.

- 010000's – 590000's – Instructional
- 600000's – Non-instructional

Review IPC Mission and Tasks

IPC members formed into groups to discuss the mission and task as it relates to the Six Circle Model, in particular the items below the Green Line.

Teresa Morris's group noted that the IPC Mission was missing the Participatory Governance component from College Council (College Council was dissolved. IPC adopted the council's role in overseeing all committees on campus). Everyone should have baseline information going into discussions in order to enhance the mission. Due to this information gap, new members may have difficulties contributing to the discussion. New chairs and students are at a disadvantage as they are not aware of the institutional knowledge.

Kristi Ridgway's group noted that IPC should:

- Ensure that all groups represented have a voice, are heard and given weight in the decision-making process.
- Perform checks and balances.
- Keep the institution honest and addressing our needs. Can we front "students" or "student needs" in the mission in some way to show this drives our committee?
- Prioritize and value programs and projects.
- Move our priorities forward.
- Be responsible for regular communication.
- Ensure inclusion and transparency.
- Explain why decisions were made the way in which they were.

Some questions to ask were: What is IPC's responsibility with regard to budget and to what degree? If we are transitioning from being a planning committee but a hybrid between planning and College Council, what is our focus? It was also noted that the document seemed as if it was written to check a box. It should be reworded.

Henry Villareal's group noted that below the Green Line language should be incorporated as part of the mission or task. Understanding from prior meetings were that some members felt their voices were not valued. Everyone should feel appreciated for committing their time and feel welcomed. IPC should establish a strong foundation so that everyone feels comfortable in expressing their ideas. IPC operates on consensus, however, that is not mentioned in the decision making process. Members should have baseline knowledge. It was suggested that documents be distributed before meetings to give members more time to review in order to facilitate better dialogue and decisions. The Action column of the agenda should be revised to be more specific. Also, if time permits, Institutional Planning Committee (IPC subcommittees) should report out.

Juanita Celaya noted that IPC, in theory, may operate on consensus, however, it is not the actual way in which it operates. Everyone has a voice, but a voice does not necessarily translate into a vote. There needs to be greater effort to bridge this gap.

Fauzi Hamadeh suggested revisiting a document from previous years, which speaks on shared governance at the college. Fauzi to possibly provide this document at a future IPC meeting.

Homework: All groups to provide David Laderman and Jan Roecks with their discussion notes.

Next Meeting: February 19, 2016, CSM 10-401