

## **Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting**

**Friday, September 2, 2016**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

**College Heights Conference Room, B10-468**

Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Juanita Celaya, Jia Chung, Michael Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, Fauzi Hamadeh, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Teresa Morris, Ludmila Prisecar, Stephanie Roach, James Roe, John Sewart, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Mary Vogt, Andreas Wolf

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

#### **Welcome New Members**

Jennifer Hughes welcomed the new members of the committee, including Jeremiah Sims, Director of Equity, who will be overseeing the Student Equity and BSI plans, and the new student representatives James Roe and Katarina Stein. Sennai Kaffl, former student government president, will continue to serve on the committee.

#### **Review of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved with the addition of one item-- the approval of the April 22 summary notes.

#### **Review of the Summary Notes for April 22**

The summary notes were approved. Jia Chung was thanked for helping to take notes during the spring semester.

#### **Review IPC Mission Statement**

Jennifer Hughes and David Laderman distributed draft documents that reflected the discussions of the IPC Mission Statement that took place in the spring, 2016 semester. Jennifer reminded the committee of the importance of maintaining the specific Mission and identified tasks of IPC. She noted that IPC was established with a very specific function as a direct result of the 2008 Accreditation Follow Up Report regarding the need to develop an integrated, formal and transparent institutional planning process. In addition to meeting this 2008 recommendation, the specificity of the "tasks" to achieve the Mission enables us to clearly articulate to internal and external parties IPC's purpose. That said, there is a benefit in better describing our processes and methods of operation that incorporate the Six Circle Model, with emphasis on the "below the green" line approaches we are interested in incorporating into our IPC meetings. There was additional discussion about the role of IPC in the budgeting process, which still needs further discussion and clarification. It was agreed that David, Milla and Jennifer would review the draft document, organizing it into three parts; Mission, Tasks, and Processes. In doing so, they will look to remove redundancies in language. A revised draft will be sent to the committee for review at the September 16 meeting.

## **Update on CSM's Accreditation Midterm Report**

Sandra Comerford provided an update on the Midterm Report that will be submitted to the Accreditation Commission (ACCJC) on October 15. The Midterm Report is required to be completed by all colleges at the midterm point in their accreditation cycle. Also, the Report is specifically written to respond to the recommendations from the Accreditation External Site Evaluation Team that visited CSM in 2013 and were provided to the college by ACCJC in February, 2014. There are several college recommendations and three District recommendations. It is important to note that the Midterm Report is not intended to “tell the CSM story” but focuses entirely on responding to the recommendations. There is opportunity for the college community to review the Report and provide online feedback via the website. The deadline for receiving feedback is September 9. IPC members who represent constituent groups were reminded to share this information with their respective constituency. All three colleges will be submitting their Midterm Reports to the Board for action on September 28.

## **Program Review Process Update**

David Laderman provided an update on the new Program Review process that has been adopted. As noted, the new Program Review cycle will be a two-year cycle beginning this fall, 2016. The new due date will always be the last Friday in October (October 28 this year). All department data has already been posted to the PRIE website. Departments and programs requesting any resources will be required to submit an annual resource request document available online on the program review website. If a department/program does not submit a program review, it will not be eligible for resources. The committee also discussed the process for IPC's review of the program reviews. Ideally, this review would take place before the deans prioritize the resource requests. This would ensure that a department/program that does not submit a program review or submits a substandard program review will not be eligible for resource requests. And, while IPC does not prioritize the resource requests, it would be helpful if we could “close the loop” once these requests have been prioritized and Cabinet decisions reached, to have communication to IPC about the funding decisions.

The committee also discussed the need to have a “norming” session for IPC members so that we are consistent when providing feedback about each department's program review. This norming could take place early in the fall, prior to the program review deadline. The group requested to have some model program reviews as samples of what an exemplary program review should look like. In addition, the committee needs to determine the process and timing for extracting and summarizing the program review themes. Finally, it will be important to let faculty/staff know when they should expect to receive feedback from IPC. Jennifer Hughes agreed to prepare a draft timeline of the program review process for the committee's review at the September 16 meeting.

## **Plans for Review of College Index**

The College Index was distributed to committee members. We need to engage the committee in a dialogue about the indicators and the “actual” outcomes. Targets for 2016-17 have been set but need to be reviewed. Jennifer Hughes mentioned that she recently attended an ACCJC training during which there was discussion about the importance of colleges engaging in an authentic discussion of indicators and the goals/targets colleges set. These goals/targets should not simply be arbitrarily selected, but instead based on evidence that

would support and provide rationale for each of the targets. John Sewart pointed out that some colleges use a specific mathematical formula that is applied to all indicators.

In preparation for discussion at the September 16 meeting, committee members should review the College Index to determine if any of the “actuals” for 2014-15 stand out. In addition, we need to think about a “one page” document that could provide information to the college on a more select group of indicators, particularly those that focus on student achievement and student success (e.g., retention, successful course completion, etc.) This would provide an “at a glance”, high level view of student achievement data.

**Next Meeting: September 16, 2016**