

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, November 17, 2017

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Attendees: Mary Vogt, Jesenia Diaz, Alicia Frangos, Laura Demsetz, Joe Mangan, Fauzi Hamadeh, Colby Riley, Kim Lopez, Ellen Young, Heidi Diamond, Annie Theodos, Jeramy Wallace, Anniqua Rana, Elnora Kelly Tayag, Jeremiah Sims, Teeka James, Ann Stafford, Katie Bliss.

Meeting Summary Notes

Welcome and Introductions

Kim reviewed the agenda and asked if we could move the Textbook presentation to the end. Everyone was in agreement.

Review Summary Notes from the November 3, 2017 Meeting

IPC members reviewed the Summary Notes from November 3, 2017

Writing in the End Zone (WEZ) Presentation

Teeka James and Anne Stafford introduced the Writing in the End Zone presentation. Teeka has been involved with the program since its inception in 2004, and Anne has been a part of WEZ since 2009. Anne said that they have written about the program, but focusing just on reading & writing doesn't get to the heart of the program, so she presented a video that they had put together for the committee. IPC viewed the video, and handed out the written report. (See handouts). Teeka said one of the reasons they wanted to do it is because it's a relationship-based program, and that's why it has worked so well.

Anniqua asked about the students in the video who decided to become English teachers. Kim thanked them for informing us about the program, and asked about the success data for the cohort. Teeka said they have data for years, which is broken down on the handout.

Jeramy asked if we can review learning programs every two years instead of every year given the work involved. Kim suggested we do them on the off program review years and agreed that it's a lot of work to do every year.

Approve Revised Mission Statement

Alicia distributed a draft copy of the mission statement. Fauzi said there has been some feedback, and is concerned about values statements to buttress the statement. He explained that without supporting value statements, this current draft of the mission statement presented at IPC might not be enough, so he asked for feedback from IPC with the intention to then return it to the task force and include the values & visions statements before it goes out to constituency. The task force is currently still working on the values & visions statements. Fauzi sees this version of the mission statement as a jumping off point for the visions & values. Kim agreed that a mission statement needs to be only a couple of sentences, and that it's a good idea to keep

it short and then bring the values & visions statements with it back to IPC in early spring. The Strategic Plan and Participatory Governance processes will be revisited then as well. Kim asked when they'd like to come back, and Alicia and Fauzi suggested mid-February. IPC approved the mission statement process and that they will be adding the values & visions statements and bringing it back as an action item to the February 23 meeting.

Update on Textbook Task Force Membership

Laura said that most of the task force has been assembled, with 6 confirmed faculty and one pending request. If that comes through, she thinks they'll have a pretty good representation of the college. They are getting representatives from learning centers where students interact. Task force so far:

Faculty: Sylvia Aguirre-Alberto (Counseling/EOPS/MCC), Donna Eyestone (DGME/CTE), Cheryl Gregory & Lena Feinman (Math), Jon Kitamura (English), Minu Mathur (Sociology), Chris Smith (Biology), Lia Thomas (Library), possibly one more person from a CTE program

Staff: Lisa Clayton (Math Resource Center), Margaret McGugan (Writing Center), Joey Martinez (Learning Center), James Peacock (Bookstore)

Students: TBD

Administrator: Laura Demsetz

Colby said 8-10 students have expressed interest but they aren't confirmed yet. The committee will have a large number of students and the January flex day will have an activity by the taskforce in a meeting and will involve a student panel. Ellen suggested that we have a mixed variety of students from different areas of study, and Laura said she wants to hear students' experience with textbooks as way to get students to start thinking about it. She said she's emailed Mike the charge, and is waiting on a confirmation.

Laura requested that Fauzi and Jeramy allow her to add three to four co-chairs that are faculty and students. Assuming she has a charge, she can move forward with the timeline. Kim asked about the timeline and Laura agreed with the request once a charge and committee members have been identified and approved.

Update on Faculty hiring Process

Laura (speaking for Sandra) said fulltime faculty requests were reviewed through resource requests; this is the first time they had a space for comments on special faculty requests, and are handled differently in different departments. On November 7, committees met and the positions were submitted to Cabinet. Based on review of retirement, or other factors, she thinks five positions will need to be filled, additional positions were identified should there be additional retirements. The reason for the accelerated timeline is to post the positions as soon as possible. That's how it worked in the past; this time it worked differently, and Joe Mangin came to address IPC about that.

Joe Mangin from Kinesiology and Dance introduced himself and said that generally it is him or Mike Schmidt who submit their program review. He said he heard things from different people at different levels, and that it was his understanding that there has been campus dialog on pursuing at least two full time faculty for the Kinesiology and Dance division. He is concerned that these positions were not properly vetted with the faculty

and that they were not consulted re: full time requests and faculty needs. He submitted the resource request and this statement is listed in there. There was an extended discussion on the process between Laura, Jeremy and Joe.

The regular process includes faculty input at the division level and it's not a vote and happens differently in each division but didn't happen at the faculty level this year. Joe didn't feel the positions were properly vetted; he said he thought it was important to bring this to IPC's attention. He didn't feel like it had been discussed as extensively as it should have been.

Jeremy asked who submitted the resource request and Joe said he had.

Kim thought IPC's role is move forward to approving the process for the other four divisions and re-visit the Kinesiology positions. IPC agreed to move forward in approving the process for four positions.

Further discussion covered the need for more consistency of process across divisions. Jeremy said he wanted to talk to Sandra about revisiting the process for the Kinesiology and Dance Division and bring it back for approval to another meeting.

Update on Guided Pathway Initiative

Anika passed around a key elements handout and did an overview (see handout). After going over it, she asked if Jeremy wanted to talk about the design team. He said the first step is looking at data and building the team and that they met last week. Anniqua said that the joint Academic Senate and Classified Senate meeting was well attended, Skyline presented their plan and people were enthused that the focus was on an equity plan and on a really strong pathway to getting students engaged and on meaningful pathways by building a strong foundation.

Jeremy reminded the committee that the process will take years. Kim mentioned a meeting with a consultant that backed that assessment up, and also added that the process is in inquiry mode right now, and emphasized how extensive the effort to change CMS' processes to further help students will be. She suggested that the design team will need to detect barriers and stick with the process, knowing it will take a good amount of time asking, answering and sharing out to figure out what this will mean for the college.

Anniqua mentioned that the foundation of the project is the most important thing and the other things will come along in coming years.

Fauzi said that the presentation that Skyline did emphasized how all CMS employees are educators, no matter what someone's position is on campus.

Kim said the interest has really grown and more and more people are coming into the discussion, and is happy so many more are joining in on it, and thanked Annika for all the work that has gone in so far.

Ellen asked what the design team building process is going to be and how they will make sure it will be representative of all parts of the campus.

Jeremy said the process will not be just interested parties, but also recruiting and inviting people from all departments.

Anniqa said originally there was a five-person design team and that has expanded to about 25, a portion of which is a logistics and will be very closely done with professional development.

Review Faculty, Staff and Student Campus Climate Surveys

John passed around the surveys. (See handouts). He said the surveys are very broad-encompassing. PRIE does them in sync with accreditation visits and for the accreditation process. The current iteration of the Student Survey was done last semester, and classified staff this semester. They are largely driven by accreditation response. John went through the surveys and gave an overview/summary.

Teresa suggested going over the data in detail in the spring. Kim suggested IPC look at the document among the members, then come back and identify what they think is important, and point out differences, etc. compared to what we did three years ago, and look for any red flags.

Teresa suggest IPC workshop through different pieces of it and come up with different themes and discuss those as it had in previous meetings with this sort of data. She suggested breaking into small groups at one of the meetings and going through it more thoroughly. Kim agreed we could do that and then bring our findings back to the group for analysis.

Kim recommended in early spring IPC revisit the surveys and dedicate a large portion of an IPC meeting to do a deeper dive, and PRIE will provide the means for the committee to do comparisons and cross-segment comparisons.

John went through a couple of examples showing where he thought there were issues with and suggested we looked into those.

Kim agreed that we should look for places where we need to be better at transparency, etc. in order to improve what we're doing here.

Creating Pathways for Youth Incarcerated to Higher Education

Katie wanted to share that our college will be co-hosting a conference. She handed out a flyer for the conference on creating pathways from youth incarceration to higher education.

Meeting adjourned: 2:42 p.m.