

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, April 14, 2017

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Juanita Celaya, Jia Chung, Michael Claire, Laura Demsetz, Fauzi Hamadeh, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Stephen McReynolds, Ludmila Prisecar, Stephanie Roach, John Sewart, Jeremiah Sims, Katarina Stein, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal, Mary Vogt, Andreas Wolf

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with two changes. Agenda item #6, Project Proposal Guidelines and Summative Evaluation was tabled. An update on the Educational Equity Committee (EEC) structure was added.

Review Summary Notes from the March 17, 2017 meeting

The summary notes from the March 17, 2017 meeting were approved.

Review Program Review Themes for Accuracy

The committee reviewed the program review themes that were consolidated at the last meeting. One change was made to the following theme: Need for ~~greater~~ continued collaboration and communication within the college and with high school and community/business partners. Jennifer Hughes and David Laderman will now develop the matrix document that ties these themes to CSM's Strategic Goals and the District Strategic Goals, as well as identifying any efforts currently underway to address the themes. A draft of the matrix will be provided to IPC. Once approved, it will be sent out to the college community.

Review IEPI Goals, Establish Targets

Jennifer Hughes and John Sewart provided information about the state required establishment of IEPI goals for 2017 and 2022. The following background information was shared with the group regarding this state mandate.

Background: In 2014, the California legislature established a system of indicators and goals to encourage California community colleges and districts to improve fiscal and operational effectiveness, while also reducing accreditation sanctions and audit findings. The Board of Governors (BOG) adopted the Year-Three goals framework to measure the ongoing condition of a community college's operational environment. Each college is required to develop, adopt and post a goals framework that addresses, at a minimum, the following four areas: 1) student performance and outcomes, 2) accreditation status, 3) fiscal viability, and 4) programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines.

John provided the committee with the historical trend data for the two student performance goals we will be reporting on for 2017 and 2022. The committee then discussed the proposed aspirational goals (i.e. the goals we hope to achieve.) All agreed that the goals are reasonable. The group also discussed the importance of continuing college wide efforts that will “move the needle” for student success, which has remained at approximately 70% for the past twenty years. Everyone agreed that this is not acceptable and we need to engage the college community in collective efforts that are scalable to improve the success rate of significant numbers of students. The committee suggested that IPC host a fall, 2017 flex day event during which we could engage the college in a dialogue about ways in which we can collectively focus our attention on student success. It was mentioned that we have many programs (i.e. Learning Communities and Supplemental Instruction) which are increasing the success of students in these programs. However, these programs serve relatively small numbers of students. We also need to continue to communicate that we are all responsible for student success – that student success is “everybody’s business”. The committee agreed to begin planning for the flex day activity at a future IPC meeting this spring. It was also suggested that there might be a way to market this student success effort in preparation for CSM’s 100 - year anniversary.

Update on Program Review - Classified Position Requests

Jennifer Hughes provided the committee with an update on the classified position requests that were submitted through Program Review. Thirty-six (36) positions were requested. A joint meeting of the instruction and student services administrators was held during which the positions were categorized in one of four groups:

- 1- Needed for health or safety reasons
- 2- Needed for the operation of instruction or student services
- 3- Nice to have
- 4- Not needed at this time

Once categorized, the administrators prioritized the requests in the first two categories. These were then submitted to Cabinet to determine the status of the college budget to support the position requests. Only positions in the first category were approved. These include the following:

- .48 Office Assistant II, Child Development Center
- Increase Athletic Trainer position from .48 to 1.0
- .48 Astronomy Technician (this will first be a hired as a temporary position using other funds)
- Research Analyst (required match for HSI grant; 50% from fund 1, 50% grant)

Jennifer Hughes and Mike Claire reminded the committee that based on the established processes for hiring classified staff, only those funded by Fund 1 (General Funds) come through IPC. Other grant or categorically funded positions are filled as needed. Also, the college president reserves the right to fill classified positions as deemed necessary for the operation of the college.

Jennifer noted that the IPC website will be updated with the list of the 36 positions and those that have been approved. In addition, she mentioned that the Program Review requests for student assistants and facilities

are still being reviewed in Cabinet. The faculty requests have already been completed and reported on to IPC. Selection committees have been formed, faculty hiring is underway, and the majority will be filled by the end of the spring, 2017 semester,

Update on Educational Equity Committee

Jeremiah Sims provided an updated version of the committee structure for the Educational Equity Committee (EEC). Based on prior recommendations from IPC, changes to the structure were made, including increasing the frequency of the meetings of the steering committee to three times per semester and changing the name of the Resource Distribution workgroup to the Resource Distribution Advisory group. Jeremiah also provided clarification on the role of the Evaluation workgroup. Its purpose will be to conduct an internal review/evaluation of any proposals presented to the EEC. This does not replace IPC's role in conducting formal evaluations of all college proposals and initiatives.

Project Proposal Guidelines and Summative Evaluation – Tabled. A small workgroup will meet on April 24 to review and revise the proposed document prior to discussion at a future IPC meeting.

Next Meeting: April 21, 2017 (Note: We will approve IEPI goals at this meeting.)

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, January 19, 2018

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Members: Mary Vogt, Mike Claire, Rich Rojo, Andreas Wolf, Jan Roecks, Kim Lopez (co-chair), Sandra Stefani-Comerford, John Sewart, Hilary Goodkind, Colby Riley, Gabriela Topete, Sarah Mangin, Jeramy Wallace (co-chair), Laura Demsetz, Teresa Morris, Elnora Kelly Tayag, Anniqua Rana, Alicia Frangos.

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The order in which the agenda items were presented changed.

Review Summary Notes from the December 1, 2017 meeting

Kim Lopez asked us to review the summary notes. Andreas said second to last paragraph CMS = CSM. [Change has been made].

Update on Guided Pathways

Anniqua said that because they have a very tight timeline to submit the plan to the state, they will be working on the work plan over the next month and would like to share it with IPC in the second meeting of February, after the 14th, which will be after the design team meeting, where they will prioritize particular items in the plan. She mentioned there are professional development opportunities and that there have been changes to the steering committee. Laura Demsetz added that some roles have shifted in the design team as well. March 8th Flex Day activities are in the planning stage, and they are considering a campus-wide discussion. Kim mentioned CSM may be closing the campus for Flex Day this year, which hasn't been done in the past. Anniqua added that we don't have student participation in steering or design yet, so that is a main objective. The team would like to invite students to the March 1st & 2nd training.

Update on High School Transition and Promise Director Position

Mike explained how program review drives the prioritization process in hiring classified staff, and if CSM has money, the operating budget can take care of these positions. When CSM receives a grant (such as HSI), that also affects hiring and new positions. Innovation funds align with Board goals and College goals; he used Year One as an example of an initiative that was funded using innovation funding. Mike said that they've found a gap in the work CSM needs to be doing with high schools, and has identified the need for a High School Transition and Promise Director. The state will give CSM

money to cover administrative costs, but to get the position going until that funding arrives, CSM will be using innovation funds. The position's main purposes is to help administer the Promise scholarship, and will be a high-level director position, and will also include working within some of the gaps CSM has working with high schools. The person will report to the Dean of Student Services. Mike asked if anyone had questions.

Jeremy asked if this person would have others under them. Kim said eventually they will have a team, but are taking it one step at a time, and emphasized all of the work that's being done in high schools. CSM would like to have a more concerted effort behind what it's doing with local high schools, and this person will be that contact as CSM builds out the relationships with the high schools. Kim added that we aren't yet case-managing our students, and as Promise grows, the needs increase, and we'll need to provide that. This position will provide the leadership and take the load off of people already involved in these efforts. Mike said that the high school efforts are too much work to be able to tackle without having someone responsible for it and in charge of it. He thinks Year One needs more system building in addition to the work that's already being done. Next steps for the position is to go to the Board of Trustees to get approval (Feb 28th). When they approve it, we have a green light to open the position (in March) and interview in April/May with a start date of June/July.

Men's Basketball Team

Mike presented the idea of having a men's basketball team. What prompted it was inquiries from the community. The last time CSM had one was in the 1970s. Mike doesn't feel we could have a program without a full time coach, so he is asking the Board for a men's basketball program and commit to a full time coach. He feels we need to provide the requisite resources to a competitive college level team. He says he would like to make the decision on this position. Mike gave some examples of going outside the regular process in order to change things up on occasion, and that he has a strong feeling that this is a good move for the college. He added that he realizes it will take resources, but it's another opportunity for students to be successful. He asked for feedback from the committee, adding that CSM would have to also spend some money on equipment and assistants. He said we can discuss it today or at the next meeting.

Teresa asked about timing of curriculum, and Andreas added that they were hoping to recruit someone for the following fall. Mike asked if anyone has any reservations and that he is open to discussing it further. Andreas stressed that students who are most engaged do best.

Review and Approve the Proposed Educational Master Planning Process & Review Preliminary EMP Data to Inform the Process

Hilary explained that she is now the ALO (Accreditation Liaison Officer) and the accreditation process has changed. Hilary passed around the documents that are submitted to ACCJC for accreditation as examples of what PRIE is working on and has produced before. She announced that a team is going to the ACCJC conference learning about the new standards. In light of that, CSM has to first provide an EMP (Educational Master Plan), before the ISER is undertaken. She demonstrated that the size of the

new plans are much smaller. Hilary mapped out the process in her handout (see handout). They have been reviewed by cabinet. She wants to attend committee meetings and review their goals, which feeds into the EMP then the accreditation process. She would like to then write the document starting in June, and have it done for review in September by IPC.

Laura said something to keep in mind through the spring is that most of the data will be updated, and that the standard committees should know what has changed (e.g., when they are using new or old data).

Kim discussed how Hilary's team could move forward with the support of other departments, and asked how they wanted to work with Hilary on this. Hilary would like to meet and facilitate with anyone who is interested. Laura suggested it be reviewed on computers rather than big bound versions as has been done in the past. Hilary distributed a second handout. John discussed how the statistics relate to the district strategic plans, and Hilary added that we roll down from the district plan. Hilary addressed the college's strategic goals and explained that the objectives under the goals are what she wants to make more actionable since they are something that we will return to again and again. John pointed to the College Index as the document that's updated every year, and where he gets our key points, and this reflects the current iteration, as PRIE dialed back some of the metrics. There is a target that IPC decided on last year, and this year they will provide the actuals, then decide what our target should be for '17-18. Hilary discussed the Course Completion Rate and how it relates to our Master Plan. John mentioned the equity focus, and whether we're looking at strategic plan metrics or student success data, the equity issue requires the most careful analysis. John said that the Master Plan will reflect that.

Mike wants to devote a section to explaining the budgeting process, and how to get IPC more directly involved in the budgeting of the college, going onto explain that this data helps show how effective the college is as a whole. Mike believes we'll have to work on our program mix for the long haul, so that next time CSM has a challenge like 2009, the college is prepared. He would like to expand by serving the part of the community that is currently underserved.

Hilary underscored the equity issues that do occur as the data gets drilled down. Kim mentioned addressing our achievement gaps and to keep that in mind moving forward, and mentioned that it is the challenge with every college. She suggested looking at the BSI model and expand on that as well. Jeremy suggested looking at the department level as well and suggested using 'gaps' rather than 'achievement gaps'.

John said the overall takeaway from the student, staff and faculty surveys opportunity, is that the recommending CSM is very high, in the 90% area. Of some concern were students with safety and racial tensions, as well, and something to take note of.

Mike would like to conduct some focus groups with students who are not as involved as to what their concerns are.

Colby said he is working with Jeremiah on focus groups that deal with equity, and mentioned that there is some tension problems and they are being worked on.

Rich asked if there were national surveys that are comparable to see if this is CSM specific or not, and the group agreed that students may also feel more comfortable discussing these topics than they were years ago.

Colby said they would like to take the handout back to Student Senate to review the data and get feedback. Mike thought it was more efficient for Hilary and John to go out to the divisions; IPC members agreed. Hilary said it was designed as a starting point to do that, get feedback, etc.

Announcements: In February, we'll have the Mission Statement coming back and the Guided Pathways plan. End of February there will be an update on the EMP process. Colby announced Welcome Week is next Tuesday and Wednesday. Jeramy said that an Equity Resolution has been passed in the Academic Senate. Mike said CSM received a 500K grant for the trades.

Next Meeting: February 2, 2018

Meeting Adjourned: 2:54 p.m.

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, March 17, 2017

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Teresa Morris, Ludmila Prisecar, Erica Reynolds, Stephanie Roach, Jan Roecks, John Sewart, Jeremiah Sims, Laura Skaff, Henry Villareal, Mary Vogt

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Review Summary Notes from the March 3, 2017 meeting

The summary notes were approved with one grammatical correction.

Review Program Review Themes

The committee reviewed the themes that were identified in each of the program reviews. Sandra Comerford organized these by program, key points/themes and the actual language extracted from each department program review. These were also reviewed at an Instructional Administrators meeting. IPC reviewed the themes and agreed that the following themes were mentioned frequently and constitute the prominent overarching themes:

- need for additional faculty and staff
- need for new equipment, technology, and space
- need for greater collaboration and communication within the college and with high school and community/business partners
- need for continued focus on student access, retention and success with emphasis on addressing achievement gaps; examine distance education offerings
- need for attention to enrollment, load and productivity, especially when below established thresholds
- need to examine college enrollment;
- need for continued professional development
- ?

Action: Jennifer and David will summarize these emerging themes and send back to the group to make sure that they capture the group discussion. These will then be distributed to the college community. David will also share them with the Academic Senate.

As IPC develops new objectives for each of the Strategic Goals, these prominent themes should be taken into consideration.

Review CSM Strategic Goals and District Strategic Goals

The committee reviewed the District's Strategic Plan goals against the existing CSM Strategic Goals. After thoughtful discussion, it was agreed that we would keep our distinct Strategic Goals, which are more specific than the District Goals. There were two minor changes proposed to the CSM Strategic Goals, noted in red below:

*Goal 1: Improve Student **Access and Success***

*Goal 6: Enhance Institutional **and Community Dialog and Collaboration with Community Partners***

Both changes reflect dominant themes that were identified in Program Review. In addition, all CSM goals can easily be aligned with the District Goals.

The committee was reminded that the Strategic Goals are included as part of CSM's Mission Statement. Thus, as we review the Mission and Diversity Statements (early fall, 2017) we will incorporate the revised Strategic Goals and submit to the Board of Trustees for approval. (The Board must approve any changes to the college's Mission Statement).

Action: Ron Andrade, Alicia Frangos, and David Laderman agreed to serve on the small work group to review the College Mission and Diversity statements. Sandra Comerford will serve as a resource to ensure that the Mission Statement complies with the Accreditation standards.

Review Table of Contents and EMP Tables for Additions/Deletions

Jennifer provided information to the committee regarding the approach for developing the new Educational Master Plan for the college. Jennifer recommended that we proceed with providing all the data elements that were included in the 2012 update, as it was very comprehensive and covered the data ordinarily contained in an EMP. That said, there were three areas where it was suggested that additional data might be useful:

1. Given the recent statewide emphasis on CTE (i.e., Strong Workforce), it was suggested that we should add additional CTE data. It may be beneficial to break out those occupational program data based on those that lead to degrees vs. those leading to certificates. It may also be helpful to update the top local employers. (John noted that we have historically provided Perkins data in the EMP.)
2. Given the establishment of SSSP and Student Equity plans, additional data to demonstrate our success in reaching the goals identified in these respective plans should be included.
3. Given the dramatic increase in International students, additional information about international students (e.g. #s of students, success rates) should be included.

4. With the establishment of the ASLT Division and the programs in this division (i.e., Learning Communities and the Learning Center), it was suggested that we provide additional data for the Learning Center and the Learning Communities.

John will incorporate this additional information when developing the EMP. The goal is to have the EMP ready in the fall for IPC review. These data will help inform priorities for the next several years. Ideally, these data and the themes from Program Review will help IPC identify new objectives and action steps for each of the Strategic Goals.

Project Proposal Guideline and Summative Evaluation

The committee reviewed the Project Proposal Guidelines document, which had been previously shared with the committee, but never approved. The goal was to develop a document for members of the college community to submit proposals and to have a mechanism for subsequent evaluation of these initiatives/proposals. The document has similar components to those found in grant proposals. In the past, there had been no established process for requests to start new initiatives/proposals. Furthermore, when IPC last evaluated the Learning Communities (Umoja, Honors, and Puente) and Supplemental Instruction, there were no consistent guidelines to give those making presentation to IPC. Thus, the committee agreed that we needed greater consistency for requesting and evaluating proposals. For this year, we planned to request that the Learning Communities, Supplemental Instruction, and Reading Apprenticeship coordinators complete Part 5 of the document (Summative Evaluation Report) and submit to IPC. In order to do this, we will need to revise this section a bit, since these groups did not submit proposals as they were established before we developed this process.

Concerns were expressed about:

- The frequency of the evaluations. Currently, the document indicates that proposals will be evaluated annually. Is this too frequent? Should the timeline be aligned with Program Review?
- The timeline for the current evaluation to take place. Must it be done by the end of the semester? Could we give the coordinators until early fall to complete the evaluation. (Note – The Business Office can work with the coordinators to complete budget information).
- The “message” that the evaluation might send to the Learning Communities. Might an evaluation result in a Learning Community being discontinued?

Action: Further discussion in IPC is needed. Committee members should review the Proposal Guideline document and be prepared to discuss at the next IPC meeting.

Merge BSI and Equity Committees

Jeremiah Simms presented the proposed merge of the BSI and Equity Committees. The merged committee would be named the Educational Equity Committee (EEC). There would be four working groups within the EEC, including an evaluation group, resource distribution group, Equity/DIAG group, and Basic Skills Initiative group. The working groups would probably meet monthly, while the EEC would meet twice per term. There will be lots of cross-over between the working groups, to prevent becoming siloed. IPC committee members had a few suggested changes:

-As the EEC is established, it might be beneficial to meet more than 2 times per semester. It was suggested that the EEC conduct three meetings per semester. Jeremiah mentioned that during the first hour of each EEC meeting, there would be a report out from each of the working groups.

-Rename the "resource distribution" working group. The name suggests that the group has the authority to distribute funds. Instead, they are a recommending body to Cabinet. It was suggested that this group be renamed the "resource review" group. Jeremiah indicated that they would be developing a rubric for reviewing resource requests.

Action: Jeremiah will take these suggested changes back to the group for further revision and then return to IPC. IPC approved the merge of BSI and Equity into the new Educational Equity Committee (EEC.)

Next Meeting: April 14, 2017 (Note: This is an additional meeting in order to review proposed IEPI goals.)

Tentative Agenda – Review of College Index – Propose IEPI goals, Review Project Proposal Guidelines

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, May 5, 2017

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Members Attending: Michael Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, Fauzi Hamadeh, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Stephen McReynolds, Teresa Morris, Jan Roecks, Jeremiah Sims, Laura Skaff, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Mary Vogt

Guest: Kristi Ridgway

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was revised to include the following additional items:

- Educational Equity Committee (EEC) information – Jeremiah Sims
- Update on Themes from Program Review – David Laderman
- Update on Mission Statement – David Laderman, Fauzi Hamadeh

Review Summary Notes from the April 14, 2017 meeting

The summary notes were approved.

Professional Development Report, 2016/2017

Theresa Martin provided highlights from the Professional Development Plan Report. A copy of the PPT will be posted to the IPC website. The PD plan is overseen by the Center for Academic Excellence (CAE) Committee, whose Chair serves as the PD coordinator. CAE strives to:

- Provide professional enrichment that connects and inspires
- Serve as support for “moving the needle” on student success
- Create an environment that supports forward thinking and institutional progress

CAE goals for 2016/2017 included:

- Implement year one of Three Year Professional Development Plan
- Collaborate with district PD efforts
- Improve sustainability of Center for Academic Excellence

Some of the highlights from the PD report include:

- Successful New Faculty Institute – it is truly a model. Eight of eleven new faculty participated in 2016/17. Jeremiah Sims and Theresa Martin plan to write a professional journal about the Institute.

- Flex Day – there is a lot of participation by full time and part-time faculty, as well as classified staff. Theresa shared a separate report (posted to IPC website) of participants attending each session, and gave a “shout-out” to all the sponsors and co-sponsors of the various sessions. Everyone commended the PD committee for creating such a robust menu of flex day activities, many of which are hosted by in-house facilitators.
- Year One and MINDSET – good progress being made with both. David Laderman mentioned that he recently spoke with a group of graduating seniors about the Year One program. Numbers for 2017 Year One have tripled.
- College Assessment Committee is doing excellent work and making the SLO work meaningful.
- The newly structured Educational Equity Committee is doing exciting equity related work, including lunch and learn sessions.

Mike Claire thanked Theresa and the PD team (Jenn Taylor-Mendoza, David Laderman, Kristi Ridgway, and Henry Villareal) for their outstanding work. The outcomes of the PD activities are impressive and demonstrate that important work is being undertaken at the college. Theresa is becoming very well known in the state for her leadership with professional development. The committee thanked her for leadership and service as PD Chair.

SLO Update

Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza provided a brief update on SLOs. The Institutional SLOs have been revised somewhat, with new objectives. In addition, a new Institutional SLO has been added: Independent Learning and Development. This SLO update will be presented to the Academic Senate Governing Council on May 9. In October 2017, faculty will begin mapping their course and program SLOs to the revised ISLOs. Specific details about the changes follow: (A copy of this document will be posted to the IPC website).

The Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) describe the knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes that students should develop through any sustained experience with the college – whether courses, degree or certificate programs, pre-transfer general education pattern, or academic and support services.

Independent Learning and Development. The ability of students to develop, evaluate, and pursue personal, academic, and/or career goals. Students will be able to:

- ~~Demonstrate solid skills in planning and time management~~ **Demonstrate effective study strategies;**
- Articulate realistic and achievable academic and/or career goals;
- Identify and make use of college and community resources (academic and student support services).

Effective Communication. The ability of students to write, read, speak, and listen in order to communicate effectively. Students will be able to:

- Comprehend, interpret, and analyze written and oral information;
- Express ideas and provide supporting evidence effectively in writing and speaking;
- **Express ideas creatively through verbal and non-verbal media (e.g. music, art, dance, etc.)**
- Communicate effectively in a group or team situation.

Quantitative Reasoning. The ability of students to perform quantitative analysis, using appropriate resources. Students will be able to:

- Solve a variety of problems that require quantitative reasoning;
- Interpret graphical representation of quantitative information.

Critical Thinking. The ability of students to think creatively, analytically, and logically, in order to assess ideas, formulate arguments, develop multiple perspectives, and solve problems.

Students will be able to:

- Develop and evaluate arguments;
- **Analyze, synthesize and evaluate ideas as part of the creative process;**
- Assess the validity of both qualitative and quantitative evidence;
- Apply diverse disciplinary approaches and perspectives;
- Understand and employ the scientific method.

Social Awareness and Diversity. The ability of students to recognize cultural traditions and to understand and appreciate the diversity of human experience, past and present. Students will be able to:

- Identify the benefits of diversity and respect the range of diversity;
- Work effectively with others of diverse backgrounds;
- Recognize the importance and analyze the interconnectedness of global and local concerns, both past and present;

- **Identify and analyze a diversity of artistic and cultural traditions.**

Ethical Responsibility / Effective Citizenship. The ability of students to make judgments with respect to individual conduct, based on systems of values. Students will be able to:

- Recognize ethical principles;
- Identify possible courses of action in response to ethical dilemmas and evaluate their consequences;
- Behave ethically and respectfully when working with students, instructors, and the campus community.

Fall Flex Day Activity – Student Success

Jennifer Hughes provided a brief summary of a planning meeting that was conducted to talk about an IPC flex day activity focused on student success. The planning group included Theresa Martin, Madeleine Murphy, Sandra Stephanie Comerford, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, David Laderman and Jeremiah Sims. The date for the flex day event is August 15. After Mike’s welcome in the morning, everyone will remain in Bayview Dining. Mike will briefly ask us all to think what the “perfect” college would look like. “Perfect” in this context refers to one that completely serves our students; thus, a bit of a different definition. We will also have the folks from Career Ladders Project (CLP) provide an update on their work with guided pathways which has an impact on completion and success.

There will then be a couple of 1-hour breakout sessions: 1) Teaching and learning – how are you as a faculty member helping to create the “perfect” college? 2) Collectively, how do we develop planning structures to support our students (e.g., early alert)? After the breakout sessions, everyone will be reconvene for a working lunch, during which they can talk more about what the “perfect” college would look like. We would like to invite some students to join us for these discussions. We also want to use this flex opportunity to bring IPC into our community and to bring the community into IPC. We want to emphasize that IPC is focusing its

attention on student success and we want to know what others think we can do to collectively “move the needle” regarding student success.

The afternoon would continue with more standard flex day sessions. The small group will continue to refine the details for the day and report back to IPC.

Project Proposal Guideline and Summative Evaluation

A small group (David Laderman, Jennifer Hughes, Jan Roecks, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Jeramy Wallace, and Mike Claire) met to review the draft document that has been reviewed by IPC. The committee agreed that a template will be developed for concisely reporting specific data for existing Learning Community and other initiatives (e.g. Supplemental Instruction). PRIE staff and the appropriate dean will assist the faculty coordinators in completing the document using data provided by PRIE. Over the course of the academic year, the Learning Community coordinators, along with their dean would provide a 10-15 minute presentation to IPC to review the documentation provided in the template.

All new initiatives would be required to complete the Proposal Guideline and Summative Evaluation documentation.

Jan Roecks will take the lead in working with the Sandra Stefani Comerford and Jennifer Hughes in developing the short template for existing programs and making revisions to the Proposal document for new initiatives. These will be reviewed at the May 19 IPC meeting.

Education Equity Committee (EEC) Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza and Jeremiah Sims requested clarification on the appointment of faculty to the EEC and workgroups of EEC. Like all other IPC committees, the Academic Senate makes all appointments for faculty representatives. Classified appointments are made by the Classified staff (by email through Fauzi Hamadeh and Juanita Celaya). Student appointments are made by the Associated Students of CSM (ASCSM).

There was also discussion as to whether these committees are bound by the Brown Act and/or Roberts Rules of Order.

Fauzi Hamadeh stated that Robert’s Rules of Order does not carry the force of law. It is based on tradition and agreed upon rules for running meetings, but it is not mandated. The Brown Act, however, is legally binding and applies to elected “legislative bodies,” such as the Board of Trustees, and any groups or committees that it recognizes as advisory. That is why groups like the Academic Senate and the Associated Students must adhere to the Brown Act. Because IPC is advisory to the college president, it is not subject to the Brown Act’s rules, and neither are any of its subcommittees. Therefore, any sub-group of those committees would also not be bound by the Brown Act.

That said, IPC always makes sure its meetings are open, and agendas and summary notes are posted. This is required of all IPC committees as well. In addition, all IPC committees use the consensus model for decision-making.

Because of some of the confusion surrounding this, it was agreed that Jennifer Hughes and Fauzi Hamadeh would work over the summer to develop an implementation manual, similar to what College Council used to describe its purpose and how it functioned. This will be reviewed each year by IPC.

Jeremiah also wanted to confirm that IPC had approved the EEC structure as previously presented to IPC. The EEC Steering Committee, based on a recommendation from IPC, meets approximately 3 times per semester. Representatives from the four EEC work groups serve on the EEC Steering Committee and report out on activities of their respective work group at the Steering Committee meeting. The work groups would meet more regularly to carry out their activities.

IPC confirmed that this structure was approved at a prior IPC meeting.

Update on Themes

Jennifer Hughes and David Laderman shared the next steps with the committee. David agreed to draft an email to go out to the college community, which would include the themes identified through this cycle. Given some time constraints and an interest in getting this out before the end of the semester, it was agreed that the themes document would not require an extensive matrix, as was done last year, identifying the various activities underway to meet the themes. Instead, the email will mention activities we are engaged in that address the themes, mention where there might be gaps, and state that these themes inform our overall planning efforts at the college.

Update on Mission Statement

The small work group (David Laderman, Alicia Frangos, Fauzi Hamadeh, and Ron Andrade) met to begin revising the Mission Statement. Samples from other colleges, which have more concise and aspirational Mission Statements, were reviewed. All agreed that the Mission Statement needed to be shortened, while still containing those elements required by ACCJC. It was also suggested that we de-couple the CSM Strategic Goals from the Mission Statement. This will eliminate the need to submit the Mission Statement to the Board of Trustees for approval each time we make a change in any of the Strategic Goals. The revised Mission Statement will be presented to IPC early in the fall, 2017 semester. IPC will also need to review the objectives for each of the current CSM Strategic Goals. This will be done in conjunction with a review of the updated EMP.

Announcements

Mike Claire informed the committee that the District has begun its next round of distributing innovation funds. He pointed out that the innovation funds are no longer tied to FTES, which is good. He expects that the District will have approximately \$1.5-2 million to distribute among the three college and District entities. Mike has met with Cabinet to discuss possible requests, which will total approximately \$800. He mentioned that we won't get that much, but we'll get sufficient dollars to help us meet some of our needs. These funds are ongoing. We'll continue to get new innovation funds each year, as long as property tax revenues remain strong. CSM requests will be reviewed by Cabinet and the Deans and shared with IPC.

Next Meeting: May 19, 2017

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, October 6, 2017

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

In Attendance:

Members: Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Ludmila Prisecar, Jan Roecks, Alicia Frangos, Katrina Relos, Jeramy Wallace, Jia Chung, Sarah Mangin, Elnora Kelly Tayag, Laura Demsetz, Teresa Morris, Fi Tovo, Mike Claire, Jeremiah Sims, John Sewart, Sarah Mangin

MEETING SUMMARY

Next Meeting: October 20, 2017

Welcome and Introductions

Jeramy oversaw the meeting as Chair Kim Lopez was out. New member Sarah Mangin introduced herself. Everyone else introduced themselves as well.

Review of the Agenda

Approved by consensus.

Review Summary Notes from the September 15, 2017 meeting

Laura said Lifelong earning should be lifelong learning (correct). No other objections were made.

Review Guided Pathway Self-Assessment

Sandra presented the Guided Pathways Self-Assessment Tool. This has to go to the Board of Trustees next Wednesday, so she asked for approval from IPC today (see handout). Sandra explained workshops, and the presentation was on self-assessment tools. Sandra presented a list of names who make up the design team, comprised of faculty, since Guided Pathways is faculty-driven. These faculty come from different disciplines and will be the ones leading the workshops.

The process begins with the self-assessment. Sandra explained the Key Elements, 1-14. The design team have put indicated in all of the element whether they are in pre-adoption, early adoption, in progress, or full scale. Most of them will be in early adoption. Based on input, the team feels as a whole, the program is in early adoption.

Sandra asked people to contact Anniqua Rana with any questions, concerns or comments. Anniqua needs to receive any feedback by Monday or Tuesday, because Wednesday is the deadline to present the program to the Board.

Sandra requested action on this. Jeramy asked if anyone had any objections to presenting this to the Board of Trustees. No one had an objection. Jeramy announced the consensus was that it should go.

Presentations from Umoja, Mana

CSM Mana Program presentation by Fi Tovo (handout)

Fi thanked PRIE for quantitative data used in her presentation. Fi talked about the high rate of previous drop-out rates and spoke about how the retention rates had increased in Mana. She said she forgotten to account for students who graduated (where the asterisks are). (See handout). She explained that Pacific Island and Oceania studies program is a new certificate and asked IPC to look at the success rate of the program, especially the retention. Her push is for the success rate.

Regarding Mana Goals – the first cohort was 2017 Mana graduation. They decided to go above and beyond the classroom with specialized programs, utilizing the village resources and working strategically with the learning center and ethnic studies department. They are also happy with the specialization certificate. She is also collaborating with San Diego and are bringing them up for a site visit. Mana preview day is their program’s outreach for high school students. This is the third year doing Earth Day outreach as well. They have a certificate of achievement as well. Colleges are reaching out to ask them how our AA degrees guided pathways resource outside of 2-year work. Another accomplishment is the 30 student cohort. Mana has made curricular shifts in the classroom, collaborating with learning center. Fi spoke about Pacific Islanders identifying as a learning community and how many don’t realize this. It opened up the discussion about identity, such as “first generation, ‘marginalized’ ‘culture capital.’ The challenges are that student population (Mana are around 50) need support to scale up. There is also a need for research materials and dedicated space to support the Mana certificate program; she suggested using the library since she feels it already has what they need. She believes CSM has opened up more opportunities for students. She read the end statement, it takes a village, collaborating, etc. and offers to collaborate across campuses. She asked all faculty to embrace it and the institution as well.

Mike pointed out that data he had predated it, and just the course success rate was 50% but the numbers have improved 10%. He also liked what she said about collaboration, and as the programs are built, he appreciated Fi mentioning the learning centers, math/science, STEM, etc. since those are also part of the identity. He added that it would be great if the student transfers could be captured, since it seemed like a lot were at the transfer ceremony. He asked what action IPC plans to take. John added that he hadn't previously had time to do some of the data, but it will be added at a later time.

Fi pointed out that she is a collaborator not by choice but the new opportunities have given her that resource.

Laura thanked her for her leadership and commended her for working as a team and pointed out the reasons for lower cohort now.

Jan complimented her on her thorough job on her report and said it helped IPC and the college that she has put it together for us moving forward and reiterated collaboration.

Jeremiah wanted clarification on what that collaboration looked like.

Fi responded that to make a reformed changed means to attack the instructional cohort. She spoke about shaping the curriculum to the students. Culturally-relevant curriculum should be addressed; students go home to gentrification. She spoke of articulating that to her students and the Mana program continues to use that. She added that when students are given that space, change will happen.

Jeremy talked about Sparkpoint as relevant. Mike said we got outreach from United Way to start a Sparkpoint program. The tough part of it to solve is housing the program.

Umoja Presentation – Annual Review

Jeremy Wallace presented the review. Umoja is a learning community mainly for the AA community, it's an afro-centric program, all African, and African American culture. There are currently 32 students and 34 continuing from the previous 3 cohorts. Many of them are in the Umoja club for an active number of 66 on campus. 24 have graduated and/or transferred, 13 have left CSM for another CC (often because of housing). 6 students were dismissed (grades or withdrawals). 25 students are untracked, etc (we don't know about them, probably dropped out) (Unknown status). 4 faculty support the program. 18 units of reassigned time for the entire year. (see handout).

Quantitative data came from PRIE.

John explained the retention data. All retention means is that a grade was received, no matter the grade, and not success rates, but since following state metrics, that's what was used. John clarified it was all courses, because Laura asked if it was just Umoja courses or all courses.

Jeremy explained the Quantitative data (see handout). Jeremy was happy with the 54 degrees awarded.

Alicia asked about the six students who were dismissed. Almost always students can be reinstated, so she wondered if Jeremy knew they were gone, and wanted to talk with Jeremy later about it.

This year is the first Escalation Workshop (by One Love).

A lot of the Umoja students are speaking at conferences. State-wide conference in LA we had 3 students speaking there last November for example.

Most of the rest of the activities are the same as previous years.

Goals – would like to extend the cohort and touch all African American students.

He wants to create a second year Umoja program. Dr. Gaines & Jeremy are developing a Black Leadership course resulting in a community based services.

Expanding the mentoring program to the community is another particular aspiration, which includes reaching out to the community (Genentech, etc.). This is one of the biggest goals of the coming year.

Jeremy went on to talk about the Accomplishments and Challenges (see handout).

Students are more likely to graduate and transfer through Umoja than not. He would like to double CSU numbers. He believes Umoja is becoming more known throughout the student body and also attracting more non-African American students to the clubs and cohorts. A lot of black student leaders are talking about Umoja, but still he'd like to get more students involved to increase retention.

PRIE data shows cohorts are getting better and better, and Jeremy said that the program is getting stronger every year.

Jeremiah offered to be involved.

Ludmilla asked if all the coordinators of the different programs ever get together to discuss common issues. Jeremy said that they do and that they also want to work with a retention specialist.

For the first 3 years of Umoja, the time was split between he and Dr. Gaines and the reassigned time gets used up by student crises which made it hard to manage the program.

Jeremy believes a retention specialist can devote 100% to student needs.

Mike said it's tough to work in a learning community and put yourself out there to the students, and he wanted to personally thank Jeremy Wallace, Dr. Gaines, Jeremiah Sims and Fi Tovo as the kind of people CSM needs and wants. Jeremy responded he was happy CSM gives them a platform.

Review Integrated BSI, SE/SSSP Plan

Jeremiah discussed the integrated plan. They have met in small subgroups to complete the plan (shown up on the projector). He presented the executive plan (see handout).

Jeremiah said that the cohort model is working well for the learning communities and that's something we need to iron out at scale, but the efficacy of marginalized students working together as minorities is good. He spoke about a study that was done with same test scores coming into Berkeley. That study has been used to support the strength of cohort learning for marginalized students, and what is taking place in our learning communities supports that.

Laura talked about separating features of the learning community between cohorts and additional resources. Jeremiah said he thought that students working together is more successful even than the other resources.

Jeremiah wants to implement learning community programs campus-wide.

Jeremiah added that a student asked him about microaggression, and he is planning on addressing it.

Jeremiah said the summary is addressing issues campus-wide. Systemic structuralized barriers students face need to be addressed.

He went on to say that he reframed the conversation and instead of paying attention myopically to achievement gaps, he looks at opportunity gaps instead, basically addressing the disease and not the symptom. The opportunity gaps are from structuralized inequity.

Jan said a comprehensive report like this has not been done before and this is the result of that, for three different programs together.

Teresa asked about guided pathways being foundational and wanted to know how it's woven in later, as an initiative or home-grown ideas. Jeremy offered that Anniqua was the one that designed that part of it.

Jan added the team was talking a lot about pathways which is a recurring thing and Jeremiah added that exemplified the kind of collaboration we can do on the CSM campus.

Teresa added that the pathways is a fundamental necessity for success.

Jeremiah says the highlight is on equity.

Jan mentioned there is an intermix throughout Guided Pathways.

Laura had concern about the two-year plan aspect and said she would ask Anniqua.

Update on Board of Trustees, Strategic Goals and Metrics

Mike presented a document that the Board of Trustees will need to adopt, and which will be finalized in a month (see handout).

Mike said that although he's a numbers guy, it's the students behind the numbers that actually matter, and it's anecdotes, stories, etc. that have an effect on the numbers. If we do our jobs well and put programs in place and connect students with the resources they need, the numbers will follow.

Regarding learning communities, there are things CSM learns that help our hypermarginalized students, but the most significant professional development thing he discovered a few years ago was that some students had no resources.

Mike stressed the need to reach out to students in high school, even reach down to the middle school level. Every one that come to CSM needs a sense of connection, and we need to give them direction and momentum. He realizes they change majors, etc. but students coming to us realize they need a diploma to make it in this part of the world.

Mike brought up Year One and has a sense of what we can offer, such as Umoja or Mana, but some way they should be connected to us significantly and if we do our jobs right and make a curriculum culture the numbers should improve, and the students behind the numbers will find success.

He referred to the metrics across the district and said that they were trying to break down the metrics to one page that everyone could refer to. They are tied to strategic goals that the Board of Trustees has set. He mentioned that after having attended board meetings for 12 years, out of all those meetings, the last 24 are the first time they spoke about equity, student success, student achievement in a significant way. CSM has these programs because we got innovation programs from the board, and they are where the funds come from. So it's reasonable for them to expect us to report back on how we're doing.

On the Board's site, there's a link to the strategic plan and anyone can see this report and disaggregate it further by other criteria.

All 3 colleges have innovative programs, and every couple of Board of Trustee meetings, CSM is doing as well if not better than the other 2 colleges. We could be doing worse but we also can be doing better. He asked that we take the document back to our constituents and look at the targets that have been established, and use the best professional assessment and be realistic. He says there are some nuances (e.g., metric 1.4). He said that he appreciated programs for changing based on the information.

Mike said the numbers are lower than the other 2 colleges is because we have a higher number of international students, etc. You can actually change the dashboard on it by clicking down and finding the reasons behind the data.

He asked that constituency groups report back and let him know if they are in the ballpark, and will ask us to look at it again before it's adopted by the Board. The Board has seen this first draft, which is a work in progress. He wants to get it done by the end of the semester.

Jeremy asked when he wants us to bring it back to IPC. Mike said by the end of November, if that's possible depending on whether people can fit it on their agendas.

John said the definitions are also on the dashboard.

Mike asked that groups have their questions ready when John comes to visit their group.

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, October 20, 2017

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

In Attendance:

Members: Juanita Celaya, David Laderman, Fauzi Hamadeh, Laura Demsetz, Anniqua Rana, Jeramy Wallace, John Sewart, Michael Vargas, Sarah Mangin, Katie Bliss, Katrina Relos, Mark Helsel, Colby Riley, Kim Lopez, Rich Rojo, Lizette Bricker, Elnora Kelly Tayag, Ron Andrade, Ellen Young, Allie Fasth, Kristi Ridgway, Mary Vogt, Madeleine Murphy, Annie Theodos, Mike Claire, Allie Fasth

MEETING SUMMARY

Next Meeting: November 3, 2017

Welcome and Introductions

Kim opened the meeting and explained we had a lot of presentations today to fit into 2 hours.

Review of the Agenda

All approved.

Review Summary Notes from the October 6, 2017 meeting

Presentations from Honors, Project Change, Supplemental Instruction, Year One and Promise Program

Honors Project:

David Laderman introduced the Honors project update. He mentioned that John Sewart had some data that he has yet to go through which is not included. David read the mission statement from the website (See Honors project [Mission Statement online](#)). He wanted to emphasize that it was measured more holistically rather than quantitatively. David switched to the awards and presentations page to demonstrate the things that students have done within the program and to give a good concrete sense of what the honors program has accomplished over the years. He also addressed the alumni page which shows where students have gone

after completing the program; some don't complete the program because they move on, but he sees it as a sign of success for those who have moved onto universities. He says 14 students in total have completed the program.

He also addressed the [participating foundation course faculty](#). These are the people who work with students within the program. He emphasized how much buy-in there is on the campus for the program. Every spring they bring students to a consortium; this past spring a student who transferred to Stanford was a keynote speaker, and the 3 top student presentations were given to students at CSM. All three college honors programs have a great synergy together. There is a showcase in December for students to show the projects they've completed. David went onto talk about the Labyrinth, which just won another national top prize. CSM was one of 2 colleges who won in a competition which included both two- and four-year colleges. In conclusion, David said he plans to scale up the program because of its success.

David introduced some students to say things about the program to IPC.

Rob Komars said that we need to change the culture, and thinks there are some bad things that still go on at CSM, but that the Honors Program is one of the good things that go on at the college. Rob teaches the program's science seminar.

Kim Lopez asked John Sewart how much data he had to share. He said he had the basic metrics, and distributed it. John explained the data on the handout (see Honors Student Data handout).

David concluded that most students come to the program as high caliber, but we'd like to give more students a chance to get there, especially by partnering with the other programs, such as Umoja, etc. and then they can come to the Honors Program in their second or third year.

Project Change:

Katie Bliss presented Project Change program. She said she is always impressed by the students as leaders. She [played a 6-minute video](#) for IPC. She said the video spoke to the dedication that the college has and that it's one of the only programs of its kind in the state. Katie explained how the classes are being presented at juvenile hall and preparing students to get ready to take classes on campus. She highlighted Nick Jasso, second year Project Change Student and Student Ambassador. He was part of the first cohort and was mentored by David Laderman. Nick has studied abroad and completed his EMT certificate and served in Americorps (see PowerPoint). The students really want to give back; they want to talk to other youth and have become a service-oriented community. Most students who have been incarcerated have a disjointed experience. When incarcerated the quality of education received is not great, so students fall behind, and the graduation rates are horrendous. So for the students to get to the point where they are now is amazing (See Breaking through the bars slide). Most are doing well and the peer

mentoring takes care of the students who are struggling. She talked about the donors from within the community and how they have the students gradually build up to 12 units since many work full time and either support families or contribute to them. Some students from the program last year earned certificates.

Supplemental Instruction:

Ron Andrade presented for Supplemental Instruction (SI). He distributed a data sheet (Annual Review of Current College Initiatives handout) and broke down the data. Last year there were 26 SI leaders and this year there are 42. The goal is to expand SI into other divisions as it works better with some classes than others. He explained how review sessions worked and the challenges of getting some students engaged on that level. Ron offered to answer questions.

Mike said he was floored by the success rates, especially in math and science, and inquired whether the data was being shared with faculty.

Ron said they do share with faculty at the end of the semester. Mike thought it would be compelling information for students too.

Kim asked why the numbers had nearly doubled since last year and Ron said that some of that was part of the roll-out plan. The plan for the next 3 years is to hold steady at about this level (42).

Year One:

Allie Fath presented Year One's initial data (see handout – Annual Review of Current College Initiatives). The first cohort started last fall so there is limited data. But there are some good anecdotal things. The program consists of academic and social aspects (see handout). Trying to offer students the opportunity to get entrenched in the community one way or another. Some are ambassadors, some get engaged in clubs.

The first cohort was initially 48, now this year it's doubled at 94. The majority of the students could not take 12+ units in their first semester, but most increased in their second semester. They all take a first year seminar course which supports them across the disciplines they are taking by teaching them strategy. Across all four sections, all students are reading the same book, e.g.

The other ways they've tried to support (see page 3) is they have 4 faculty teaching it and strong library sponsorship. Allie stressed collaboration with the library. She believes there is so much opportunity to grow the program, for students to start clubs, etc. and is excited about how creative the program can be.

Jeremy feels Year One is the Guided Pathways' foundation and said he was exploring with Allie how to make some connections.

Laura asked about how the different disciplines work.

Allie explained that right now, students aren't selecting their area of study and that eventually that could change.

Laura asked what do we do with the students who are struggling and dropping class?

David suggested accelerated courses for someone to get to the second half of a semester.

Allie said that counseling is helping in this regard, and working with students, as she is doing presently.

Mike commented credited David with the name "Year One" and commended Allie and her colleagues on doing such a great job. He feels the next step is to expand the 'year zero' aspect and start the momentum even sooner. Another next step is to continue to build it; he mentioned retention specialists because of the workload for the learning community leaders.

The Promise Program:

Lizette Bricker distributed four handouts (brochure, SMCCD Promise Scholarship Program, stats, Annual Review of Current College Initiatives) and went over the handout.

Laura pointed out Skyline doesn't have the county requirement.

There is no success data because this was the program's first semester. Lizette was very pleased with the high rate of enrollment for first generation students.

AB 19 means they will need more outreach to get FAFSAs earlier and connect earlier on in general (reach out to high school students). She would like to expand to the other learning communities and collaborate with other groups to help for an easier transition.

As a response to a question by one of the students, Lizette explained she wants to see the cost to the district in order incorporate it into financial aid.

Fauzi asked if in the e textbooks issue was addressed here and Lizette said it was. She added that so was food and transportation, etc. are other issues being addressed.

Another member asked if there was flexibility about attending other colleges in the district and Lizette said yes, that is the goal.

Mike added that all 3 colleges are probably adopting many of the same 'best practices' policies in this regard.

Approve Revised Mission Statement

Fauzi presented the new CSM Mission statement (Version 1). It's what the task force developed initially. IPC said make it shorter, punchier & aspirational, instead of driven by accreditation. (see handout). It wasn't distributed, but David read it aloud. He asked Colby what they had discussed. Colby said that no one really knew the definition of equity in the context of the statement. David said after he got feedback and he thinks it's a bit wordy and jargon-y and thinks it should be simplified and streamlined and accessible while still retaining the meaning.

Fauzi read the new one to IPC to see what they think. Colby said by shortening it, it might dull it down too much. He felt the need for inclusion of the word "equity". Jeremy offered that during the editing process, focusing on equity, perhaps people don't know what equity is. That was his only concern with the new version.

Mike said he's fine with either statement, but that we have an opportunity to fold in other things within the statement; just something to keep in mind. Collectively somewhere we have to meet the accreditation requirements as well, and he thinks we can do that with related statements.

Fauzi mentioned that our diversity statement could also use updating as well.

Kim asked what the task force's plan was at this point. Fauzi thought it would be good to hand it out to the constituency and bring the feedback back to the task force.

Laura suggested sending the whole thing out to constituency (the mission statement and subs underneath it).

Colby liked the emailed version (v2), and disagreed that we need the entire thing (the subs) in order to work on the main statement.

Kim said she thinks there is a lot more to flesh out, so requested the task force to bring us another draft at the next meeting, starting with the V2 (email) version to see if we can come to a consensus.

Discussion on Textbook Reduction

Mike discussed the text book initiative. He spoke about how AB19 passed and helped, but there are a whole other range of costs to students, and a key one is text books. So the board is

looking at costs of food/transportation/housing and books. The one they have most direct control is textbooks, so he asked the group to create a task force to reach out to the constituency (headed by Laura Demsetz) to form a coalition to work on solutions. He asked for some realistic strategies that CSM can implement to reduce in a significant way the cost of textbooks. He also requested that students be on the task force. He stressed he'd like to get moving on it right away. Elnora had some suggestions and Laura also said there are good ideas everywhere and that it's been known for a long time, and faculty is already doing a lot with textbook cost reduction, and knows of a lot of classes that have already reduced. So there is already awareness, but also need to look for what more needs to be done. Laura added it's a bigger situation than just the textbooks.

Mike added that the Board of Trustees is right on top of this and very supportive of the drive to get the costs down and be as strategic as possible and that it should be a specific goal of this college.

Laura requested a co-chair and also that it be faculty and library. She requested that James and Jeremy be on the committee. She also requested that she have student representation on the task force as well.

Kim suggested giving Laura time to get the task force together. Mike suggested classified staff should be on it, and Kim said it would be a discussion item on the agenda.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, October 21, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Juanita Celaya, Michael Claire, Alicia Frangos, Fauzi Hamadeh, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, Ludmila Prisecar, Erica Reynolds, Stephanie Roach, James Roe, Jan Roecks, John Sewart, Jeremiah Sims, Katarina Stein, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal, Mary Vogt, Andreas Wolf

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Review Summary Notes from October 7, 2016 Meeting

The summary notes from the October 7 meeting were approved.

Mission statement

The committee approved the most recent draft of the IPC mission statement.

Discuss of college index

There was a robust, lively discussion, lead by John Sewart, around collection of indexes used to track a number of student success indicators. Examples include transfer rate, course completion, etc. It has become apparent that not all of the indexes provide straightforward data. When definitions from outside organizations are used, which is required for many of the indexes, some students are left out of the equation, which can result in data that is unclear. For example, when transfer rates are calculated, the total number of transfer students is not captured because the external definition requires that only first time college attendees be counted. In other words, returning students, or students who have taken one course elsewhere, are not counted as a transfer student even if they successfully transfer from CSM to another institution. IPC is considering working with PRIE to come up with a set of indexes that are more useful for our purposes at the CSM community. There was discussion of whether to take a more holistic approach to setting targets, or one that is more quantitatively based on linear projection. Most members seemed to prefer the former, which was recommended by John. Interest arose in pursuing the idea of reviving an IPC subcommittee devoted to enrollment management and the college index, in order to 1) more effectively monitor the index in relation to college initiatives, interventions and other enrollment issues, so as to more effectively set targets and increase student success; 2) develop a more local, CSM community-identity index, one extrapolated from the State index but modified and streamlined to more accurately reflect a variety of student success indicators.

All college budget update

Kathy Blackwood gave IPC the presentation she had given at the Board on Sept. 28th for adoption of the Final Budget for 2016/17. Kathy described the various Fund 1 Revenues and outlined the Categorical Funds from the state that the District receives and reviewed expenses paid by the District including Salaries and Benefits, Materials and Operating Expenses, PERS and STRS increases and contributions by the District to the Retirement Trust Fund.

Jan Roecks then presented to IPC the College of San Mateo Master Budget Summary, describing the Fund 1 and Categorical Funds allocated to the college from the District and discussing how those funds are budgeted at the college level.

Next Meeting: Friday, November 4, 2016

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.

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, November 18, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Membership: Ron Andrade, Kathy Blackwood, 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), Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, Ludmila Prisecar, Erica Reynolds, Stephanie Roach, James Roe, Jan Roecks, John Sewart, Jeremiah Sims, Laura Skaff, Katarina Stein, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal, Mary Vogt, Andreas Wolf

MEETING AGENDA

Item #	Item	Person Responsible	Time	Action
1	Review of the Agenda	All	2 min.	Decision
2	Small Teams to Review Assigned Program Reviews*	All	1.5 hrs.	Discussion and Review

Next Meeting: Friday, December 2

*

*Note: Based on schedule of IPC members, review teams may choose to meet at alternate times on both November 4 and November 18.

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, December 1, 2017

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Members: Kim Lopez, Mary Vogt, Ellen Young, Madeleine Murphy, John Sewart, Fauzi Hamadeh, Paul Hankamp, Jan Roecks, Mike Claire, Hilary Goodkind, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Teresa Morris, Sarah Mangin, Laura Demsetz, Jon Kitamura, rich Rojo, Jeramy Wallace and Anniqua Rana.

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

Kim added a welcome to the agenda review since we have a new member, Hillary Goodkind. Mike explained changes in the PRIE department. John Sewart will be working more with the District research department and, as a result, the position of Dean of PRIE needed to be back-filled. Mike introduced Hillary as the new Dean of PRIE to the committee and IPC members introduced themselves. Hillary said she knew many of the members already having worked with them on various projects.

Review Summary Notes from the November 17, 2017 meeting

Teresa mentioned she had come late to the meeting but wanted the minutes to reflect she was there. [Minutes have been updated to add Teresa to the members list].

Approve District Strategic Metrics

Mike was hoping to get the feedback on the strategic metrics from IPC with the request they'd be taken back to members' constituencies for feedback so there could be a participatory government discussion about them. Jeramy's concern was SEP not making 100% next year and added that counseling was okay with 95%-100%. Mike said it was an aspirational target, and suggested 95% as a baseline and asked if there was agreement. The committee concurred. Fauzi said the biggest issue is finding a way to make the information a bit more accessible and said Classified Senate was in agreement with everything. John said they put it together pretty quickly and that it could use formatting for presentation and streamlining to make it more digestible. Jeramy asked if there would be metrics on part-timers. Mike said it's a relatively small percentage of our students but for the first go-round, there is ample data on the part-time students, so as everyone gets comfortable with this document, it will be extended to the other student groups. John agreed and said that the metrics program does allow for someone to change the criteria to enable views of all groups and see how they fare under each metrics set. He added that the three main groups have very different success rates and that for part-time students it takes longer to track their metrics. Since they all have very different

success rates, it takes a longer to track. John believes that will be included in the next iteration of the score card process.

Mike said the frustration for the state score card is that it captures an even smaller group of students and that they need a much clearer picture of what the intent is, and that a lot of CTE students get pulled into the work force pretty quickly. The board would like a richer set of metrics to go by, because students that are here part time are here for various reasons.

Gabby (student) asked if the target was normal or if we were going for a larger class size? She also wondered about the percentage of people who got degrees or transferred. Mike stressed that the learning communities need to be supported to help the students get through college faster. He mentioned that even if we do all we can for students, sometimes the life variable makes sure we will never be at 100%, although we should shoot for it.

Mike would like to make the dashboard more user-friendly going forward, and start tracking part-time students more. He said the feedback would help to direct changes on the metrics and will be incorporated into the data.

Puente Presentation

Krystal distributed the annual review data sheet. The focus was on goals and activities. The Puente program was suspended this year, and the program heads discovered that they needed to return to the original model which included a full-time counselor, 50% dedicated to Puente. The English faculty is currently being selected, and a counselor will be coming on board in May or June so that they can receive the requisite training.

Krystal stressed that the handout doesn't really adequately show the extent of what the program does. She suggested having some of the students come back to IPC to discuss the program further, since she doesn't believe the handout statistics cover the programs' true worth and effectiveness. She believes Puente has created a legacy for the college and largely affected the campus in positive ways. She believes the cultural identity and awareness training brings a lot to the campus and that it's hard to quantify in numbers. She would rather show their effectiveness, and gave the example of an entire family changing visibly because of the program.

John Kitamura offered a PowerPoint presentation (see handouts). He added that Puente has been at CMS for five years, with five cohorts. The program is also a national model at 64 community colleges. All of the programs follow a similar structure, always an English professor matched with a counselor. They work together in a year-long program with one student cohort, spanning several phases. They move onto phase three in their second year. The number of students grows each year. Many have gone onto universities. He stressed the success for Latino males who statistically don't do as well as women, but that Puente helps with that. He stressed community, the Latino experience in-depth, and

bridging of culture to the institution. He addressed the mentoring component as another bridge to the professional world. He mentioned as an example the Cesar Chavez garden the students work on, and other examples. Puente is a transfer-focused program and academically rigorous, which is giving students the skills to succeed when they transfer.

Mike concurred that the Puente events were impressive. Mike asked what the qualifications were for Puente and John said they were revisiting it, and checking the state-wide model to see if they need to make any shifts.

Jeremy reminded IPC that we have decided to do learning community presentations every two years, rather than annually.

Changes in PRIE

Mike had already introduced Hillary so no questions were asked, and the meeting moved on.

Approve Textbook Taskforce Charge & Membership

Laura distributed a Charge Handout on the Textbook Taskforce (see handout). The handout is a proposed charge for which Laura had gotten feedback from Classified Senate and others. She mentioned that they want to be aware of steps faculty have already taken regarding things such as online access, etc. She wants to develop a program to determine what is available for each discipline. They want to see what's out there and work with faculty and the bookstore to promote student awareness and examine all options. She feels most faculty want to make books less expensive, and many already have plans in action. The proposed timeline is to gather information between now and January/February to present later.

Mike asked if for the student panel they can get students from across disciplines, and online or classroom. Laura agreed that they were indeed doing that. She proposed an update for a Flex day in March. Also, in March they want to do a student survey. She said ultimately it is up to faculty how they want to implement any changes.

Jeremy said that statewide they are discussing low costs. Laura pointed out that was included on the handout. She emphasized that the target is low cost, not no cost.

Ellen said the next Flex Day is January 14th.

Mike thanked Laura and the Academic Senate for the work so far, and hoped not only to get resource costs down but to make this a culture of the college without sacrificing quality. He wants this issue put front and center as it's very important to the Chancellor's office. He also said the board is very committed to this issue. He respects that it's a faculty decision and hopes this will help make college affordable for students. Jeremy said many departments have already doing it.

Sandra added that there is a law that was passed that will be in effect January 1 that requires our web schedule to identify which courses have zero textbook cost. There is a logo/label to show which ones are and which are not; this is new and we haven't gathered the info before, and so she has been asking the professors which courses don't have textbook cost. This works per class, not by faculty. Faculty can offer options, and if one is no-cost they can use the logo as well. Sandra suggested we have a logo for low cost also, but that is something for discussion going forward.

She said that there was no logo for this spring semester but will be up to speed next semester.

Distance Education Coordinator Introduction

Paul Hankamp distributed a handout (see handout) and introduced himself as biology professor online, web-assisted and lecture lab courses coordinator. He said he became interested in the position because he really wanted to work with Erica and cares about developing online content and help make everything more accessible to students. He will be filling in for Erica while she is out on maternity leave.

It's a brand new position and many may not know what it is. His top goal is to provide peer to peer support. Paul will be using Canvas mostly, and working with Erica to develop the DE website, which will be cleaned up and hosting videos and tutorials that will be available to be used online for courses. He will also be working with Curricunet to work on courses with faculty. In addition, Paul also co-chairs DEETC. He also attends virtual meetings with the chancellor's office and DE coordinators with sister colleges.

The first big public event Paul will do is open office hours for faculty or staff who need support around campus on January 11th. He will be making the rounds to committees and division meetings beginning next week as well.

Madeleine asked if all colleges were pooling resources for DE and Paul talked about structured training, adding that when the Canvas transition happened that didn't carry over, but it is being addressed. Jan asked how the other colleges addressed the Canvas change and Paul said that instructional technologists took care of it. He mentioned some resources for best practices which are available which are cheap or free, which is another resource he points people toward.

The DEAC meeting will be in January. Paul is hoping to bring the information from that committee back to the college.

Announcements

Sandra explained the process that we have for prioritizing full time faculty and instructional equipment. She believes it's quite transparent, and it has worked well in the past, and thought it was fine this year. But the full time positions are more difficult and there's not enough money, so they pitch

based on the prioritized positions. When Joe Mangan came to IPC concerned about the process at the previous IPC meeting, he felt there was confusion. Sandra asked the division to get together with Andreas, and that there was full support for the position of football coach. She said the football coach position is approved to go forward. If there are more retirements, they will move down the list. An announcement is forthcoming.

Teresa asked please asked people to notify their students of library extended hours and therapy dogs on Tuesday.

Mike said that CSM was recognized by state senators at a meeting last week as a CTE Star. Within the metrics used, CSM was the only college to achieve this across five different sectors. He complimented the faculty involved with CTE.

Student government is having their relaxation week next Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, and refreshments will be served and there are events for night students. The regular event is from 11-2 outside Building 10.

Meeting Adjourned: 2:11 p.m.