

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, April 8, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

City View Conference Room, B10-401

Members Attending: Jia Chung, Michael Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Sennai Kaffl, Beverly Madden, Teresa Morris, Stephanie Roach, Jan Roecks (co-chair), John Sewart, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal, Mary Vogt, Danuta Wang, Jasmine Witham, Andreas Wolf

MEETING SUMMARY

Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Review of the Summary Notes from March 11, 2016

The summary notes were approved.

Review Activities and Timelines of the DEETC Work Plan

Jennifer Taylor- Mendoza provided an update on the Distance Education Work Plan: 2013/2014 – 2016/2017. In spring 2014, IPC approved the Distance Education Plan, Goals and Objectives. In fall 2014 and spring 2015, Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee (DEETC) established the Outcomes, Leads and Timelines. Some highlights of the update included:

- Goal #1 – Distance education classes are well integrated into CSM's institutional quality assessment process and cycle. Some outcomes of this goal is to evaluate Distance Education (DE) courses and ensure accessibility compliance across all courses.
- Goal #2 – Comprehensive information is communicated to the college community about the range of programs and services to distance learners. The main outcome of this goal is to communicate DE related offerings, programs, and planning to the community.
- Goal #3 – Distance education students have access to instructional, student services, learning resources and other support services which are comparable to those available for students enrolled in face-to-face mode courses. Some outcomes include, aligning DE course offerings to meet transfer requirements; monitoring courses to identify gaps, trends, and growth opportunities; and implementation of an online tutoring program.
- Goal #4 – Distance Education courses have comparable rates of student success, completion, and satisfaction to on-campus courses OR have satisfactory rates of success, completion and satisfaction. DEETC and PRIE reviewed success rates across all courses. John Sewart noted that most colleges compared all DE courses to

face-to-face courses. CSM conducted a course-to-course comparison to facilitate better data analysis, e.g. English online to English face-to-face courses. PRIE and DEETC will work to discuss and identify gaps.

- Goal #5 – Faculty, staff, and administrators and instructional and student services support staff receive strong institutional support for distance education teaching. The main outcome of this goal focus on developing a training schedule for faculty and staff.
- Goal #6 – Comprehensive administrative oversight and staffing for distance education allows students to accomplish their varied educational goals in a reasonable and predictable timeframe. The main outcome of this goal focus on addressing gaps and on-going support for the DE program.

Jennifer also updated IPC on the Canvas Implementation Plan. Some highlights of the update included:

- Task 1 – Campus Communication and Information. The Canvas transition page can be found online.
- Task 2 – Faculty Training. The mandatory online training for online instructors is a new policy. Training policies will be developed by May 27, 2016.
- Task 3 – Course Identification for Canvas Transition. Summer Canvas pilot program volunteers have been selected. There are also about 50 individuals who have volunteered for fall.
- Task 4 – Accessibility Compliance. This is a new policy to be discussed at the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) meeting on May 5, 2015.
- Task 5 – Third-Party Products Compliance. This is a new policy to be discussed at the DEAC meeting on May 5, 2015.
- Task 6 – Regular and Effective Contact Policies. This will be reviewed at the District Academic Senate retreat.
- Task 7 – Course Shell Review and OEI Rubric Compliance. This is a new policy to be discussed at the DEAC meeting on May 5, 2015.
- Task 8 – Academic Support Resources. Online tutoring and student readiness modules will be provided in the summer.

Mission Statement Revision

Jan Roecks distributed a draft of the IPC Mission Statement for review and discussion. The draft stemmed from group discussions at a previous IPC meeting. The following edits were suggested:

- Resource request is the only representation of the budget process. There should be a greater presences, but not necessarily a line-by-line review.
- Include language regarding assessing results.
- Bullet point number four should be more specific to clarify that IPC prioritize Institutional initiatives.
- Include language to state that Program Review is reviewed and discussed.

Jan, David Laderman, and Mary Vogt to provide a new draft for discussion at a future IPC meeting.

Other Items: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Institutional Effectiveness

John Sewart distributed the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Institutional Effectiveness Indicator Rates-San Mateo CCD sheet for discussion, in order to collect IPC's input on number nine - Completion Rate (Scorecard) and on number fifteen, Successful Course Completion (Datamart). The Chancellor's Office has requested colleges to report a goal rate for one year and six years. College of San Mateo Student Outcome Metrics, Success, Withdraw, and Retention data sheet was also distributed to support the discussion. John noted that the Successful Course Completion metrics shifted from full year to only Fall term data for 2014-15. After discussion, IPC decided to set 72% for both the short-term one year 2016-17 goal and long-term six year goal for number fifteen, based on historical data. 45% was decided for both the short-term one year 2016-17 goal and long-term six year goal for number nine, based on historical data.

Next Meeting: April 22, 2016