

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

Wednesday, March 20, 2019

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Room 18-206

Members: Emily Barrick, John Burrigh, Tarana Chapple, Michael Claire (ex-officio), Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Tabitha Conaway, Laura Demsetz, Heidi Diamond, Krystal Duncan, Georgia Giari, Fauzi Hamadeh (co-chair), Kim Lopez (co-chair), Madeleine Murphy, Luis Padilla, Erica Reynolds, Jose Rocha, Richard Rojo, Elizabeth Schuler, Arielle Smith, Jeremy Wallace (co-chair)

Members Absent: Mondana Bathai, Alicia Frangos, Sarah Mangin-Hinkley, David Laderman, Paola Mora Paredes, Teresa Morris, Elnora Kelly-Tayag,

Guests: Jia Chung, Mike Holtzclaw, Jeremiah Sims, Mary Vogt, Lizette Bricker

MEETING AGENDA

Review of the Agenda

Hilary Goodkind is not able to attend so her presentation will be moved to a future meeting.

Review Summary Notes from the February 20, 2019 meeting

No changes were requested for the summary notes.

Discuss Academic Senate and Student Services Council 2018-19 Program Cycle

Concerns and trends from Program Review 2018: Jeremy reported that the feedback from the Academic Senate reflected that many felt the available data was limited; there is a big demand for more research support and more help from PRIE in general, to collect and analyze data, especially for student success, of which he gave some examples. He personally feels the research department is too small to provide what is needed in addition to all of the planning work that PRIE does, and that more research resources are needed to support faculty's needs. There was also a big discussion on equity themes; he felt that the data and equity research trends were important. The third trend is outdated technology, including online technology. Some equipment is out of date. Out of date software was also a concern/emerging trend. Mike asked for more specific information regarding software incompatibility, which may be fairly easy to fix. Another theme addressed was accessibility to professional development.

Mike discussed how we are making changes in PRIE and research in general in response to the concerns about research availability.

Jeremy also reported that an emerging theme was high school dual enrollment, and ways to get into the high schools to create pathways. In addition, scheduling class cancellations, including capstone classes, were a concern. There are also concerns about communication regarding feedback on resource requests, and the need for some sort of automation in that regard. A further concern was that access to data on equity may be limited.

Review Trends and Themes Quantitative Measures and Target Setting Review 2018-19 Program Review Process

Student Services Council Program Review: Kim mentioned that Student Services does not read all of the program reviews, but she'd like that to happen in the future. They discussed what could be done better. Krystal added that they focused on the redesign and she'd like to see more changes with more focus on assessment, rather than proving they are doing a good job. Emily felt like the repetition had been removed which she felt was an improvement. Kim agreed that some questions had been redundant so they tried to make it less repetitious. Kim felt the template wasn't really fitting student services – so she created a draft that addresses assessment and planning (see handout). She shared the document with the committee.

Lizette and Kim walked the committee through the new template and asked for feedback, explaining each section in detail.

Kim talked about the survey development project with PRIE.

Kim asked for input on what worked and what didn't work for program review in 2018-2019.

Laura said better than in the past was IPC's review process but thinks there could be tweaking of the rubric – that we as a group need better calibration.

Arielle said it would be helpful to see the rubric before they wrote the program review. Since this was her first time doing it, she was blindsided by the resource requests and not prepared to have to create another document. It wasn't as clear as could be that resource requests were a separate process than program review, especially to a new employee.

Jeremiah thought that the process had improved from prior years.

Tarana thought the confusing part was confusion between ASLT and Learning Centers.

Many agreed that Novi Survey was clunky, and that a better submission program is needed for the next cycle.

Madeleine suggested that the responses reflected that people might not quite understand the purpose of program review given the varied responses to the same type of questions.

Some of the adjuncts weren't able to attend the flex day training meetings.

Many agreed there should be more training opportunities or sessions for Program Review.

Instruction videos were suggested.

There should be a deadline where no more editing on the Program Review template is allowed – perhaps more than 2 months or so before it's due.

It was pointed out that this time around, the College was in the middle of a new mission and vision statement approval process, which should not be a problem for the next cycle.

Separate uploaded documents (required by the Novi Survey method) also made it clunky. It was suggested that perhaps more guidance on the actual writing might be provided.

Faculty should get a timeline for getting feedback. Also, it was requested that there be a place to upload documents that serve as evidence in case someone leaves; basically, a repository for documents. Kim referred to the discussion at the last meeting about a document management system, which Hilary said she would be looking into, for sharing research that has been completed.

Announcements

Mike shared highlights from the Board retreat last weekend. The Promise program is now expanded to 3 years if students need it and colleges will be getting additional funding for more staff as well. The Board also is addressing the food and housing challenges for students in need.

Next Meeting: March 27, 2019