

# Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, February 27, 2015

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

City View, Bldg 10

Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Lana Bakour, Kathy Blackwood, Juanita Celaya, Mike Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Java Inatov, Maggie Ko, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Jan Roecks, Henry Villareal, Andreas Wolf

## MEETING SUMMARY

### 1. Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved with changes to the order of the items discussed; in addition, the New Initiatives Assessment was pulled from the agenda at the request of President's Cabinet. IPC discussion about the document will be scheduled for a later date.

### 2. Feedback on Class Schedule Production

Lana reported discussion by student government affirming the value of the printed schedule in its current form; she also reported that as a participant in the First-Year Initiative she had heard from high school counselors that the printed schedule was a very important tool for them and they "couldn't do their jobs without it." David reported a similar reaction by the Academic Senate. Both groups voiced a need for some sort of printed schedule.

Sandra acknowledged the need for some type of hard copy, explaining that they could be located in student activities, division offices, and the library. What is proposed is two hard-copy publications—one "pretty" for the community, focused on CSM features and highlights, and one that would be a real-time printed class schedule.

Also proposed would be real-time information about classes online via Webschedule so that students could print a whole schedule if desired. Mike said he'd like to see an online and printed matrix for GE classes organized by time so that students could search, for example for a MWF class that fit a certain requirement. He also stated CSM must be "smart" about what is distributed to the HS communities.

A number of related issues were explored (Andreas, Mike, Jan, Lana, Sandra, Bev, Milla, David):

- The proposed changes are not due to cost, but due to the big staffing impact on the division offices in preparing info in the required format for the printed schedule. It takes a great deal of staff time to meet the many deadlines (in advance) required to meet the current print deadlines; then the result is a schedule that is out-of-date once the semester starts. This was confirmed by the recent Business Process Analysis conducted by an external consultant who identified the big impact and cost of division office staff time in preparing the schedule with all its deadlines.
- Some dissatisfaction was voiced with the current newsprint format of a printed schedule. Consensus was voiced that the schedule info ends up so "wrong" and out of date once it finally goes to press.
- The proposed schedule would likely be printed on regular paper, 8.5 x 11, and would be a "real-time" printing.

- One print run (to be determined later) would be designated the official copy which is needed for transcripts and other official purposes.
- The newsprint publication would be a better, more appealing community marketing piece if it were separated from the function and format of the printed schedule. In addition the View brochures are used as a marketing tool for high schools. These could also have a printed schedule insert. HS counselors could possibly provide feedback about what sort of scheduling tool might be helpful for them.
- Mike proposed that we eventually explore developing an app for hand-held devices.

The final consensus outcome is that we would “prototype” a new class schedule format and that would be separate from the community publication. David and Lana will report this back to their constituencies.

### **3. District Reserves Policy (Kathy Blackwood)**

Kathy distributed a proposed policy for Reserve Requirements for Unrestricted General Fund. The document is a result of her research on best practices, including those used by our neighboring town of Atherton. The policy was requested by the Board which has already seen a draft. This will need to go to again to District Shared Governance, which has previously seen a draft, as well as back to the Board for approval. The policy will also need implementation procedures to be drafted.

Three areas for reserve are proposed with 5%-10% (amount to be determined per category) of the annual operating expenses of the Unrestricted general funded. They include: Budget Stabilization Reserve, Emergency Disaster Reserve, and Working Capital Reserve.

Kathy explained the difference between ending balance and a reserve. She stated that the district ending balance is generally between 15% and 17%, mostly typical of the statewide of 17%. Our current reserve is 5-7%. David noted that the Senate is happy with the direction Kathy is taking, and would prefer that the procedure to accompany the policy puts some kind of restriction on the total amount (e.g., not to exceed 20 or 25%).

Jan raised the question of whether the colleges will each keep a reserve, as CSM already does. Mike noted that in the past the college has used reserves so that if there is an “altitude change” as there was in recent years’ lean times, we would not have to cut so deeply into the programs. On one occasion, the college used reserves to help stave some cuts until Measure G funds came through.

Next steps: procedures will be drafted by Kathy with new revisions to go to District Shared Governance and finally for the Board for review and approval.

### **4. College Index Update**

Milla McConnell-Tuite distributed a new version of the College Index with all the data populated as well as proposed targets for 2014/15. She provided a general overview, stating that discussion in depth will be postponed to the next meeting when John Sewart is present (who is familiar with the data on a very granular level.)

Overview issues:

- Data indicator definitions are being reworked and updated and will be posted very soon.
- Some indicators are defined by external entities (as indicated in blue).
- Financial aid data had to be reworked and is now updated.
- New indicators were added for professional development (as that is a relatively new institutional priority).
- All three colleges will identify some common core indicators that could be used as a one-page document for the general public.

Discussion:

- Henry raised the issue of whether we should have more ambitious targets; Milla responded that modest historical targets have not inhibited us from making program interventions.
- Andreas posed some questions about LOAD calculations and whether they are adjusted for late start courses. Milla said the discussion needs to occur when John can provide details.
- Kathy raised the issue of having a student equity indicator, given the importance of the student equity plans. She gave an example of an indicator that would delineate non-white students.
- Mike noted that in his “first look” at the data, he questioned why there is improvement in the student support indicators and yet the student success indicators have not proportionally improved.

Next Meeting Scheduled:

The next meeting is scheduled for only one week ahead, 3/7; there was some discussion about the reasons for this and whether it was to accommodate a later extra session on program review.

David said he would consult with Jennifer Hughes and then get back to the group confirming the next meeting time.

Meeting ended at 2:30 PM

## **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, May 1, 2015**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

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

Members Attending: Ron Andrade, Lana Bakour, Kathy Blackwood, Juanita Celaya, Jia Chung, Michael Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, Maggie Garcia, Kevin Henson, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Java Inatov, Maggie Ko, David Laderman (co-chair), Beverley Madden, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, Kristi Ridgway, Stephanie Roach, Jan Roecks, John Sewart, Laura Skaff, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

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

The agenda was approved.

#### **Review of Summary Notes from the April 17, 2015 meeting**

The summary notes from the April 17, 2015 meeting were approved.

#### **Puente Program Update**

Lorena Gonzalez and Teeka James provided an update on the Puente Program, now in its third year. They reviewed the mission established by the statewide Puente office, which has remained the same for as long as Puente has been in existence. The focus of the program is to increase the transfer rates of Latino students to four year institutions. Instruction, counseling, and mentoring are the key components; the integration of these components is critical. Lorena provided information regarding the strengths of the program and the challenges they have faced since the program began at CSM. She also shared data regarding students' progression through the English sequence and retention in courses. For both progression and retention, Puente students have higher rates of progression and retention as compared to Latino students not enrolled in Puente and the general student population. To date, the program has accomplished the program goals outlined in the implementation plan. In the third year the focus is on developing the mentoring component. There are a number of mentoring models that Puente programs statewide have adopted. In addition, the faculty have incorporated many of the proven best practices into the curriculum and program activities. The Puente Club is doing well and provides an avenue for students in Phase 3 of Puente (i.e. those students who have completed the required counseling course and English course sequence) to remain connected to Puente. Teeka provided examples of students in the program, the challenges they face, and the success they have achieved. It is important to note that some of the students in the program are at high risk for dropping out. Thus, even if they do not pass their courses, the fact that they have been retained and will re-enroll is a positive outcome. The opportunity to "change the narrative" for students is very important. Many Puentistas have never imagined themselves as college students who could be successful. Four students are scheduled to graduate this May. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation will be posted to the IPC website.

## College Index

Milla McConnell-Tuite and John Sewart provided information on the College Index. It was stressed that we need to view the Index as a way to get a “temperature check” regarding institutional effectiveness. Milla reminded the committee that the indicators are tied to each of the College’s Institutional Priorities and mentioned that a new priority, Support Professional Development, was adopted by IPC in 2014 and recently approved by the Board of Trustees earlier in the spring, 2015 semester. The specific indicators for Professional Development, 4.1 and 4.2, are taken from the annual campus climate survey. Indicators highlighted in blue are those with external definitions (e.g. defined by the State Chancellor’s Office or U.S. Dept. of Education.) When reviewing such indicators we need to be cautious because the definitions can be extremely convoluted and/or narrow in scope and representative of a small percentage of students. Finally, a couple of indicators have been removed as they did not provide useful information. The committee was reminded that we have come a long way with respect to the College Index. We now have nearly 7 years of trend data which allows us to have a better sense of how we are doing institutionally. Finally, we are still exploring the establishment of a “one page” snapshot of key indicators. We would still maintain the comprehensive Index, but the short list would be a more brief, at a glance, “fast-facts” document. Kathy Blackwood suggested that we should present the Index information at a Board meeting.

## Budget Update

Kathy Blackwood and Jan Roecks provided an update on the District and college budgets. Kathy Blackwood recently presented information about the budget to CSM’s management council. While the budgets are more stable because we are a community supported district (i.e. basic aid), the additional money in the budget has been spent on compensation for all employee groups. In addition, the required contributions to the STRS/PERS retirement systems have increased which impacts the district budget. Also, with the end of Measure G, all of these expenses are now being absorbed by the general fund. There are some one time monies that we have from Prop 30 funds, but these are not funds we can count on in the future. Kathy mentioned that the state budget is looking more promising and there may be approximately \$300 million coming to the community colleges. However, this won’t be finalized until information comes out with the May revise. Many other groups (e.g. prisons, police/fire, etc.) are lobbying for this funding so it is too early to know what community colleges may receive. Most importantly, because we are a community supported district, we are not eligible for the majority of these funds.

Kathy talked briefly about the new allocation model which determines how funds are distributed to the three colleges. The new allocation model includes funds for innovation which the colleges may use for various innovative college projects. We may be able to use the innovation funds for various initiatives (e.g. Supplemental Instruction, First Year Success).

Kathy pointed out that we will be financially stable for next year (2015-16); however, if the District and three colleges continue spending as they are doing now, the following two years (2016-17 and 2017-18), the District will be in deficit. Thus, we need to be careful with expenditures and make changes where possible.

Jan noted that the college budget reflects the District trend; specifically, CSM will be ok for 2015-16, but the following two years will be in deficit if we don’t make some decisions about spending. Jan met with the



budget subcommittee/workgroup which is constituted with the following representatives from IPC: Henry Villareal, Laura Demsetz, Jan Roecks, and Mike Claire. Together, they reviewed the budget and conducted some budget forecasting for the next several years. We are trying to shift any general fund expenses that align with SSSP and Student Equity funding guidelines to these funding sources. Based on the information we are receiving from the state, these programs anticipated to be fairly stable for quite some time. We need to make sure that if we use these funds to fill any positions, we are making a commitment to fund them with in perpetuity. Given the forecast outlined by Jan, we can't think of using these funds now for personnel and then shifting them in a year or two or three to the general fund. Mike also mentioned that we are pursuing a variety of grant opportunities, including an ANNAPISI grant (targeted to improving the success of Pacific Island students) and a TRIO grant. We will apply for the ANNAPISI this year and TRIO when the next round of RFPs is released. Also, now that CSM has reached the enrollment threshold required to be classified as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) we will be pursuing an HSI grant. Any of these six figure grants will enable us to continue the work of many of our initiatives. Jan also reminded the committee that while the District did pass a bond that will fund a variety of capital improvement projects on the three college campuses, these funds cannot be used for operating expenses. Thus, these funds do not help us with the anticipated budget deficit forecasted for 2016-17 and 2017-18. Jan mentioned that the other two colleges have been very judicious in terms of hiring personnel. While they have not stated that they are not hiring or are in a hiring freeze, they are examining all personnel requests very carefully. CSM will need to the same. Jennifer asked that all IPC committee members help communicate the budget information to their constituencies, as we need everyone's help in dispelling the perception that we have lots of money. In addition, Kathy will provide a budget update to the entire college community sometime in May.

### **Complete Review Process for Program Review**

Jennifer Hughes asked that all work groups submit their one page summaries for the program reviews assigned to them no later than Tuesday, May 5. Jennifer and David will then prepare emails to be sent to all departments. The email will include the one page summary, as well as information regarding when faculty might learn about the status of their various resource requests, including instructional materials, equipment/technology, and personnel (faculty, classified staff, and student assistants.) This process will help close the loop on the program review process. As we review our process for next year, we will need to establish a firm deadline for submission. Reviews submitted after a certain date will not be considered resource requests. In addition, the Academic Senate is exploring the idea of conducting program review every other year with some type of annual update for requesting resources. Should this be the decision, a variety of issues will need to be addressed.

Jennifer also mentioned that at a joint meeting of the instructional and students services administrators held early in the week, the deans completed the prioritization of the classified position requests that came through program review. This does not include position requests that will be obtained from the administrative units and division program reviews. The list should be complete and ready to distribute to IPC at its May 22 meeting. Cabinet will review the prioritized list and determine if any of the positions can be funded. At this same meeting of the instructional and student services administrators, instructional material requests were reviewed. Fortunately, we receive sufficient funds from the state to fund the majority of these requests.

Next Meeting: Thursday, May 7, 2015. College Heights Conference Room, Bldg. 10-468.

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

**Friday, September 16, 2016**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

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

**Members Attending:** Ron Andrade, 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, Ludmila Prisecar, Erica Reynolds, Stephanie Roach, James Roe, Jan Roecks, John Sewart, Jeremiah Sims, Katarina Stein, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal, Mary Vogt

Guest: Theresa Martin

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

#### **Announcement**

Mike Claire indicated that in the last several years, 85 new employees (faculty and staff) have been hired.

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

The agenda was approved.

#### **Review Summary Notes from September 2, 2016 meeting**

The summary notes were approved.

#### **Review Draft of IPC Mission Statement**

The group reviewed the revised mission statement. There was consensus that the revisions were good and the format much improved. It was noted that the tasks to accomplish the Mission often begin with the verb “ensure.” Questions arose about whether than meant to simply “be mindful” or to actually “enforce.” It was suggested that we develop a glossary of terms so that we are all on the same page with our definitions. AS we move forward it will be important that we regularly review, discuss, and evaluate the effectiveness of each of the tasks in accomplishing what is stated. In discussing ways to communicate the Mission of IPC to the college community, it was suggested that we need a coordinated communication plan that might include quarterly communications to the college community, training of members regarding participatory governance that members would then carry out at their respective committee meetings (i.e., BSI, DIAG). There are a few last edits to make and the final draft will be distributed to committee members.

#### **California Promise**

President Claire provided information about the California Promise and CSM’s First Year Program. Promise programs are being established at many community colleges throughout the state. The latest community college district to establish a Promise program was the Los Angeles District. There needs to be consistency in the Promise programs offered at the three colleges in SMCCD. Skyline has launched their program this fall, and CSM will launch next fall. Mike has been in conversation with Dr. Kevin Skelly, the new San Mateo High School

District Superintendent, who is very support of this effort and is interested in ongoing efforts to strengthen the partnership between the high schools and CSM. The First Year/Promise program is designed to increase the success of first year students (recent high school graduates) by providing them with support services and financial support. Efforts will begin while students are still enrolled in high school. Students will be required to apply for financial aid to determine if they are eligible for funds to offset educational expenses. Those students who are eligible for the Board of Governor's Fee Waiver (about 67% of CSM students) already have their fees waived. Because we are a Basic Aid District, we do not get reimbursement from the State for these fee waiver students. Thus, our District is, in essence, already providing the fee waiver to students. For those who are not BOG eligible, we will waive their fees. In addition to waiving fees, we may be exploring ways to help students with textbook costs. Mike has had conversations with David Laderman about the Academic Senate helping to work with faculty to look at other options (e.g. Open Source.) This item is on an upcoming Academic Senate agenda. Sennai Kaffl, James Roe, and Kat Stein provided some examples of how certain instructors are helping to reduce textbook costs for students (e.g. providing PDF files, e-books, books available through the Library, etc.) Access codes for books are still very high (\$60+) and Pearson controls about 80% of the textbook market. Other options to help students include looking into help with transportation (Skyline is piloting a shuttle service this semester.) Mike provided IPC members a document summarizing CSM's First Year. There were a number of comments/suggestions made by committee members, including

- Making sure we still are mindful of equity gaps and continue efforts to address these
- Finding ways to connect with after school programs (e.g. YMCA) that often provide support for students we are interested in serving
- First Year is designed to be very intentional
- First Year can help expand the notion of a high school "home room"

### **Review and Discuss College Index**

John Sewart provided information on the College Index. Committee members often ask why we are not able to "move the needle" in any significant way on some of the core indicators... To help explain and have IPC members better understand this, John provided several examples of various scenarios of what it would take to reach 5% increases in core indicators (i.e. Enrollment, Retention Rate, Course Completion, Progression of Basic Skills). For example, we would need to have 2,332 additional course completions to reach a 5% increase in Course Completion, and 2, 332 additional retained enrollments to reach a 5% increase in the Retention Rate. However, other measures, such as Transfer Rate and Degrees/Certificates Awarded rates are more attainable. For example, we would only need to have 32 additional award earners to achieve a 5% increase and 8 additional transfers to reach a 5% increase. This information will help IPC set reasonable targets; ones that are both aspirational and based on a statistical formula. John noted while some of the data is now available for some of the 46 indicators, some of the data, which is derived from external sources (e.g. UC/CSU transfer data) is not available until the end of the year. Jennifer agreed to look for some samples of a "high level" indicator document that tells the CSM story in a one page summary. Subsequent to John's presentation, a few comments were provided by committee members, including:

- Need to look at some of our effective practices (e.g. Learning Communities) and use these practices, some of which are not dependent upon funding, to scale up to serve greater numbers of students. These best practices could help us "move the needle" on some of the indicators.

- There is interdependence among many of the indicators. For example, if we improved course completion and persistence rates, we may see an increase in degree/certificate awards and transfers.
- We need not be afraid to have honest conversations about where we are falling short as an institution; look at equity gaps and infrastructure challenges. What are the institutional barriers that are presenting some of our students from not being successful? We need to shift the culture and thinking from “deficit model” to “asset model” of our students

### **Administrative Program Review**

Jennifer Hughes mentioned that the administrators have recently revised the administrative program review. This will be used by the vice presidents, president, PRIE and Community Relations in Marketing units. In addition, the division deans have developed a modified program review for their division needs. All administrative units will use the existing resource request form if they wish to request any personnel or equipment needs.

### **Discuss Process for IPC Review of Program Review – Assign Small Groups**

Jennifer distributed a draft document upcoming cycle of program reviews and the assignments for IPC members. All IPC members will be assigned to small teams and be responsible for reviewing approximately 8-10 program reviews. She also distributed a draft timeline for the program review process so that we can the various deadlines that must be met to conclude the program review process by the end of the fall semester. Two IPC meetings, November 4 and 18 will be devoted to reviewing program reviews. Prior to the review meetings, IPC members will participate in a program review “norming” session so that we will know how consistently review the program reviews. In doing so, we will review a couple of program reviews together as a group at a meeting before the November 4 and 18 meetings.

### **Information Update:**

All College Budget meeting – 2<sup>nd</sup> hour of the October 21, 2016 IPC Meeting (2-3 p.m.)

Next Meeting: October 7, 2016

## Institutional Planning and Budgeting Committee (IPBC) Meeting

Friday, December 6, 2013

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, College Center, Room 468

Members Attending: Stephanie Alexander, James Carranza, Juanita Celaya, Laura Demsetz, Gary Dilley, Amanda Governale, Fauzi Hamadeh, Hanna Haddad, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), David Laderman (co-chair), Deborah Laulusa, David Locke, Milla McConnell-Tuite, Teresa Morris, John Sewart, Hayley Sharpe, Laura Skaff, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Henry Villareal

### Meeting Summary

#### Review of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

#### Review Summary Notes from November 22 and 23, 2013, Meetings

The summary notes from the November 22 meeting were amended as follows: In the data analysis section of the minutes, the following statements have been revised.

Retention and success rates stable over time; need to focus on disaggregated data since we know that specific students populations ~~are not~~ **have not been** as successful as others (i.e. African American, Pacific Islanders, Native Americans and Latinos)

#### Employees

- Increase in headcount of non-instructional (librarians, counselors) faculty
- Greater number of female employees
- Majority of employees are white (**55%**); Asian is second largest ethnic group (**9.1%**) – It was recommended that the percentages be added.

The meeting summary from the November 23 meeting was approved.

#### Continued “Closeout” of Planning Cycle, 2008-2013

##### *Budget Planning Committee Plan*

Henry Villareal provided a summary of the status of the Budget Planning Committee plan. All goals and activities were accomplished except for the fourth goal which was “Develop and implement a comprehensive institutional advancement plan to include strategies for fundraising and external grants development.” This was not completed due to budget constraints.

##### *Enrollment Management Committee Plan*

Andreas will present the status of this plan at the December 11 meeting.

#### Update on Supplemental Instruction

Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Cheryl Gregory, Lena Feinman, Pepper Powell, Ron Andrade, an SI student leader, and Charlene Frontiera presented an update on supplemental instruction. A report of their findings was distributed which included a plan for institutionalization. Initial results of the success of SI are quite positive, including students' reflections. There are 20 basic skills sections attached to SI; over 200 students participated. Eighteen SI leaders have been trained. While the program initially focused on SI for mathematics classes, CSM faculty have expressed interest in expanding the program to philosophy, economics and biology courses. BSI has funded the program for the last two years. Effective fall, 2014 there will be no BSI funding. IPBC will take action on this item at the December 11 meeting.

### **Review College Index**

John Sewart provided committee members with the latest version of the College Index which included the 2013-2014 proposed targets. There was discussion of the index and a review of some of the specific indicators and their targets vs. actuals. There was also some initial discussion of how we might better communicate the Index information, in a modified form, to the college and general community. Committee members were asked to review the proposed targets and be prepared at the next meeting to determine if they are acceptable as proposed.

### **New Classified Position Requests**

#### *Number of Positions*

Michael Claire provided a brief update on the college budget. In doing so, he mentioned that he would be comfortable approving the hiring of approximately 5-6 new classified positions. This is just a preliminary estimate as there may need to be some changes as more information about the budget becomes available. In addition, the number may change based on the specific positions that are requested and approved by Cabinet due to the differences in the salary ranges of classified positions.

#### *Revised Process for New Positions*

Jennifer Hughes distributed the revised process for hiring new classified positions. The major change involves the prioritization of the positions to be the responsibility of the instructional and student services administrators, rather than IPBC. IPBC will still have an opportunity to review the positions. Jennifer also provided the committee with the original list of proposed positions from program review and additional requests submitted from the deans and vice presidents. Also, a second list was provided which resulted from discussions with the deans. Further discussion will take place at the December 11 meeting.

*Summary notes prepared by Jennifer Hughes, IBPC co-chair*