

## **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, 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 14<sup>th</sup>, 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 28<sup>th</sup>). 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.