

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 – 2nd hour of the October 21, 2016 IPC Meeting (2-3 p.m.)

Next Meeting: October 7, 2016