

## **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, April 6, 2018**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

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

Meeting Attendees: Alicia Frangos, Laura Demsetz, Andreas Wolf, Sandra Stefani Comerford, Erica Reynolds, Anniqua Rana, Hilary Goodkind, Sarah Mangin, Ludmila Prisecar, Paul Hankamp, Katrina Relos, Hilary Ego, Ellen Young, Elnora Tayag, Jeremiah Sims

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

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

Agenda approved.

#### **Review Summary Notes from the February 23, 2018 Meeting**

Summary from February 23, 2018 approved.

#### **Mission and Values Statement Finalization**

Jeremy presented the final version of the Mission and Values Statement for approval from IPC.

Discussion between IPC members regarding the HSI (Hispanic Serving Institution) portion of the Mission Statement ensued. Jeremy explained that it was a good way of letting the community know we are an HSI.

A discussion followed, in which some rewording occurred. A motion to move the HSI phrase to the values section was approved by the committee. With that change, the majority approved the statement. One member was opposed to the change. The statement will be moving onto the Board for approval.

#### **Review Draft of Planning/Governance Manual**

Mike presented the draft of the manual to date and handed out a draft and a copy of the annual planning calendar to committee members. Mike explained how the attempt is made to distill down something extremely complex to be represented in a much smaller way. He explained the planning cycle and how everything is going on synonymously. He emphasized sticking to a planning process that is easy for most to understand but not have a process that's too rigid.

Mike then handed out a status of the progress of the Planning Manual. He pointed out that it has to be written to ACCJC specifications and expounded upon how the entire planning cycle works. Mike went over the appendices that he felt were important for the committee to see. There was discussion and input on appendices from committee members. Mike suggested having the planning manual be updated annually. He distributed Appendix B to the committee and discussed the Summary of Key Recommendations and Decisions, which was last updated in 2013 (see handout).

An example planning calendar was distributed for perusal (see handout). He suggested getting a small sub group to hash out the process.

Mike said that it will be presented again when it's closer to finishing for final review. The goal is to finish part 1 through 5 in April and present it during the May 18<sup>th</sup> meeting for approval on that section, and then present the entire manual for approval the first meeting in fall when IPC reconvenes.

#### **Update on Educational Master Plan (EMP) Process**

Hilary Goodkind updated the committee on her EMP process and meetings, of which there is one left, and the data she is amassing. She will be analyzing the data after the last meeting is finished. On May 18<sup>th</sup>, there will be a longer meeting to discuss all the findings before she writes the EMP over the summer, for approval in the fall when the committee reconvenes.

#### **Review Draft of the 2018 CSM Sustainability Plan**

Hilary Ego presented a PowerPoint presentation showing all of the sustainability programs that have been going on at CSM within the last couple of years and their continued success. She explained how we are one of the largest sustainability staff in at the community college level in the country and the goals for being waste-free in the not-too-distant future. The new sustainability plan will be sent to the Board for approval, and she wanted to get IPC's input. The presentation was well-received and there was a short question and answer session afterwards.

Meeting adjourned at 2:28 p.m.

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

**Friday, May 5, 2017**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

Members Attending: Michael Claire, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Alicia Frangos, Fauzi Hamadeh, Jennifer Hughes (co-chair), Sennai Kaffl, David Laderman (co-chair), Stephen McReynolds, Teresa Morris, Jan Roecks, Jeremiah Sims, Laura Skaff, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Mary Vogt

Guest: Kristi Ridgway

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

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

The agenda was revised to include the following additional items:

- Educational Equity Committee (EEC) information – Jeremiah Sims
- Update on Themes from Program Review – David Laderman
- Update on Mission Statement – David Laderman, Fauzi Hamadeh

#### **Review Summary Notes from the April 14, 2017 meeting**

The summary notes were approved.

#### **Professional Development Report, 2016/2017**

Theresa Martin provided highlights from the Professional Development Plan Report. A copy of the PPT will be posted to the IPC website. The PD plan is overseen by the Center for Academic Excellence (CAE) Committee, whose Chair serves as the PD coordinator. CAE strives to:

- Provide professional enrichment that connects and inspires
- Serve as support for “moving the needle” on student success
- Create an environment that supports forward thinking and institutional progress

CAE goals for 2016/2017 included:

- Implement year one of Three Year Professional Development Plan
- Collaborate with district PD efforts
- Improve sustainability of Center for Academic Excellence

Some of the highlights from the PD report include:

- Successful New Faculty Institute – it is truly a model. Eight of eleven new faculty participated in 2016/17. Jeremiah Sims and Theresa Martin plan to write a professional journal about the Institute.

- Flex Day – there is a lot of participation by full time and part-time faculty, as well as classified staff. Theresa shared a separate report (posted to IPC website) of participants attending each session, and gave a “shout-out” to all the sponsors and co-sponsors of the various sessions. Everyone commended the PD committee for creating such a robust menu of flex day activities, many of which are hosted by in-house facilitators.
- Year One and MINDSET – good progress being made with both. David Laderman mentioned that he recently spoke with a group of graduating seniors about the Year One program. Numbers for 2017 Year One have tripled.
- College Assessment Committee is doing excellent work and making the SLO work meaningful.
- The newly structured Educational Equity Committee is doing exciting equity related work, including lunch and learn sessions.

Mike Claire thanked Theresa and the PD team (Jenn Taylor-Mendoza, David Laderman, Kristi Ridgway, and Henry Villareal) for their outstanding work. The outcomes of the PD activities are impressive and demonstrate that important work is being undertaken at the college. Theresa is becoming very well known in the state for her leadership with professional development. The committee thanked her for leadership and service as PD Chair.

## SLO Update

Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza provided a brief update on SLOs. The Institutional SLOs have been revised somewhat, with new objectives. In addition, a new Institutional SLO has been added: Independent Learning and Development. This SLO update will be presented to the Academic Senate Governing Council on May 9. In October 2017, faculty will begin mapping their course and program SLOs to the revised ISLOs. Specific details about the changes follow: (A copy of this document will be posted to the IPC website).

**The Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) describe the knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes that students should develop through any sustained experience with the college – whether courses, degree or certificate programs, pre-transfer general education pattern, or academic and support services.**

**Independent Learning and Development.** The ability of students to develop, evaluate, and pursue personal, academic, and/or career goals. Students will be able to:

- ~~Demonstrate solid skills in planning and time management~~ **Demonstrate effective study strategies;**
- Articulate realistic and achievable academic and/or career goals;
- Identify and make use of college and community resources (academic and student support services).

**Effective Communication.** The ability of students to write, read, speak, and listen in order to communicate effectively. Students will be able to:

- Comprehend, interpret, and analyze written and oral information;
- Express ideas and provide supporting evidence effectively in writing and speaking;
- **Express ideas creatively through verbal and non-verbal media (e.g. music, art, dance, etc.)**
- Communicate effectively in a group or team situation.

**Quantitative Reasoning.** The ability of students to perform quantitative analysis, using appropriate resources. Students will be able to:



- Solve a variety of problems that require quantitative reasoning;
- Interpret graphical representation of quantitative information.

**Critical Thinking.** The ability of students to think creatively, analytically, and logically, in order to assess ideas, formulate arguments, develop multiple perspectives, and solve problems.

Students will be able to:

- Develop and evaluate arguments;
- **Analyze, synthesize and evaluate ideas as part of the creative process;**
- Assess the validity of both qualitative and quantitative evidence;
- Apply diverse disciplinary approaches and perspectives;
- Understand and employ the scientific method.

**Social Awareness and Diversity.** The ability of students to recognize cultural traditions and to understand and appreciate the diversity of human experience, past and present. Students will be able to:

- Identify the benefits of diversity and respect the range of diversity;
- Work effectively with others of diverse backgrounds;
- Recognize the importance and analyze the interconnectedness of global and local concerns, both past and present;

- **Identify and analyze a diversity of artistic and cultural traditions.**

**Ethical Responsibility / Effective Citizenship.** The ability of students to make judgments with respect to individual conduct, based on systems of values. Students will be able to:

- Recognize ethical principles;
- Identify possible courses of action in response to ethical dilemmas and evaluate their consequences;
- Behave ethically and respectfully when working with students, instructors, and the campus community.

### **Fall Flex Day Activity – Student Success**

Jennifer Hughes provided a brief summary of a planning meeting that was conducted to talk about an IPC flex day activity focused on student success. The planning group included Theresa Martin, Madeleine Murphy, Sandra Stephanie Comerford, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, David Laderman and Jeremiah Sims. The date for the flex day event is August 15. After Mike’s welcome in the morning, everyone will remain in Bayview Dining. Mike will briefly ask us all to think what the “perfect” college would look like. “Perfect” in this context refers to one that completely serves our students; thus, a bit of a different definition. We will also have the folks from Career Ladders Project (CLP) provide an update on their work with guided pathways which has an impact on completion and success.

There will then be a couple of 1-hour breakout sessions: 1) Teaching and learning – how are you as a faculty member helping to create the “perfect” college? 2) Collectively, how do we develop planning structures to support our students (e.g., early alert)? After the breakout sessions, everyone will be reconvene for a working lunch, during which they can talk more about what the “perfect” college would look like. We would like to invite some students to join us for these discussions. We also want to use this flex opportunity to bring IPC into our community and to bring the community into IPC. We want to emphasize that IPC is focusing its

attention on student success and we want to know what others think we can do to collectively “move the needle” regarding student success.

The afternoon would continue with more standard flex day sessions. The small group will continue to refine the details for the day and report back to IPC.

### **Project Proposal Guideline and Summative Evaluation**

A small group (David Laderman, Jennifer Hughes, Jan Roecks, Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Jeramy Wallace, and Mike Claire) met to review the draft document that has been reviewed by IPC. The committee agreed that a template will be developed for concisely reporting specific data for existing Learning Community and other initiatives (e.g. Supplemental Instruction). PRIE staff and the appropriate dean will assist the faculty coordinators in completing the document using data provided by PRIE. Over the course of the academic year, the Learning Community coordinators, along with their dean would provide a 10-15 minute presentation to IPC to review the documentation provided in the template.

All new initiatives would be required to complete the Proposal Guideline and Summative Evaluation documentation.

Jan Roecks will take the lead in working with the Sandra Stefani Comerford and Jennifer Hughes in developing the short template for existing programs and making revisions to the Proposal document for new initiatives. These will be reviewed at the May 19 IPC meeting.

Education Equity Committee (EEC) Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza and Jeremiah Sims requested clarification on the appointment of faculty to the EEC and workgroups of EEC. Like all other IPC committees, the Academic Senate makes all appointments for faculty representatives. Classified appointments are made by the Classified staff (by email through Fauzi Hamadeh and Juanita Celaya). Student appointments are made by the Associated Students of CSM (ASCSM).

There was also discussion as to whether these committees are bound by the Brown Act and/or Roberts Rules of Order.

Fauzi Hamadeh stated that Robert’s Rules of Order does not carry the force of law. It is based on tradition and agreed upon rules for running meetings, but it is not mandated. The Brown Act, however, is legally binding and applies to elected “legislative bodies,” such as the Board of Trustees, and any groups or committees that it recognizes as advisory. That is why groups like the Academic Senate and the Associated Students must adhere to the Brown Act. Because IPC is advisory to the college president, it is not subject to the Brown Act’s rules, and neither are any of its subcommittees. Therefore, any sub-group of those committees would also not be bound by the Brown Act.

That said, IPC always makes sure its meetings are open, and agendas and summary notes are posted. This is required of all IPC committees as well. In addition, all IPC committees use the consensus model for decision-making.

Because of some of the confusion surrounding this, it was agreed that Jennifer Hughes and Fauzi Hamadeh would work over the summer to develop an implementation manual, similar to what College Council used to describe its purpose and how it functioned. This will be reviewed each year by IPC.

Jeremiah also wanted to confirm that IPC had approved the EEC structure as previously presented to IPC. The EEC Steering Committee, based on a recommendation from IPC, meets approximately 3 times per semester. Representatives from the four EEC work groups serve on the EEC Steering Committee and report out on activities of their respective work group at the Steering Committee meeting. The work groups would meet more regularly to carry out their activities.

IPC confirmed that this structure was approved at a prior IPC meeting.

### **Update on Themes**

Jennifer Hughes and David Laderman shared the next steps with the committee. David agreed to draft an email to go out to the college community, which would include the themes identified through this cycle. Given some time constraints and an interest in getting this out before the end of the semester, it was agreed that the themes document would not require an extensive matrix, as was done last year, identifying the various activities underway to meet the themes. Instead, the email will mention activities we are engaged in that address the themes, mention where there might be gaps, and state that these themes inform our overall planning efforts at the college.

### **Update on Mission Statement**

The small work group (David Laderman, Alicia Frangos, Fauzi Hamadeh, and Ron Andrade) met to begin revising the Mission Statement. Samples from other colleges, which have more concise and aspirational Mission Statements, were reviewed. All agreed that the Mission Statement needed to be shortened, while still containing those elements required by ACCJC. It was also suggested that we de-couple the CSM Strategic Goals from the Mission Statement. This will eliminate the need to submit the Mission Statement to the Board of Trustees for approval each time we make a change in any of the Strategic Goals. The revised Mission Statement will be presented to IPC early in the fall, 2017 semester. IPC will also need to review the objectives for each of the current CSM Strategic Goals. This will be done in conjunction with a review of the updated EMP.

### **Announcements**

Mike Claire informed the committee that the District has begun its next round of distributing innovation funds. He pointed out that the innovation funds are no longer tied to FTES, which is good. He expects that the District will have approximately \$1.5-2 million to distribute among the three college and District entities. Mike has met with Cabinet to discuss possible requests, which will total approximately \$800. He mentioned that we won't get that much, but we'll get sufficient dollars to help us meet some of our needs. These funds are ongoing. We'll continue to get new innovation funds each year, as long as property tax revenues remain strong. CSM requests will be reviewed by Cabinet and the Deans and shared with IPC.

**Next Meeting: May 19, 2017**



**Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting**

**Friday, October 20, 2017**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

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

**In Attendance:**

Members: Juanita Celaya, David Laderman, Fauzi Hamadeh, Laura Demsetz, Anniqua Rana, Jeramy Wallace, John Sewart, Michael Vargas, Sarah Mangin, Katie Bliss, Katrina Relos, Mark Helsel, Colby Riley, Kim Lopez, Rich Rojo, Lizette Bricker, Elnora Kelly Tayag, Ron Andrade, Ellen Young, Allie Fasth, Kristi Ridgway, Mary Vogt, Madeleine Murphy, Annie Theodos, Mike Claire, Allie Fasth

**MEETING SUMMARY**

Next Meeting: November 3, 2017

**Welcome and Introductions**

Kim opened the meeting and explained we had a lot of presentations today to fit into 2 hours.

**Review of the Agenda**

All approved.

**Review Summary Notes from the October 6, 2017 meeting**

**Presentations from Honors, Project Change, Supplemental Instruction, Year One and Promise Program**

**Honors Project:**

David Laderman introduced the Honors project update. He mentioned that John Sewart had some data that he has yet to go through which is not included. David read the mission statement from the website (See Honors project [Mission Statement online](#)). He wanted to emphasize that it was measured more holistically rather than quantitatively. David switched to the awards and presentations page to demonstrate the things that students have done within the program and to give a good concrete sense of what the honors program has accomplished over the years. He also addressed the alumni page which shows where students have gone

after completing the program; some don't complete the program because they move on, but he sees it as a sign of success for those who have moved onto universities. He says 14 students in total have completed the program.

He also addressed the [participating foundation course faculty](#). These are the people who work with students within the program. He emphasized how much buy-in there is on the campus for the program. Every spring they bring students to a consortium; this past spring a student who transferred to Stanford was a keynote speaker, and the 3 top student presentations were given to students at CSM. All three college honors programs have a great synergy together. There is a showcase in December for students to show the projects they've completed. David went onto talk about the Labyrinth, which just won another national top prize. CSM was one of 2 colleges who won in a competition which included both two- and four-year colleges. In conclusion, David said he plans to scale up the program because of its success.

David introduced some students to say things about the program to IPC.

Rob Komars said that we need to change the culture, and thinks there are some bad things that still go on at CSM, but that the Honors Program is one of the good things that go on at the college. Rob teaches the program's science seminar.

Kim Lopez asked John Sewart how much data he had to share. He said he had the basic metrics, and distributed it. John explained the data on the handout (see Honors Student Data handout).

David concluded that most students come to the program as high caliber, but we'd like to give more students a chance to get there, especially by partnering with the other programs, such as Umoja, etc. and then they can come to the Honors Program in their second or third year.

### **Project Change:**

Katie Bliss presented Project Change program. She said she is always impressed by the students as leaders. She [played a 6-minute video](#) for IPC. She said the video spoke to the dedication that the college has and that it's one of the only programs of its kind in the state. Katie explained how the classes are being presented at juvenile hall and preparing students to get ready to take classes on campus. She highlighted Nick Jasso, second year Project Change Student and Student Ambassador. He was part of the first cohort and was mentored by David Laderman. Nick has studied abroad and completed his EMT certificate and served in Americorps (see PowerPoint). The students really want to give back; they want to talk to other youth and have become a service-oriented community. Most students who have been incarcerated have a disjointed experience. When incarcerated the quality of education received is not great, so students fall behind, and the graduation rates are horrendous. So for the students to get to the point where they are now is amazing (See Breaking through the bars slide). Most are doing well and the peer

mentoring takes care of the students who are struggling. She talked about the donors from within the community and how they have the students gradually build up to 12 units since many work full time and either support families or contribute to them. Some students from the program last year earned certificates.

### **Supplemental Instruction:**

Ron Andrade presented for Supplemental Instruction (SI). He distributed a data sheet (Annual Review of Current College Initiatives handout) and broke down the data. Last year there were 26 SI leaders and this year there are 42. The goal is to expand SI into other divisions as it works better with some classes than others. He explained how review sessions worked and the challenges of getting some students engaged on that level. Ron offered to answer questions.

Mike said he was floored by the success rates, especially in math and science, and inquired whether the data was being shared with faculty.

Ron said they do share with faculty at the end of the semester. Mike thought it would be compelling information for students too.

Kim asked why the numbers had nearly doubled since last year and Ron said that some of that was part of the roll-out plan. The plan for the next 3 years is to hold steady at about this level (42).

### **Year One:**

Allie Fasth presented Year One's initial data (see handout – Annual Review of Current College Initiatives). The first cohort started last fall so there is limited data. But there are some good anecdotal things. The program consists of academic and social aspects (see handout). Trying to offer students the opportunity to get entrenched in the community one way or another. Some are ambassadors, some get engaged in clubs.

The first cohort was initially 48, now this year it's doubled at 94. The majority of the students could not take 12+ units in their first semester, but most increased in their second semester. They all take a first year seminar course which supports them across the disciplines they are taking by teaching them strategy. Across all four sections, all students are reading the same book, e.g.

The other ways they've tried to support (see page 3) is they have 4 faculty teaching it and strong library sponsorship. Allie stressed collaboration with the library. She believes there is so much opportunity to grow the program, for students to start clubs, etc. and is excited about how creative the program can be.

Jeremy feels Year One is the Guided Pathways' foundation and said he was exploring with Allie how to make some connections.

Laura asked about how the different disciplines work.

Allie explained that right now, students aren't selecting their area of study and that eventually that could change.

Laura asked what do we do with the students who are struggling and dropping class?

David suggested accelerated courses for someone to get to the second half of a semester.

Allie said that counseling is helping in this regard, and working with students, as she is doing presently.

Mike commented credited David with the name "Year One" and commended Allie and her colleagues on doing such a great job. He feels the next step is to expand the 'year zero' aspect and start the momentum even sooner. Another next step is to continue to build it; he mentioned retention specialists because of the workload for the learning community leaders.

#### **The Promise Program:**

Lizette Bricker distributed four handouts (brochure, SMCCD Promise Scholarship Program, stats, Annual Review of Current College Initiatives) and went over the handout.

Laura pointed out Skyline doesn't have the county requirement.

There is no success data because this was the program's first semester. Lizette was very pleased with the high rate of enrollment for first generation students.

AB 19 means they will need more outreach to get FAFSAs earlier and connect earlier on in general (reach out to high school students). She would like to expand to the other learning communities and collaborate with other groups to help for an easier transition.

As a response to a question by one of the students, Lizette explained she wants to see the cost to the district in order incorporate it into financial aid.

Fauzi asked if in the e textbooks issue was addressed here and Lizette said it was. She added that so was food and transportation, etc. are other issues being addressed.

Another member asked if there was flexibility about attending other colleges in the district and Lizette said yes, that is the goal.



Mike added that all 3 colleges are probably adopting many of the same 'best practices' policies in this regard.

### **Approve Revised Mission Statement**

Fauzi presented the new CSM Mission statement (Version 1). It's what the task force developed initially. IPC said make it shorter, punchier & aspirational, instead of driven by accreditation. (see handout). It wasn't distributed, but David read it aloud. He asked Colby what they had discussed. Colby said that no one really knew the definition of equity in the context of the statement. David said after he got feedback and he thinks it's a bit wordy and jargon-y and thinks it should be simplified and streamlined and accessible while still retaining the meaning.

Fauzi read the new one to IPC to see what they think. Colby said by shortening it, it might dull it down too much. He felt the need for inclusion of the word "equity". Jeremy offered that during the editing process, focusing on equity, perhaps people don't know what equity is. That was his only concern with the new version.

Mike said he's fine with either statement, but that we have an opportunity to fold in other things within the statement; just something to keep in mind. Collectively somewhere we have to meet the accreditation requirements as well, and he thinks we can do that with related statements.

Fauzi mentioned that our diversity statement could also use updating as well.

Kim asked what the task force's plan was at this point. Fauzi thought it would be good to hand it out to the constituency and bring the feedback back to the task force.

Laura suggested sending the whole thing out to constituency (the mission statement and subs underneath it).

Colby liked the emailed version (v2), and disagreed that we need the entire thing (the subs) in order to work on the main statement.

Kim said she thinks there is a lot more to flesh out, so requested the task force to bring us another draft at the next meeting, starting with the V2 (email) version to see if we can come to a consensus.

### **Discussion on Textbook Reduction**

Mike discussed the text book initiative. He spoke about how AB19 passed and helped, but there are a whole other range of costs to students, and a key one is text books. So the board is

looking at costs of food/transportation/housing and books. The one they have most direct control is textbooks, so he asked the group to create a task force to reach out to the constituency (headed by Laura Demsetz) to form a coalition to work on solutions. He asked for some realistic strategies that CSM can implement to reduce in a significant way the cost of textbooks. He also requested that students be on the task force. He stressed he'd like to get moving on it right away. Elnora had some suggestions and Laura also said there are good ideas everywhere and that it's been known for a long time, and faculty is already doing a lot with textbook cost reduction, and knows of a lot of classes that have already reduced. So there is already awareness, but also need to look for what more needs to be done. Laura added it's a bigger situation than just the textbooks.

Mike added that the Board of Trustees is right on top of this and very supportive of the drive to get the costs down and be as strategic as possible and that it should be a specific goal of this college.

Laura requested a co-chair and also that it be faculty and library. She requested that James and Jeremy be on the committee. She also requested that she have student representation on the task force as well.

Kim suggested giving Laura time to get the task force together. Mike suggested classified staff should be on it, and Kim said it would be a discussion item on the agenda.

**Meeting Adjourned** at 3:10 p.m.

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

**Friday, November 3, 2017**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

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

Attendees: Mary Vogt, Kim Lopez, Jan Roecks, Mike Claire, John Sewart, Tabitha Conaway, Ellen Young, Sarah Mangin, Erica Reynolds, Alicia Frangos, Sandra Stephani Comerford, Laura Demsetz, Juanita Celaya.

### **Meeting Summary Notes**

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

Introductions – no new members. Kim summarized today's agenda.

#### **Review Summary Notes from the October 20, 2017 Meeting**

Kim asked if anyone had any changes to the summary from October 17<sup>th</sup>. No changes were suggested.

#### **Update on Textbook Task Force Membership**

Laura gave an update on the task force. She has spoken to Fauzi and he is working on getting staff involved, and waiting on student memberships. Kim summarized that it is a work in progress, and Laura agreed that it could be on the agenda for the 17<sup>th</sup> when she will have made more progress. Mike said he wants to acknowledge that even though we are looking at new solutions, to keep in mind there was some money squirreled away to fund textbook options, and put it out there that those funds are still available. He wanted the task force to know that there is some financial help to move this along, not only at CSM but all three colleges to help students with textbook costs, which is a major interest of the Board.

#### **Approve Revised Mission Statement**

Alicia had added some reiterations/changes, but she was concerned that the other members of the task force weren't present to discuss it, so Kim suggested she meet with the task force again to work on it further before presenting it to IPC. Alicia would like to revisit one of the previous versions. She said she'd like to invite Kristy and Danny to revise it further as well. Kim asked if we could bring it back on November 17, and asked where it would go after that. Mike suggested it be broadcast to the constituents to get further feedback. Ultimately the Board needs to approve it. Kim said we will bring it back to the November 17 meeting and hopefully approve the draft then, and then at that point constituents would approve it for December, and then we can seek Board approval. Alicia agreed to bring it back the 17<sup>th</sup>.

Alicia added they will include a values statement with the Mission.

#### **Approve Integrated BSI/SE/SSSP Plan**

Tabitha distributed 2017-2019 Integrated Plan for BSI, SE & SSSP.

She stated we're well on our way to meeting our goal to submit the plan in December, 2017. There are some exceptions but there is a lot of integration between student services and Instruction. The plan builds on the

college's strengths. Many of the goals came from the equity plan and the District Strategic Metrics. Laura asked what completion meant in this context; Tabitha said it means course completion with a grade. John concurred. It means they didn't withdraw and it means any grade (even D or F).

In general what they found is where we are most successful is in the learning community cohort models. She also said they are hoping this better aligns them with Guided Pathways. Mike thanked Tabitha especially for tying this to the larger metrics that the Board is interested in.

Consensus was taken and all agreed on approving the plan and asked that Tabitha submit it to the District Office by November 10th so that it can be in the November 29th Board Report.

### **Update on Development of 2019 ISER**

Sandra reported there are 4 teams working on the 4 Standards for the ISER and are on their way, and there will be a first draft soon. Jeremy has asked for a faculty co-lead to start next semester. Sandra has been to some conference webinars for ACCJC and there are some things that don't have to be done that used to be, which is good news, as ACCJC has reformed and changed a lot of the process. For one thing, they are asking for the ISER to be less lengthy. Stephanie Droker would like to see ISERs at 100 pages in the future, for example, rather than the 500- and 600-page ISERs.

Mike reported on the visit to Lake Tahoe and talked about being a team assistant. He said Lake Tahoe taught the team a lot about site visits. He mentioned that CSM was placed on warning by the ACCJC 10 years ago, and it was really hard to get off of the warning. He mentioned SF college almost lost their accreditation. But the ACCJC leadership has changed, and it doesn't mean we get a free pass and of course have to meet the standards but the ACCJC's new leadership has a different philosophy and culture -- for the better. He mentioned that different statements carry different weight and that even our mission statement used to be driven by accreditation, but it is different now. Mike advised those who will be writing that brevity is key, and to write short responses and point to evidence. He indicated the presentations IPC observed at its last meeting (10/20/2017) by the learning communities as a good example of evidence. Mike feels we will have a successful visit and believes we are meeting the standards, and that CSM is in good shape and will do fine.

Sandra added that the accreditation oversight committee is meeting next week, and they'll be meeting more frequently as we get closer to the date.

### **Review IPC Proposed Agenda Items for Fall 2017**

Kim said we only have 3 more meetings until the end of the semester. Next meeting (11/17/2017) will have an update from John Sewart, Guided Pathways, Incarcerated youth, and John will bring the EMP for spring. Puente will be giving a presentation as well.

Mike mentioned a Cal State East Bay meeting he was just returning from, and the disaster of the coming CSU application system. Tabitha and Alicia said it's not user friendly and there are some confusing items for students. Mike said wants to work with some members of IPC to figure out a plan for dealing with it. Tabitha suggested transfer workshops that we already have. Mike said East Bay has offered to send people to our campus. Sandra asked if there was a way to request students not to apply on their own but ask for help.

Meeting adjourned: 1:48 p.m.

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

**Friday, November 17, 2017**

**1:00 – 3:00 p.m.**

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

Attendees: Mary Vogt, Jesenia Diaz, Alicia Frangos, Laura Demsetz, Joe Mangan, Fauzi Hamadeh, Colby Riley, Kim Lopez, Ellen Young, Heidi Diamond, Annie Theodos, Jeramy Wallace, Anniqua Rana, Elnora Kelly Tayag, Jeremiah Sims, Teeka James, Ann Stafford, Katie Bliss.

### **Meeting Summary Notes**

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

Kim reviewed the agenda and asked if we could move the Textbook presentation to the end. Everyone was in agreement.

#### **Review Summary Notes from the November 3, 2017 Meeting**

IPC members reviewed the Summary Notes from November 3, 2017

#### **Writing in the End Zone (WEZ) Presentation**

Teeka James and Anne Stafford introduced the Writing in the End Zone presentation. Teeka has been involved with the program since its inception in 2004, and Anne has been a part of WEZ since 2009. Anne said that they have written about the program, but focusing just on reading & writing doesn't get to the heart of the program, so she presented a video that they had put together for the committee. IPC viewed the video, and handed out the written report. (See handouts). Teeka said one of the reasons they wanted to do it is because it's a relationship-based program, and that's why it has worked so well.

Anniqua asked about the students in the video who decided to become English teachers. Kim thanked them for informing us about the program, and asked about the success data for the cohort. Teeka said they have data for years, which is broken down on the handout.

Jeramy asked if we can review learning programs every two years instead of every year given the work involved. Kim suggested we do them on the off program review years and agreed that it's a lot of work to do every year.

#### **Approve Revised Mission Statement**

Alicia distributed a draft copy of the mission statement. Fauzi said there has been some feedback, and is concerned about values statements to buttress the statement. He explained that without supporting value statements, this current draft of the mission statement presented at IPC might not be enough, so he asked for feedback from IPC with the intention to then return it to the task force and include the values & visions statements before it goes out to constituency. The task force is currently still working on the values & visions statements. Fauzi sees this version of the mission statement as a jumping off point for the visions & values. Kim agreed that a mission statement needs to be only a couple of sentences, and that it's a good idea to keep

it short and then bring the values & visions statements with it back to IPC in early spring. The Strategic Plan and Participatory Governance processes will be revisited then as well. Kim asked when they'd like to come back, and Alicia and Fauzi suggested mid-February. IPC approved the mission statement process and that they will be adding the values & visions statements and bringing it back as an action item to the February 23 meeting.

### **Update on Textbook Task Force Membership**

Laura said that most of the task force has been assembled, with 6 confirmed faculty and one pending request. If that comes through, she thinks they'll have a pretty good representation of the college. They are getting representatives from learning centers where students interact. Task force so far:

Faculty: Sylvia Aguirre-Alberto (Counseling/EOPS/MCC), Donna Eyestone (DGME/CTE), Cheryl Gregory & Lena Feinman (Math), Jon Kitamura (English), Minu Mathur (Sociology), Chris Smith (Biology), Lia Thomas (Library), possibly one more person from a CTE program

Staff: Lisa Clayton (Math Resource Center), Margaret McGugan (Writing Center), Joey Martinez (Learning Center), James Peacock (Bookstore)

Students: TBD

Administrator: Laura Demsetz

Colby said 8-10 students have expressed interest but they aren't confirmed yet. The committee will have a large number of students and the January flex day will have an activity by the taskforce in a meeting and will involve a student panel. Ellen suggested that we have a mixed variety of students from different areas of study, and Laura said she wants to hear students' experience with textbooks as way to get students to start thinking about it. She said she's emailed Mike the charge, and is waiting on a confirmation.

Laura requested that Fauzi and Jeramy allow her to add three to four co-chairs that are faculty and students. Assuming she has a charge, she can move forward with the timeline. Kim asked about the timeline and Laura agreed with the request once a charge and committee members have been identified and approved.

### **Update on Faculty hiring Process**

Laura (speaking for Sandra) said fulltime faculty requests were reviewed through resource requests; this is the first time they had a space for comments on special faculty requests, and are handled differently in different departments. On November 7, committees met and the positions were submitted to Cabinet. Based on review of retirement, or other factors, she thinks five positions will need to be filled, additional positions were identified should there be additional retirements. The reason for the accelerated timeline is to post the positions as soon as possible. That's how it worked in the past; this time it worked differently, and Joe Mangin came to address IPC about that.

Joe Mangin from Kinesiology and Dance introduced himself and said that generally it is him or Mike Schmidt who submit their program review. He said he heard things from different people at different levels, and that it was his understanding that there has been campus dialog on pursuing at least two full time faculty for the Kinesiology and Dance division. He is concerned that these positions were not properly vetted with the faculty

and that they were not consulted re: full time requests and faculty needs. He submitted the resource request and this statement is listed in there. There was an extended discussion on the process between Laura, Jeremy and Joe.

The regular process includes faculty input at the division level and it's not a vote and happens differently in each division but didn't happen at the faculty level this year. Joe didn't feel the positions were properly vetted; he said he thought it was important to bring this to IPC's attention. He didn't feel like it had been discussed as extensively as it should have been.

Jeremy asked who submitted the resource request and Joe said he had.

Kim thought IPC's role is move forward to approving the process for the other four divisions and re-visit the Kinesiology positions. IPC agreed to move forward in approving the process for four positions.

Further discussion covered the need for more consistency of process across divisions. Jeremy said he wanted to talk to Sandra about revisiting the process for the Kinesiology and Dance Division and bring it back for approval to another meeting.

### **Update on Guided Pathway Initiative**

Anika passed around a key elements handout and did an overview (see handout). After going over it, she asked if Jeremy wanted to talk about the design team. He said the first step is looking at data and building the team and that they met last week. Anniqua said that the joint Academic Senate and Classified Senate meeting was well attended, Skyline presented their plan and people were enthused that the focus was on an equity plan and on a really strong pathway to getting students engaged and on meaningful pathways by building a strong foundation.

Jeremy reminded the committee that the process will take years. Kim mentioned a meeting with a consultant that backed that assessment up, and also added that the process is in inquiry mode right now, and emphasized how extensive the effort to change CMS' processes to further help students will be. She suggested that the design team will need to detect barriers and stick with the process, knowing it will take a good amount of time asking, answering and sharing out to figure out what this will mean for the college.

Anniqua mentioned that the foundation of the project is the most important thing and the other things will come along in coming years.

Fauzi said that the presentation that Skyline did emphasized how all CMS employees are educators, no matter what someone's position is on campus.

Kim said the interest has really grown and more and more people are coming into the discussion, and is happy so many more are joining in on it, and thanked Annika for all the work that has gone in so far.

Ellen asked what the design team building process is going to be and how they will make sure it will be representative of all parts of the campus.

Jeremy said the process will not be just interested parties, but also recruiting and inviting people from all departments.

Anniqa said originally there was a five-person design team and that has expanded to about 25, a portion of which is a logistics and will be very closely done with professional development.

### **Review Faculty, Staff and Student Campus Climate Surveys**

John passed around the surveys. (See handouts). He said the surveys are very broad-encompassing. PRIE does them in sync with accreditation visits and for the accreditation process. The current iteration of the Student Survey was done last semester, and classified staff this semester. They are largely driven by accreditation response. John went through the surveys and gave an overview/summary.

Teresa suggested going over the data in detail in the spring. Kim suggested IPC look at the document among the members, then come back and identify what they think is important, and point out differences, etc. compared to what we did three years ago, and look for any red flags.

Teresa suggest IPC workshop through different pieces of it and come up with different themes and discuss those as it had in previous meetings with this sort of data. She suggested breaking into small groups at one of the meetings and going through it more thoroughly. Kim agreed we could do that and then bring our findings back to the group for analysis.

Kim recommended in early spring IPC revisit the surveys and dedicate a large portion of an IPC meeting to do a deeper dive, and PRIE will provide the means for the committee to do comparisons and cross-segment comparisons.

John went through a couple of examples showing where he thought there were issues with and suggested we looked into those.

Kim agreed that we should look for places where we need to be better at transparency, etc. in order to improve what we're doing here.

### **Creating Pathways for Youth Incarcerated to Higher Education**

Katie wanted to share that our college will be co-hosting a conference. She handed out a flyer for the conference on creating pathways from youth incarceration to higher education.

Meeting adjourned: 2:42 p.m.