

IPC Ad Hoc Steering Committee
Summary of meeting of Tuesday, March 2, 2010
12:30 – 1:30 p.m., Building 18 Room 302

Members Present: Kitty Brown, Dave Danielson, Laura Demsetz, Cynthia Erickson, Mike Galisatus, Cheryl Gregory, Mohammed Haniff, Kevin Henson, Allison Herman, Joyce Heyman, Mike Mitchell, Rosemary Nurre, Bret Pollack, Marsha Ramezane, Michelle Schneider, Huy Tran.

Members Excused: Michelle Brown

Members Absent: none

Guest: none

Introductions: Committee members introduced themselves. It was noted that the current meeting time requires some to leave early and others to arrive late.

Review of charge and context: The Fall 2009 budget reduction proposal process and results and the committee's charge as outlined in Mike Claire's *CSM Budget Update: Next Steps* email of 1/26/2010 were reviewed.

Possible scope of work: The committee's scope of work will fall somewhere between the extremes of "do nothing" and "rewrite CSM's Educational Master Plan." A major task for the first two meetings is to define a scope that will be feasible given that the committee is report results at the end of May.

Feasible goals given our time constraint:

As a starting point for the committee's discussion on how to create out a tractable approach to the problem, three pictures were presented (see attached photos of white board):

1. The campus as a pie with "slices" representing what we can offer. How should the number and relative size of the slices change as the size of the pie changes? Must some slices maintain at least a minimum area to be effective? Are there slices that should be added when resources grow? Are that slices that should be removed when resource shrink?
2. Our curriculum as a diamond in which the bottom portion represents the lowest level of basic skills classes, the top level represents the most advanced transfer and CTE courses, and most offerings lie in the range just below and just above the "collegiate" level.
3. Our curriculum as a Venn diagram. Components include basic skills, "required" courses such as ENGL 100, core general education courses, transfer major courses, and CTE major courses, with overlap at several levels.

Points brought up in discussion -

Guidance: We need to consider the Board's restatement of core values and other guiding documents (mission statement, institutional priorities, preferences expressed during the fall budget discussions). It was noted that there is an absence of guidance between high level statements (e.g. Board's core values) and the "on the ground" level of decisions made as a schedule is put together.

Staffing: We must be aware of staffing issues; bumping rights for adjunct faculty are limited to CSM, but for full time faculty are across district.

Outside funding: What about grants as a way to bring in resources? Grants can supplement the "resource pie" (currently especially for retraining).

Innovation: How can we maintain innovation in a time of contracting budgets? For example, how do we institutionalize the work done with current basic skills funding so that it remains in place when the funding is gone?

Links to business: What happened to corporate education courses? These courses kept the college in touch with and visible to the business community. If linkage to business community is important (including possible revenue enhancement), may want to bring back this function.

Vision: We have been all things to all people. Should the campus instead have a high-level vision or focus. For example, a "health-wellness" focus could build on nursing and science offerings. Additional CTE in this focus might include training for home-health aides and other services expected to be in demand as baby-boomers age.

Coordination across district: Should there be (can there be?) coordination and specialization across the district? In some districts, there is specialization at the college level – each has a core emphasis. In the Peralta district, lower level ESL courses are offered at multiple campuses, but higher levels are not – counseling is used to make sure students know that their next step is to go to another college. Does the community view us a district, rather than as three separate colleges? Maybe more so in the current economic climate – we are seeing more students this term moving from campus to campus due to reduced offerings and full classes. The savvy students use us as one district (they may not start this way, but they learn). Evening students are coming from CSU campuses to the north and south. Many students are desperate to get 12 units to retain medical coverage.

Student needs: Especially in a difficult economy, there is a need for student services (including crisis management; peer intervention) in parallel with curriculum.

Our challenge: What can this committee help the campus do by the end of the term (while documenting what might be important but not feasible to do by the end of May)? Charge is not for us to solve this problem; charge is to foster a campus discussion that will result in direction for future decisions.

Tasks prior to next meeting:

Laura Demsetz to prepare summary of guiding principles and philosophies expressed in fall budget discussions.

Next meeting: Tuesday, March 9, 12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m., 18-302

Summary Prepared by: Laura Demsetz, March 7, 2010