

IPC Ad Hoc Steering Committee
Summary of meeting of Tuesday, March 16, 2010
12:30 – 2:00 p.m., Building 18 Room 302

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

Members Excused: Cynthia Erickson, Joyce Heyman, Bret Pollack,

Members Absent: Michelle Brown, Mohammed Haniff

Guest: none

Announcements: Bret Pollack has resigned from the committee so that the division may find a replacement who can attend the full meeting. We were starting meetings at 12:30 to accommodate Bret's schedule; for next week, we will start at 1:00 p.m. The committee's now has a website, collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalcommittees/ipcsteering.asp. Agenda, minutes, and supporting documents are now posted. The resource document will be updated to include the criteria used in the fall.

Review summary of 3/16 meeting: No changes

Overview of curriculum: Laura presented the first portions of the spreadsheet requested last time. It includes every course in the catalog and indicates degree and transfer applicability (including specific AA/AS and transfer requirements). Based on committee feedback, this effort will be continued in parallel with our other work and expanded to include major areas (listing all associate majors to which each course applies) and transfer majors starting with local transfer schools (SJSU, SFSU, UCB, UCD, etc.; pull top schools from histogram in PRIE research report). This information may be useful background information for us and for campus (e.g. to determine which classes are "working hard" doing double duty as general education and major prep). Laura will check with John Sewart to see if we have information on which majors our students most frequently transfer to. Mike Mitchell will see if he has a count of TAG/TAA agreements by major.

Feasible goals given our time constraints: Part of our charge is to have a campus-wide discussion, in the hope that this will lead to some consensus or at least useful feedback for the President/cabinet to work with as decisions are being made.

What to bring to campus: We could go out at the "vision level" or at the "bullet level" or both, but we probably don't want to get to the course level. As a committee, we could provide "candidates" at the vision or bullet level along with analysis of each (implications/pros/cons) and a space for feedback; our "document" might look like the legislative analyst's portion of an election pamphlet: statement (bullet), analysis, pros/cons, feedback these. Our document could also solicit write-in bullets with pros/cons from campus to add to the list.

We can bring this out to campus in many ways (hard copy, email, meetings), get back information, distill results into something coherent and concise, take back to campus and ask: How do you feel about this? Can you support it? Do you agree with parts?

Questions in discussion: Do we rank options? Are there overarching bullets? Do we include a "vision" of campus? Would we just restate board's vision? Maybe we don't ask for vision because we've been given a vision by the board. Some visions lead to more specificity than others. Maybe we don't answer vision question now, but instead work on bullets and determine later whether "vision" is needed.

After discussion: First focus is bullet level. We need to come up with a preliminary list of bullets and for each provide analysis, pros/cons. In preamble, need to make it clear that we can't have everything. Hold off on decision re: ranking until we see what the bullet list contains.

Look at bullet points from fall budget discussions as a starting point. How to word preamble so campus knows where these came from?

Brainstorming of bullet points (just to see what we come up with; not necessarily those that will wind up on "ballot"):

- Cut x% across the budget
- Cut x% across divisions
- Cut x% across departments
- Retain courses/programs that serve multiple goals (xfer, cte, prereq)
First cut eliminates all else? Then what?
- Reserve y% of the curriculum for courses/programs that serve multiple goals (xfer, cte, prereq)
- Retain top n paths, where n is number of students – starting? completing?
- Given an area of specialization for the college (in the context of the district?), focus on this area (e.g., CSM has the only full music program in the district).
- Keep the "gems"
- Keep programs that are unique w/in district (or broader area)
- Reduce summer offerings (at campus level; at district level)
- Focus offerings on AA/AS/transfer students w/continuity at CSM
- Build on strength of facilities (e.g. use planetarium); this should be true across district (e.g. music/art here; drama Canada).
- Consider alternate schedules (?)
- Consider alternating courses (some classes Fonly; some Sp only)
- Preserve specialized courses by offering in rotation (coord across).
- Retain "gateway" courses.
- Preserve student access to courses needed for goals by offering in rotation (coord across).
- Focus on cohorts of students(?); known trajectory allows rotating offerings.
- Be aware of the amount of bureaucratic work required to handle everything (3 programs @ 4 courses each is more work than 1 program @ 12 courses).
- Streamline requirements where possible.

For next meeting: Bring/send list of bullet points

Next meeting: Tuesday, March 23, 1:00 – 2:00, 18-302