

To: College of San Mateo Employees and Students
From: IPC Ad Hoc Steering Committee
Laura Demsetz, Committee on Instruction Chair, Steering Committee Co-chair
Huy Tran, Academic Senate Vice President, Steering Committee Co-chair
Date: April 13, 2010
Re: Starting Points and Schedule for Campus-wide Dialog to Develop Criteria

With our current budget and anticipated reductions, we will no longer be able to provide a full range of courses and services to satisfy the needs of all students who would like to pursue their education at College of San Mateo. As a college, we have been asked to engage in a dialog that will lead to broadly accepted criteria which will in turn be used to prioritize our educational efforts.

This will of necessity be a discussion based on values. If we cannot offer all things for all students, what should we offer and for whom? Who will we serve and how? The education code and accreditation standards provide constraints on our response. The Board of Trustees recently provided an additional constraint: lifelong learning is assigned a lower priority than transfer education, workforce training, and the basic skills classes that our students take in preparation for transfer and training. Even within these constraints, however, there are many possible ways in which the college can allocate its limited resources.

The Steering Committee began its work by reviewing a variety of documents, including the Board's Reaffirmation of Core Values and Principles, CSM's Strategic Plan and Institutional Priorities, and the exchanges that took place regarding course and program reductions in Fall 2009. A summary of these resources, along with Steering Committee membership, agenda, and minutes, can be found at collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalcommittees/ipcsteering.asp.

Starting points for discussion

The criteria that are to be developed are intended to guide decision making for the 2011-2012 academic year and beyond. To help begin the campus-wide dialog, four categories of starting points for the campus-wide dialog have been developed:

Principles proposed as a guide to decision-making (page 3);

Talking points to serve as a starting point for campus-wide discussions leading to the development of criteria to guide decisions for 2011-2012 (pages 4-6);

Strategies that can be used to help implement decisions under multiple criteria (page 7);

Additional ideas whose implementation would require more time to develop or the participation of entities outside the college such as AFT (page 8).

The appendix to this document (pages 9-19) lists some of the advantages and disadvantages of these starting points and provides additional background information.

The campus community is asked to review these starting points (and they are only starting points), to discuss them in a variety of venues, to provide feedback, and to suggest additional ideas according to the following timeline:

- April 12-16 Starting points available.
- April 16 All-college meeting, 2:10 – 4:00, 36-319
- April 16-30 Campus dialog starting with April 16 all-college meeting and continuing with six smaller open meetings during the week of April 19. Additional discussion takes place in division, department, and standing committee meetings.

Smaller open meetings:

Monday, April 19	2:10 – 3:00	18-307
Tuesday, April 20	12:10 – 1:00	18-307
	2:10 – 3:00	18-307
Wednesday, April 21	8:10 – 9:00	18-306
	12:10 – 1:00	18-307
Thursday, April 22	8:10 – 9:00	18-305

- by May 1 Feedback and additional ideas submitted through web form
- May 1-14 Steering committee synthesizes feedback
- May 17-21 Results distributed campus-wide for final evaluation
- May 26 Results forwarded to IPC and the President to inform budget planning for 2011-2012

Feedback and suggestions will be submitted through a web-based form available soon at collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalcommittees/ipcsteering.asp.

Principles

The following are proposed as examples of principles that should guide decision-making.

- P1. Students are our first priority.** College of San Mateo “is an open-access, student-focused, teaching and learning institution” [Mission Statement] that must “build on our strengths to provide an educational experience that, within College of San Mateo's mission, is appropriate to the needs of our students” [Vision Statement]. All decisions must first and foremost take into the consideration the needs of students.
- P2. Communication, collaboration, and cooperation across the district are essential to addressing students’ needs in a time of scarce resources.** The absence of transparent discussions across the district was noted by faculty in responding to program and course reductions proposed in Fall 2009 and has been echoed by many constituents on campus and at our sister colleges. Our campuses are linked through the overlapping student populations that we serve, through common curricula and services, and through faculty seniority. Decisions to change programs and services at one campus have an impact on the other two campuses. To achieve the best outcome for our students, campus-level decisions should not be made in isolation.
- P3. The college’s instructional offerings, taken together, must result in FTES load that meets or exceeds college, district, and state targets.** The College’s overall FTES load had been increasing and was further improved with the cancellation of low-enrolled courses in recent semesters. If we must further reduce the number of sections, sections with higher FTES load will be cancelled. This may save money in the short run, while the district is over cap. However, it will lead to lower overall load and potentially reduce state funding in the future.
- P4. There must be sufficient support for college’s instructional programs and student services.** Recent staff reductions have made it difficult to provide the necessary support for programs and services. In decisions regarding course and program offerings, efficiencies of scale should be recognized. Maintaining four distinct programs offering three classes each requires more supporting work by faculty, staff, and administrators than maintaining one program that offers 12 classes.
- P* Additional principles suggested by campus community through feedback form.**

The above are examples; the campus is asked to provide feedback and additional ideas.

Talking points

The following talking points provide examples of criteria that might be used to allocate instructional resources. They are presented in order of increasing specificity, starting with broad, across-the-board changes and moving to ideas that would result in a more targeted allocation of resources. Based on feedback, and with refinement, some of these talking points, along with additional proposals, may evolve into criteria for decision making.

T1. Flat changes

T1a. Uniform changes across the budget

As funding is reduced, make uniform cuts across the budget (administration, staff, faculty, and instructional supplies). When funding is increased, allow uniform growth across the budget.

T1b. Uniform changes across divisions

As funding is reduced, make uniform cuts across divisions but allow non-uniform cuts within divisions. Decision-making takes place at the division level. This is essentially what evolved in Fall 2009. When funding is increased, allow uniform growth at the division level but allow non-uniform growth within divisions.

T2. Focus on courses that serve multiple student goals

Goals include transfer (courses required as transfer major preparation; courses that satisfy the CSU-GE and IGETC general education transfer patterns), associate degree (courses that satisfy associate degree major requirements; courses that satisfy associate degree general education requirements), employment (courses that satisfy career/technical certificate requirements), and preparation (courses that are prerequisites for those retained for transfer, associate degree, or employment).

T2a. Retain courses that serve multiple goals.

T2b. Reserve a specific percentage of the instructional budget for courses that serve multiple goals.

T3. Focus on the most “popular” paths to student goals

T3a. Retain courses required for the most popular associate degrees.

T3b. Retain courses required for the most popular certificates.

T3c. Retain courses required for the most popular transfer programs.

T3d. Re-examine and consider for hiatus associate degree programs and transfer paths that serve few students.

T4. Focus on areas with demonstrated success

T4a. Retain courses and programs with strong records of retention, persistence, and goal attainment.

T4b. Limit funding for courses and programs with poor records of retention, persistence, and goal attainment. Apply available resources in a more focused manner to improve outcomes. This could include early assessment, paired basic skills/study skills courses, etc.

T4c. Consider other venues such as community education or adult education for courses and programs without demonstrated success including lower levels of basic skills courses.

T5. Focus on associate/transfer core

Preserve gateway courses at specified levels. Achieve budget reduction through across the board cuts to remaining non-exempt areas.

T5a. Identify and preserve a specific number of English and Math sections at each of the levels below AA competency.

T5b. Identify and preserve a specific number of English and Math sections at AA competency levels (ENGL 100, MATH 120).

T5c. Identify and preserve a specific number of courses that satisfy the mandatory requirements for transfer to CSU and UC: English Composition/Written Communication, Oral Communication, Critical Thinking, and Mathematics. See CSU-GE and IGETC worksheets for specific courses.

T5d. Identify and preserve a specific number of courses that satisfy each of the associate degree, CSU-GE, and IGETC areas beyond those covered in T5c. See AA/AS, CSU-GE, and IGETC worksheets for areas.

T6. Focus on programs that are or that can develop into “gems.”

Retain the “gems”: programs that maximize the use of unique facilities, talents, curriculum, and/or personnel.

T6a. Retain programs that are unique within the region or within the district.

T6b. Retain and build programs that use unique facilities (e.g. planetarium; KCSM)

T6c. Consider consolidation across the district to build “gems” at each campus. (This is also included as A1).

T6d. Retain a specified level of instructional resources to retain the flexibility to address current “hot” areas.

T7. Campus Vision/Identity

As reaffirmed by the board, the College’s core mission is to provide transfer preparation and career/technical education (CTE). Within this constraint, the college could develop a vision or identity that focuses on a particular theme. For example, a focus on “Health and Wellness” could build on our Nursing, Dental Assisting, and Adaptive PE programs and take advantage of new or unique facilities such as Building 5N. Courses and programs in other areas would still be offered, but a greater portion of resources would be allocated to programs and majors related to the “Health and Wellness” theme.

T7a. Health and wellness focus

T7b. Business and accounting focus

T7c. Fine arts focus

T7d. Emerging fields focus

T* Additional decision-making criteria suggested by campus community through feedback form.

The above are examples; the campus is asked to provide feedback and additional ideas.

Strategies that can be used to help implement decision-making criteria

The following are examples of strategies that might be used along with a variety of decision-making criteria.

S1. Preserve student access to courses through creative scheduling

S1a. Alternate advanced or specialized courses (some classes fall only; some spring only) with coordination across the campus and the district.

S1b. Focus on cohorts of students for whom courses could be sequenced on a publicized cycle.

S2. Revisit course-level enrollment limitations to promote student success

S2a. Implement computerized prerequisite checking so that students who are not adequately prepared for a course do not displace those who are.

S2b. Consider whether existing enrollment limitations should be tightened to promote student success (for example, consider whether a specific recommended preparation should be changed to a prerequisite).

S3. Reconfigure summer offerings at the campus and district levels to focus on serving continuing students.

S4. Streamline the associate degree by removing requirements not mandated by Title 5 or accreditation standards.

S* Additional strategies suggested by campus community through feedback form.

The above are examples; the campus is asked to provide feedback and additional ideas.

Additional Ideas

The following are examples of additional ideas whose implementation would require more time to develop or the participation of entities outside the college (such as AFT).

- A1. Consider consolidation across the district to reduce the number of low enrolled programs and build “gems” at each campus.**
- A2. Revise Program Development and Program Improvement and Viability (PIV) Processes**
 - A2a.** Create a program improvement and viability process that makes it easier to eliminate, rather than improve, programs which have become outdated or too expensive to maintain.
 - A2b.** Create a program development process that closely examines longer-term trends and avoids “flavor of the month” decisions.
- A3. Review the relative budget allocations to staff, administration, instruction, and student services**
- A4. Consider temporary freezes or reductions in salaries as a way to accomplish part or all of any budget reduction. Explore creative ways of preserving projected retirement benefits at non-freeze levels.**
- A* Additional strategies suggested by campus community through feedback form.**

The above are examples; the campus is asked to provide feedback and additional ideas.

Appendix

The talking points, strategies, and additional ideas are restated here, along with some of the advantages and disadvantages of each.

Talking points

T1. Flat changes

T1a. Uniform changes across the budget

As funding is reduced, make uniform cuts across the budget (administration, staff, faculty, and instructional supplies). When funding is increased, allow uniform growth across the budget.

PROS	CONS
Provides a quick and easy decision-making process.	May not serve students well.
Gives a perception of fairness.	Penalizes departments/programs that have already developed a lean operation.
	Staff support needs are not uniform across programs and departments. Some programs/courses/course sequences become non-sustainable without minimum staff support.

T1b. Uniform changes across divisions

As funding is reduced, make uniform cuts across divisions but allow non-uniform cuts within divisions. Decision-making takes place at the division level. This is essentially what evolved in Fall 2009. When funding is increased, allow uniform growth at the division level but allow non-uniform growth within divisions.

PROS	CONS
Provides a quick and easy decision-making process.	Penalizes departments/programs who have already developed a lean operation.
Allows divisions to balance within to retain student progress toward degrees, certificate, transfer, etc.	Denies reasonable access to gateway courses in large high demand service areas.
Provides clear criteria for decisions in the future.	Puts road blocks in student progress toward program completion and transfer.
Gives a perception that everyone in the college community suffers "equally."	May be inappropriate for smaller departments.
	May eliminate courses needed to complete programs.
	Doesn't address the overall needs and focus of the college.

T2. Focus on courses that serve multiple student goals

Goals include transfer (courses required as transfer major preparation; courses that satisfy the CSU-GE and IGETC general education transfer patterns), associate degree (courses that satisfy associate degree major requirements; courses that satisfy associate degree general education requirements), employment (courses that satisfy career/technical certificate requirements), and preparation (courses that are prerequisites for those retained for transfer, associate degree, or employment).

T2a. Retain courses that serve multiple goals.

T2b. Reserve a specific percentage of the instructional budget for courses that serve multiple goals.

PROS	CONS
Provides reasonable access to gateway courses for students to begin and achieve their educational goals.	Puts pressure for deeper cuts on other non-exempt areas of the college.
Promotes student completion of core classes within a reasonable time frame.	Introduces inequity between faculty across subject areas.
Looks at the curriculum at an "end user" level.	We may have too many courses which fall into this category to help us make cuts.
Values the core of our mission	
Highlights/retains courses or programs which are necessities, not luxuries.	

T3. Focus on the most popular paths to student goals

T3a. Retain courses required for the most popular associate degrees.

T3b. Retain courses required for the most popular certificates.

T3c. Retain courses required for the most popular transfer programs.

T3d. Re-examine and consider for hiatus associate degree programs and transfer paths that serve few students.

PROS	CONS
Provides reasonable access; students can begin and complete their educational goals within a reasonable time frame.	We may have too many courses which fall into this category to help us make cuts.
Promotes CSM as the go-to college for certain majors and programs.	Denies access to students interested in less popular programs and majors. Puts pressure for deeper cuts on other less popular major preparations or programs.
For students in popular programs, provides	May eliminate, put on hiatus, or

reasonable confidence that the courses need to achieve goals will be available.	drastically curtail some majors/programs/departments.
Looks at the curriculum at a user end level (the way students look at college).	Introduces inequity in job security between faculty and across subject areas.
Retains a base of GE courses for AA/AS degree and transfer.	Turf protection. Faculty at each college will fight to retain programs at their college.
Values the core of our mission.	Introduces inequity in job security between faculty across subject areas.
If coordinated across the district, may allow a broad range of programs to retain a critical mass of offerings, increasing opportunities for students.	If not coordinated across the district, may lead to duplication in popular programs and elimination of many other programs.

T4. Focus on areas with demonstrated success

- T4a.** Retain courses and programs with strong records of retention, persistence, and goal attainment.
- T4b.** Limit funding for courses and programs with poor records of retention, persistence, and goal attainment. Apply available resources in a more focused manner to improve outcomes. This could include early assessment, paired basic skills/study skills courses, etc.
- T4c.** Consider other venues such as community education or adult education for courses and programs without demonstrated success including lower levels of basic skills courses.

PROS	CONS
Uses resources where students are more likely to be successful.	Could have negative impact on degree completion and transfer rates if students are not able to enroll in preparatory courses.
Allows a greater number of students with higher success potential to be served.	Students have no alternative; ROP and adult school are cutting back also.
Students are not well served when they do not have the skills to persist in a course.	Retention could be addressed better through computerized prerequisite checking.
Truly addresses the “we cannot be all things to all people” notion that has been stressed by administration/district.	Risk losing too many students.
	No grading in Community Education; no way to confirm that students will learn necessary skills for higher level courses.
	Financial aid may not be available for courses in other venues.

T5. Focus on associate/transfer core

Preserve gateway courses at specified levels. Achieve budget reduction through across the board cuts to remaining non-exempt areas.

T5a. Identify and preserve a specific number of English and Math sections at each of the levels below AA competency.

T5b. Identify and preserve a specific number of English and Math sections at AA competency levels (ENGL 100, MATH 120).

T5c. Identify and preserve a specific number of courses that satisfy the mandatory requirements for transfer to CSU and UC: English Composition/Written Communication, Oral Communication, Critical Thinking, and Mathematics. See CSU-GE and IGETC worksheets for specific courses.

T5d. Identify and preserve a specific number of courses that satisfy each of the associate degree, CSU-GE, and IGETC areas beyond those covered in T5c. See AA/AS, CSU-GE, and IGETC worksheets for areas.

PROS	CONS
Provides reasonable access to gateway courses for students to begin and achieve their educational goals.	Puts pressure for deeper cuts on other non-exempt areas of the college; may require sacrifice of redundancy among non-gateway electives.
Promotes student completion of core classes within a reasonable time frame.	Introduces inequity between faculty and across subject areas.
Opens discussion on how many levels of basic skills ENGL/MATH to provide at CSM.	May lead to elimination of basic skills levels for members of the community.
Engages campus in college-wide discussion of best IGETC, CSU, UC coverage to provide to students.	Potentially introduces additional source of tension between divisions/programs offering courses fulfilling the same IGETC, CSU, and UC areas.
Eliminates low-enrolled non-entry level courses in unpopular/unessential AA programs.	Eliminates low-enrolled non-entry level courses in unpopular/unessential AA programs.
Moves CSM from an antiquated view of itself as having students <i>majoring</i> in “history,” “political science,” “literature,” “English,” etc., to a more realistic view of “transfer packages.” Emphasizes providing students with a broad “liberal arts” education. Engages the campus in a college-wide discussion of what constitutes a broad liberal arts education.	Deprives faculty of the rich experience of teaching more specialized courses in their fields. Deprives students of the rich experience of exploring an area more in-depth during their first years of college. Might threaten “smaller AA programs” that we feel are essential to a well-rounded liberal arts education.

T6. Focus on programs that are or that can develop into “gems.”

Retain the “gems”: programs that maximize the use of unique facilities, talents, curriculum, and/or personnel.

T6a. Retain programs that are unique within the region or within the district.

T6b. Retain and build programs that use unique facilities (e.g. planetarium; KCSM)

T6c. Consider consolidation across the district to build “gems” at each campus.
(This is also included as A1).

T6d. Retain a specified level of instructional resources to retain the flexibility to address current “hot” areas.

PROS	CONS
Gain recognition for college, programs and students.	Limits student choice.
Draw students from a broader region.	May not reflect interests of local community.
Attract students with clearly defined interests; these students may make more rapid progress toward their goals.	Increase in students from broader region reduces resources for local community.

T7. Campus Vision/Identity

As reaffirmed by the board, the College’s core mission is to provide transfer preparation and career/technical education (CTE). Within this constraint, the college could develop a vision or identity that focuses on a particular theme. For example, a focus on “Health and Wellness” could build on our Nursing, Dental Assisting, and Adaptive PE programs and take advantage of new or unique facilities such as Building 5N. Courses and programs in other areas would still be offered, but a greater portion of resources would be allocated to programs and majors related to the “Health and Wellness” theme.

T7a. Health and wellness focus

T7b. Business and accounting focus

T7c. Fine arts focus

T7d. Emerging fields focus

PROS	CONS
Builds upon existing strengths.	Puts pressure for deeper cuts on major or skills outside the focus area.
Builds upon existing facilities and image in the community.	May eliminate or drastically reduce some popular and successful majors/programs.
Retains a base of GE courses for AA/AS degree and transfer.	Educational priorities are driven by facilities; should be the other way around.
Promotes CSM as the go-to college for certain majors and programs.	Potentially limits many departments to roles as “service programs” rather than full

	transfer preparation and degree granting programs.
Focuses programs around a core area that, if chosen wisely, would be projected to grow nationally and in our area.	May conflict with board vision by focusing on a limited vision.
Allows students certainty of program offerings.	Risky if demand/interest in focus area decreases.
Retains a base of GE courses for AA/AS degree and transfer regardless of major.	While transfer may still be possible outside the focus area (for example, into programs with few lower division major requirements), CTE areas may be limited.
Provides reasonable access to gateway courses for students to begin and achieve specific educational goals.	We lose students who are uncertain of major or do not see themselves going into the focus area.

T* Additional possibilities for decision-making criteria suggested by campus community through feedback form.

The above are examples; the campus is asked to provide feedback and additional ideas.

Strategies that can be used to help implement decision-making criteria

The following are examples of strategies that might be used along with a variety of decision-making criteria.

S1. Preserve student access to courses through creative scheduling

S1a. Alternate advanced or specialized courses (some classes F only; some Sp only) with coordination across the campus and the district.

S1b. Focus on cohorts of students for whom courses could be sequenced on a publicized cycle.

PROS	CONS
Retains reasonable access to courses for students to begin and achieve their educational goals.	May delay completion of program for students who fall “out of cycle.”
Allows for rotation of offerings to accommodate a known pool of students.	Penalizes out of cohort students.
Promotes student completion a reasonable time frame by offering major courses on a predictable schedule.	Few students are able to schedule in such a predicable manner due to out of school obligations.
Limiting the offerings in advanced and specialized courses may increase enrollment in each class.	If not implemented across the district, may create “emigration” trends to other campuses, slowly draining our pool of

	students.
Offering classes in only some semesters may improve retention; students know they will have to wait to attempt class again.	Requires students to be better informed; may be difficult with reduced counseling resources.
Prepares students for what they will find at transfer schools.	May delay students' completion of program if courses are cancelled.
Scheduling around cohorts may decrease attrition and improve persistence rate.	Requires more planning for departments and divisions.
	Not as many "interesting" classes to teach and less specialized courses for student interest.
	Students may have even more difficulty of getting into highly impacted courses.

S2. Revisit course-level enrollment limitations to promote student success

S2a. Implement computerized prerequisite checking so that students who are not adequately prepared for a course do not displace those who are.

S2b. Consider whether existing enrollment limitations should be tightened to promote student success (for example, consider whether a specific recommended preparation should be changed to a prerequisite).

PROS	CONS
With budget cuts, "seats" in classes are a scarce resource and should only go to students who have met the stated prerequisites.	May delay student progress.
Promotes student success by ensuring adequate preparation.	May restrict access for students who would otherwise be able to succeed in a course.
Reduces the number of "false starts" that result students dropping or withdrawing from a course.	Requires across the district agreements on prerequisites.
Limiting the offerings in advanced and specialized courses may increase enrollment in each class.	

S3. Reconfigure summer offerings at the campus and district levels to focus on serving continuing students.

PROS	CONS
Saves money, allowing more courses to be retained during fall and spring terms.	Makes it harder for students to complete in a timely fashion.
Creates down time for facilities work.	We lose students who may not return.
If we offer summer school at only one campus it allows us to focus resources on one campus. We could alternate between colleges each year. We'll still serve all students in the county but some may have to travel farther.	We lose connection with local families whose primary interaction with CSM is through summer classes taken during high school or while attending another college or university.

S4. Streamline the associate degree by removing requirements not mandated by Title 5 or accreditation standards.

PROS	CONS
Provides clear path to educational goals	May provide a less rich and less well-rounded general education experience.
Additional elective units enrich either the breadth or depth of student program.	Some classes that are not longer required would still be offered for students with catalog rights in earlier years.

S* Additional strategies suggested by campus community through feedback form.

The above are examples; the campus is asked to provide feedback and additional ideas.

Additional Ideas

The following are examples of additional ideas whose implementation would require more time to develop or the participation of entities outside the college (such as AFT).

A1. Consider consolidation across the district to reduce the number of low enrolled programs and build “gems” at each campus.

PROS	CONS
Gain recognition for college, programs and students.	Limits student choice, especially for students who use public transportation.
Draw students from a broader region.	May not reflect interests of local community.
Attract students with clearly defined interests; these students may make more rapid progress toward their goals.	Increase in students from broader region reduces resources for local community.

A2. Revise program development and Program Improvement and Viability (PIV) processes

A2a. Create a program improvement and viability process that makes it easier to eliminate, rather than improve, programs which have become outdated or too expensive to maintain.

PROS	CONS
Makes explicit the focus on cost.	May make it too easy to eliminate programs that could be greatly improved with minor changes in curriculum or personnel.

A2b. Create a program development process that closely examines longer-term trends and avoids “flavor of the month” decisions.

PROS	CONS
Prevents hiring of full time faculty in areas that many not have long-term potential.	Difficult to accurately predict longer-term trends.

A3. Review the relative budget allocations to staff, administration, instruction, and student services

PROS	CONS
Ensures that adequate, but not excessive, resources are allocated outside the classroom.	Potentially diverts funds away from the classroom.

A4. Consider temporary freezes or reductions in salaries as a way to accomplish part or all of any budget reduction. Explore creative ways of preserving projected retirement benefits at non-freeze levels.

PROS	CONS
Allows more course sections to be offered at a given funding level, preserving access for students.	Reduces income for employees without reducing work hours or workload.
Retains faculty and staff positions, reducing layoffs.	Requires agreement across the district.
Retains faculty and staff positions, positioning college for growth when funding becomes available.	Requires renegotiation of contracts.
Creates solidarity between administration, staff and faculty (no one group takes on a disproportionate amount of the burden)	Sets a precedent for cutting wages in the future.

	Without appropriate wording of contracts, return to previous salary levels may not be guaranteed.
	Without appropriate wording of contracts, may have an additional negative impact on those close to retirement.

A* Additional strategies suggested by campus community through feedback form.

The above are examples; the campus is asked to provide feedback and additional ideas.

Background

In late January, the Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) created an Ad Hoc Steering Committee whose charge is to *“Coordinate a campus-wide dialog that leads to broadly accepted criteria to prioritize college educational efforts... [that] will be relied upon for making recommendations to be implemented by the 2011-2012 academic year. The campus community is asked to provide support to the Steering Committee by contributing ideas and feedback, by providing time in the agenda of standing meetings, and by participating in additional meetings as needed...”*

It is important to keep in mind the nature of the task at hand. The college has a “commitment to informed decision-making based on a culture of evidence” [charge to Education Master Plan Committee] and a “reliance on internal and external data to inform decision-making” [introduction to Strategic Plan]. Decisions that are eventually made in response to a changing budget must be based on appropriate use of the data that characterize the costs and benefits of our course offerings and services and their impact on our students.

In a time of abundance, the college might strive to offer all things for all students. In a time of extraordinary abundance, the college might even be able to do this well. However, we are not operating in a time of abundance. With our current budget and anticipated reductions, we are no longer able to provide the full range of courses and services that would satisfy the needs of all students who would like to pursue their education at College of San Mateo.

As a college, we have been asked to engage in a dialog that will lead to broadly accepted criteria which will in turn be used to prioritize our educational efforts. This will of necessity be a discussion based on values. If we cannot offer all things for all students, what should we offer and for whom? Who will we serve and how? The education code and accreditation standards provide some constraints on our response. The Board of Trustees, through its recent Reaffirmation of Core Values and Principles, provided an additional constraint: lifelong learning is assigned a lower priority than transfer education, workforce training, and the basic skills classes that many of our students take in preparation for transfer and training. Even with these constraints, however, there are many possible ways in which the college can allocate its limited resources.

The Steering Committee began its work by reviewing a variety of documents, including the Board’s Reaffirmation of Core Values and Principles, CSM’s Strategic Plan and Institutional Priorities, and the exchanges that took place regarding course and program reductions in Fall 2009. A summary of these resources, along with Steering Committee membership, agenda, and minutes, can be found at collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalcommittees/ipcsteering.asp.