1. **Approval of Minutes of May 20, 2014 Meeting**
   
   Moved to approve the minutes of May 20, 2014.
   Motion passed.

2. **Action Item**
   
   a. **IPC Membership**
      
      Rebecca – in an effort to update and make sure the list is correct we need to know of any changes to the committee membership.
      
      Anna Stirling will replace Jared Davis as a voting member representing the classified staff. Both Rebecca and Jared would like the committee to consider Jared remaining on the committee as part of the support staff because of his knowledge of the committee and how it operates. Jared worked with Fred to establish the hiring rubric for personnel, other than faculty who utilize their Joint Hiring guidelines, and IPC will need to finalize that rubric this year.
      
      Dr. Schultz doesn’t want to set a precedent therefore will leave the committee membership up to the individual groups.
      
      Dawn said the classified agreed that their representatives to the committee would be Marcus, Anna, Justin and Dawn.
IPC agreed that Jared will be called upon as support staff when needed and would continue to work on the rubric with Fred.

Rebecca said that it is her understanding the Academic Senate representation will remain the same at this time. As for the students Liliana Gomez is still on the committee.

b. RAP Rankings Recommendation 2014-2015 (Handout)
Rebecca – an IPC/Budget ad hoc committee scored the RAPs during the spring/summer. The scores are listed on the handout. Business Services used the heavy line on the report to separate the top 75% for funding purposes. Some groups moved ahead and started funding RAPs that could be funded from alternative sources other than the general fund and those are noted under the TYPE column. Those RAPs can be marked off since they are funded from another source. Today we need to look at the RAPs that fall under the general fund and make a recommendation as to those that IPC feels should be funded with the $475,000 budget that has been set aside for this process.

Dr. Schultz – depending on the outcome of the bond measure the first item on the list, MVC Marquee Replacement, could possibly be removed if an alternative funding source is identified. We can just fence that amount at this time.

John Seed – would like to have an accurate calculation of the available funds and then have the discussion.

Rebecca – the difference in this cycle is that we are looking at both on-going and one-time money funding requests. Personnel requests are not considered at this time and will be a separate discussion. This body needs to have the discussion today on prioritizing the items above the line.

Brian Orlauski – perhaps we can fence $75,000 for the Marquee this year and do the same next year since even if we approve it, it won’t be done until next year.

Dr. Schultz – wants to stay with the standards that have been set. He doesn’t like spending money just because we have it. Perhaps we could look at RAP rollovers.

Rebecca – we did discuss RAP rollovers. Since the RAP is changing as we move into the next 3-year cycle and comprehensive program review we felt that any RAP submitted for the 15/16 cycle could be resubmitted every year if it wasn’t successfully funded that first year. The RAP and program review cycle would remain constant for the next 3 years.
Dr. Pat – speaking of alternative funding sources, would SSSP cover RAP#SS 103-1415, Online Counseling?

Rebecca – it could pay for the software and SSSP has the money now.

Fred – RAP #SS 102-1415 Training will cover the changes that have been made to Title IX. There are a number of new requirements associated with very high government fines for non-compliance that we must be aware to avoid those fines.

Brian – the process is sound and suggested the committee move forward and approves it.

m/sc Orlauski/Schwerdtfeger

Moved to approve all RAPS above the 75% cutoff line except for BUS101-1415 MVC Marquee Replacement, fencing $75,000 balance to roll to next year’s RAP reserve.

Discussion

Motion passed.
Rebecca – this will now go to the budget committee this Thursday for discussion and approval. Then the award notices will be sent out.

3. Discussion Update/Item
   a. RAP Personnel Requests/Scoring

Rebecca – these are all classified reclassifications, net new positions, etc. and have not been scored. They will be scored and used as a test utilizing the rubric that was approved by IPC last year. This will provide us the opportunity to see how the rubric works and make any tweaks and improvements that are needed prior to the 15/16 cycle when the hiring rubric will be incorporated in the RAP process.

John Seed – voiced concern that he wasn’t told that this rubric would not be considered this year. He wasn’t aware it was a practice exercise and submitted a RAP requesting a position he very much needed. This was a communication issue and we need to let people know what will and won’t be included in the process.

Rebecca – she doesn’t believe the PAR is the right tool to prioritize positions, it asks the wrong questions, and we need another mechanism. It is a great checklist. As it presently stands everyone would be awarded the same score because everyone will say their position(s) was included in the program review. It wouldn’t help Executive Cabinet to make decisions without having a prioritization tool specifically for hiring. That is why Fred and Jared developed a rubric for hiring classified positions. You will continue to use the RAP to request personnel but the rubric will be different for hiring. We will
develop it this year. We need to score personnel requests on the PAR and have a healthy dialogue about what is wrong with using the PAR as that tool and using the rubric for that. Paul will lead an ad hoc committee to score the requests with Fred, Stacey, Brian, and Marcus from IPC and additional volunteers from the Budget Committee.

b. Comprehensive Program Review Template (Handout)
Paul – we are in the first year of our 3-year cycle of this comprehensive review. This is the document being used in Instruction. Alex Cuatok is running a similar form and timeline in Student Services. Rebecca is working with the Administrative units that don’t have as many tiers as Instruction. We are trying to keep the form as short as possible but also want to capture everything we need to maintain compliance with the ACCJC rubrics for planning program review and assessment. We also want to capture enough analysis from the faculty so that this is meaningful for them. We want them to be able to look at their course data and analyze that as well as their assessment data to inform the planning process for the next iterations of the equipment and staffing plans. We shortened the form and under Analysis and Comments there are places to enter text into text fields. The format may look a little odd but it creates the shortest form and will look good in the end. This will be sent to all faculty involved with a program.

- Under Program/Course/Assessment everyone will get a program template for their discipline with a data spreadsheet that has multiple tabs with the data on success rates, withdraw rates, fill rates and waitlists. We are asking faculty to look at and comment on courses in their discipline. We presently have this districtwide and online. The faculty will get site specific data so they can make specific RAP requests by site. This is similar to what people have been asked to do over the last 2-3 years, just a different format.

- As for the assessment piece, the faculty is being asked to complete course improvement plans for courses that were assessed last year. That will be done through eLumen like last time. The regular faculty will also be entered into eLumen as course coordinators so they have access to the course improvement plans and it isn’t just available to department chairs.

- Under Planning and Resource Requirements we are asking faculty to specify their program goals, facilities, staffing, technology, equipment and professional development to inform the institutional planning from the ground up.

- Budget Allocation includes the RAP submissions followed by the Final Summary that records who participated and asks for constructive criticism regarding the process.

This doesn’t cover everything because there are templates we need to record for a 3 year schedule so that full and part time faculty know which courses we will be assessing over the next 3 years. We have a curriculum review, mapping for learning outcomes as well
as curriculum mapping to make sure as we expect students to learn we develop it and master it in a way that they have multiple ways to learn that curriculum. The deadline for all of these except the RAP is November 14th. The RAP deadline has been pushed back to December 20th the middle of February to revise it.

Paul went on to discuss the RAP/PAR for 2015/16 – (Handouts)

- The RAP has been shortened for presentation and cleaned up to make it more user-friendly for the submitter and the scorers. It flows much as it did last year with the big difference falling under Section II, Strategic Plan Goals. These are the ten new goals for the 2014-17 SP. The submitter will check the boxes that apply to the specific RAP.
- The PAR has a couple of changes. Under Section II we switched Fiscally Sound Position which used to be worth 8 points and is now worth 2 points. Systematic Planning and Assessment was worth 2 points is now worth 8 points. Therefore, there are more ways to earn more points, it’s better for scoring and easier to differentiate between proposals.

Rebecca – this information will be shared with the Budget Committee on Thursday. If they approve we will formalize, send out and post this on the website. If you have any concerns and/or changes, etc. contact Rebecca.

c. Strategic Plan 2014-2017 Draft (Handout)
Rebecca - the 10 goals and the condensed objectives are in the handout. The Strategic Plan went through a robust process over the summer with Executive Cabinet spending 3 separate work sessions refining the goals/objectives that were sent forward following the planning process. Those goals/objectives came up through Instruction, Student Services and the Administrative units as well as the student focus groups. We are sharing them with IPC and will move on to create the final document. Because things changed as the document went through the different iterations, instead of outlining each outcome with the objectives this information will become an appendix in the back of the Strategic Plan. It will list all of the outcomes and they can be used as measurements or if any area wants to complete their own relative to the objectives and the goals that were developed they can do that as well. It allows for more flexibility.

d. ACCJC Midterm Report
Rebecca – the report went to the Board as an information item last Thursday and will be placed on the October agenda for approval. It looks like we are in full compliance with all 5 of the recommendations:
The 1st recommendation focused on the Mission Statement, assessment of the Mission Statement and putting us on a regular calendar for evaluation, revision and adoption.

The 2nd recommendation focused on continuing our institutional practices related to integrated programming and planning.

The 3rd recommendation focused on sustained progress on student learning outcomes and assessment.

The 4th recommendation focused on disaggregation of data.

The 5th recommendation focused on minimum staffing levels.

We addressed all of the 50+ improvement plans with shared governance involved throughout the development of the plan. Faculty leadership reviewed and edited the document as well as participated in the steering meetings. The report will be sent to the ACCJC upon Board approval and hopefully they will accept the report and we won’t hear back from them for 3-4 years or 2017 when our self-study is due. We will begin to work on the self-study in 2015.

e. SETS/Minimum Staffing Analysis

Nik Mesaris – this is an enrollment tracking tool where we pulled in the faculty data broken into fulltime and part-time faculty. The unit load and overload was added for the faculty hiring rubric.

Rebecca – It is a uniform tool to handoff to faculty to document proposals and submit through the joint hiring process. The SETS tool is helping us create minimum staffing level requirements for programs and services. It takes all the measurements into account and will show the minimum staffing requirements for faculty, staff, and administrators to establish a baseline by site in order to have quality programs. We are creating a consistent tool for everyone.

Lorraine – they directed the faculty to work with their respective Dean rather than Nik. She asked Nik to refer them back to their Dean.

f. Planning Updates

i. SSSP

Lorraine – the SSSP document needs to be postmarked October 16th. A task force of faculty, classified and counselors went through the plan looking at the needs and next tasks that need to be captured in the document. Bill Vincent and JoAnna Quejada are taking the lead with Lorraine, Stacey and Rebecca providing input as needed and some oversight.
ii. Equity
Lorraine – the report was originally due in November but has been pushed back to January 2015. Convocation was well attended and the speaker’s theme of student success and equity indicators are being carried forward. They are moving on with the climate survey and are looking at hosting forums for students and other ways to enhance our institution and make this a focus of what we do here.

g. IPC Goals/Objectives
Rebecca provided a copy of the IPC Goals for 2014-2016 and the Shared Governance Midterm Report.

4. Other Information/Updates
None

5. Next Meeting – October 21, 2014

m/sc Bridge/Searl-Chapin
Moved to adjourn.
Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Mt. San Jacinto College, a California Community College, offers accessible, innovative, comprehensive and quality educational programs and services to diverse, dynamic and growing communities both within and beyond traditional geographic boundaries. We support life-long learning and student success by utilizing proven educational methodologies as determined by collaborative institutional planning and assessment. To meet economic and workforce development needs, MSJC provides students with basic skills, general and career education that lead to transfer, associate degrees and certificates. Our commitment to student learning empowers students with the skills and knowledge needed to effect positive change and enhance the world in which we live.