1. Approval of Minutes of September 16, 2014 Meeting
   
m/sc Slattery-Farrell/Dr. Schwerdtfeger
   
   Moved to approve the minutes of September 16, 2014.
   
   Motion passed.
   
   Evelyn Menz abstained

2. Action Item
   
a. 2015-2016 RAP/PAR Templates
   
   Paul Hert - These have passed through IPC and the budget committee and now include a compilation of all of the suggestions that came from those discussions.
   
   RAP draft 11/17 form includes the following changes:
   
   White box in header - Resource Allocation Proposal title change to RAP ID
   
   White box in header - Include a Title on what is being asked for
   
   Left hand column - Put down vertically the total points possible for that section and that box
   
   Take out the wet signature lines at the end of the form
   
   Rebecca said that Paul also created a manual that outlines how to fill out the RAP in Program Review.

   PAR Form
   
   Most of the Changes happened in section 3 of the 5 sections.
Section 2 lists the 5 Institutional Priorities, the prior form just had 5 boxes/1 for each of the 5 priorities. To shorten the form and not encourage those completing the form to not provide something everywhere in the hopes of getting more points, they went ahead and let the Strategic Plan goals take the place of the 5 separate boxes of the 5 separate institutional priorities. Going back to the RAP form in section 2, we have listed the 10 Strategic Plan goals. Those encompass the 5 institutional priorities. On the RAP form there are 25 points possible for section 2 with 10 goals you can check. If you look at the instructions we don’t want to encourage everyone to check all of them so we wanted to balance between the work it takes to write and score the RAP. We wanted to reduce the number of goals they would check in hopes that they would choose the most applicable ones. If you go back to the PAR form, Section 2, there are 10 points possible for Student Success, 8 for Systematic Planning and Assessment, 2 for Fiscally sound Position, 3 for Institutional Pride and Organizational Culture and 2 for Community Partnerships and Service. We have taken the 10 Strategic Plan goals and aligned them with each of the 5 institutional priorities. If you were filling out a RAP and you chose Strategic Plan Goal #1 *Reduce time to completion of student educational goals to increase degree transfer, and certificate completion* you would get 10 points when scored by the PAR. If you chose goal 2 or 3 from the list on the RAP you would get 8 points assuming your verbiage would support it. But, if you only let the authors select 3 goals per the RAP instructions, they will never get 25 points. We should probably create a range and let them select between 4-6 goals and if they chose the right ones they can earn 25 points. We might say check all goals that apply (4-6) and review the PAR scoring to see how the points are awarded.

Lorraine – shouldn’t the writer have to justify how their request applies?

Paul – yes, and all in 150 words.

Rebecca – there are very few requests that would touch all of the goals.

Roger – we have this as an action item.

Lorraine – doesn’t believe action should be taken on it at this time because it is still confusing as written.

Rebecca – recommends that IPC suggests how you would like to proceed.

John – we talked about communication last month and on the last page of the PAR it says *...there will be feedback sent to the Dean who will then give feedback to the department*
or program area that submitted it. John never received that feedback and we should come up with a communication process that works with the PAR. He would like to recommend that when a person completes a RAP it is followed by the following 3 stages of communication:
   - We have received it
   - Status (reviewed or un-reviewed)
   - Decision
With open communication provided at all 3 of those stages.

Becky – as it goes through the process all of this gets posted on the web.

John – we need effective communication.

Bill – we need to get the information out that all of the feedback is available on the web.

Rebecca – everything is on the web. She doesn’t see an issue with communicating as John suggested.

Lorraine – it sounds like the communication breakdown might have happened at his Dean level because she didn’t experience that.

Brandon – the Deans need to communicate with the faculty.

IPC agreed that notices will go out to improve communication to the college community as well as those who submitted RAPs.

John said he is satisfied with the comments.

**m/sc Lorraine Slattery-Farrell/Becky Elam**
**Moved to accept the proposed changes to the RAP/PAR templates as discussed and move forward.**
**Motion passed.**

b. **2014-2017 Strategic Plan**
Rebecca – last month IPC saw the Strategic Plan draft. We need a formal adoption of the Strategic Plan goals and objectives so we can begin to package and formalize it for presentation to the Board of Trustees in November. This was presented to Academic Senate last week for information. It is already embedded in the PAR, RAP, Program Review, Faculty Handbook, etc.
Moved to adopt the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan draft as presented. Motion passed.

3. **Discussion**
   a. **Strategic Plan Implementation Framework**

   Rebecca – wants to have a discussion on how IPC would like to implement the plan. The Executive Cabinet reviewed the plan and designated key leads to take on the goals and objectives in the last Strategic Plan cycle. That group was to report back to EC regarding the status of the goals and objectives on an annual basis. That only happened to a midterm point. There were templates that were created and were to be completed. That process worked to the midterm point. IPC has ownership of the document. She would like to see that this plan is reviewed on an annual basis so that adjustments can be made as necessary to insure that the goals and objectives are met and whether or not we are falling behind in some areas, etc.

   Fred – would it make sense to tie the Strategic Plan annual review to the budget calendar?

   Becky – where would that fit on the calendar?

   Rebecca – at the completion of a year – a June report.

   Roger – similar to all of the committee reporting as we have scheduled.

   Bill – look at reviewing it at the same time we move through the Shared Governance review.

   Dr. Pat – some of the goals are going to require funding to move forward. We should think about that, incorporate that at the beginning and it should go to budget to put it ahead of the curve.

   Lorraine – we have these 10 goals with objectives, the reporting mechanism is important. What are we doing this year to be sure that we are addressing these objectives and who is responsible for this?

   Rebecca – yes, Lorraine is correct. Most of the goals overlap and to have one lead is challenging because you may need more than one lead to make sure the goal/objective is being addressed. The communication with IPC broke down with the past Strategic Plan.
Roger – we should assign the key leads and the appropriate administrator to oversee the leads and have them report back to this body. Assign the leads to people who are in the position to get it done. It is more the mechanism to get it done, placing it on the agenda each month.

Rebecca – we need team leaders with someone over each priority.

Evelyn – can we identify the leads for each objective?

Roger – do we want to identify an ad hoc subcommittee to identify a slate of team leaders to bring back to the next meeting?

Evelyn, Roger, Fred will serve on the ad hoc committee.

Dr. Pat – who is going to organize the objectives on the pages at the back of the document under these 10 goals?

Rebecca – we need to create an ad hoc group for each of the priorities and each of those people will work together on the objectives. There will be overlap. Example: Objective #1, will be both Instruction and Student Services so it won’t be one but two people responsible. There will be one person responsible for the priority to tie it all together.

Dr. Pat – it seems we try to focus on so many we end up focusing on nothing or wait to the end date and then scramble to see if we have met this objective or have anything to use to convince the group we have done something. Perhaps even though there will be 10 of them we focus our attention so they become a priority where we are all committed to accomplish them and keep them at the forefront of what we focus on.

Rebecca – if it is truly integrated in the other plans that we follow on a daily basis relative to all of the plans it should be documented in the Strategic Plan.

Becky – spoke to it from her division perspective – we wait for the Board to set their priority and goals and then the division sets its own division priorities that are based around the Board’s priorities and the Strategic Plan. Any initiative that comes forward from her managers are directly tied to this. Therefore her division is not back-loading when it comes time to report out. They are moving forward with the Strategic Plan as the compass.

Dr. Pat – that has not been his experience.
Becky – it may be a little different for her division as they are more linear based regarding what they do.

Dr. Pat – he would like to see a goal that makes a significant improvement on the instructional side and student learning that fixes something that is visible and significant. We often we have goals that look good on paper but in the end people aren’t sure. He would like to see us focus on one or two significant items that really make a change.

Lorraine – we are starting a new 3-year cycle so we have the ability to infuse it in our culture.

Dr. Pat – he is suggesting that we consciously make a decision over the 3 years to focus on the few things that we think will make a big difference and highlight items that we think could make a huge difference while others are working on the other items.

Bill – choosing the top 3 priorities for this body?

Dr. Pat – select the 3 we want to concentrate on first. It doesn’t mean we aren’t doing the other ones.

Roger – what is missing in this version from the last version is that we included dollars and timelines for achievement. Maybe we adopt this and that is what the leads will provide, a realistic assessment of what is achievable with the resources that are out there and then we can start to set the priorities. He likes where Dr. Pat is going rather than diluting everything, we say we are going to achieve so much of it in year one, etc. This body should embrace the field’s perspective and we may not be the best experts to assess how achievable something is. He would like us to adopt this with the caveat that we will assign some prioritization timelines.

Rebecca – agrees the timelines are very important. There is no data to backup any of this now. As we develop the timelines we are setting the baseline of where we are starting. We will set a baseline now to see how far we can go. What is not here are the outcomes but they are in the appendix of the Strategic Plan so departments can go back and work off of the plan to build the division goals, outcomes and objectives.

Fred – can the ad hoc group who will develop the slate of leads also ask those leads to report back to IPC and provide a timeline/priority list for each of the objectives?
Rebecca – this will go to Board in November. We will come back to IPC with the leaders and develop the structure.

Roger – would it be worth having a summit once we have identified the leads so everyone can come together and have a discussion? That way everyone starts on the same page with the same of understanding as to how we will proceed.

Roger – add Rebecca and Bill to the ad hoc group. So once we identify the leads we will map out the rest of the planning at the next meeting with the understanding that the timeline will come into play as the process is developed.

b. **Scorecard Presentation (formerly ARCC data) and Institutional Implications**

Nik Mesaris – provided a presentation on the MSJC 2014 Student Success Scorecard (aka Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges) mandated by the Chancellor’s Office beginning in 2004.

Objective – the objective is to provide clear and concise information on key student progress and success metrics in order to improve performance. The main intention is to improve student success and maintain accountability and transparency. They take a cohort of students based on criteria and track them for 6 years to see how they are performing on the metrics.

Dr. Vincent – as a point of information this is not to compare but to track your own school’s progress and compare your institutional data from one year to another.

Nik went on to share that The Student Success Scorecard Metrics include:

1. Persistence
2. Complete At least 30 units
3. Completion
4. Remedial
5. Career Technical Education
6. They track the same cohort of students on the first 3 metrics. Metric 4, they track students in a remedial cohort for 6 years to see if they have transitioned to complete a college level course in the same discipline. Metric 5, they track Career Technical Education students to see if they have completed several courses classified as career technical in a single discipline and completed a degree, certificate or transferred.

What the Chancellor’s Office doesn’t point out is what we are looking at in cohort size and the ratio to the total student body. Because they track the data for six years we
actually end up looking at data that is a day late and a dollar short and we are looking at a very small percent of our student body, 11 or 12% of MSJC total student body. Nik went on to cover each metric but continued to caution the group that we are looking at very old data and no one puts a lot of emphasis on this other than the mandate that we must present it to the Board. Recap – MSJC stayed flat on persistence, up a little in 30 units, up slightly in completion, remedial flat, CTE flat.

Bill – he is looking forward to the next 6 year report because we have been asked to do so much more that he wants to see the progress that will be made.

c. Planning Updates:
   i. SSSP
      Rebecca – the report has been submitted. You all have copies and it will be posted online with our planning documents.

   ii. Equity
      Rebecca – she just had a great meeting with Lorraine and Alma Ramirez to discuss this subject. The report is due January 1st so we will ask for an extension as the Board doesn’t meet until later that month. The Chancellor’s Office understands the challenges with the upcoming holidays and has given everyone the opportunity to ask for an extension. The group does plan to have a planning retreat on November 7th to look at the data. Based on preliminary information we don’t have any disproportionate impacts regarding the 5 indicators. The group will review the data, have a conversation on disproportionate impacts and if there are none establish recommendations and action steps within the plan for equity. It may not target a specific population if we don’t have a disproportionate impact relevant to those indicators but we may take a more institutional approach to equity. A presentation will go to the Board in November as an information item and back to the Board in January for approval.

   iii. BSI
      Rebecca – the report was completed and submitted.
      If you want more information we can invite Micah to come and speak to it.

      Becky – this is dated October 20, 2013, is that correct?

      Rebecca – yes because this is a year-end report and also the budget for the next year.
iv. Educational Master Plan Addendum v Staffing Plan
Rebecca – The Educational Master Plan sunsets in 2016 so we need to start having a conversation on how to move forward. It was suggested we do it with addendums to the plan. We can have a better conversation after November 4th.

Staffing Plan – we have a draft. It still needs some data pieces that she and Nik will work on. They will bring it back to IPC. We need to talk about minimum staffing levels.

d. Program Review and Assessment
Paul – We are in the first year of a three-year cycle in Program Review. The faculty in Instruction and Student Services are busy working to complete their comprehensive Program Reviews that are due the end of October for Student Services and the middle of November for faculty and Instruction. The faculty/instruction have had a lot of work going on in curriculum and joint hiring that has increased the workload for department chairs so they pushed the deadline for some of the pieces back a little to alleviate that pressure.

In assessment we are working on a new version of eLumen that is creating some challenges. It looks like we can do Program Review within eLumen that will help us organize Program Review and tie it closely to assessment in the future.

e. Funded 14/15 RAPS – Communication
Rebecca – this is in response to John’s comments from the previous IPC meeting. We are formalizing a communication out to the faculty on what was scored, not scored and that personnel will be included in scoring this fall. That communication will go out to everyone.

f. Shared Governance Midterm Report Draft
Rebecca – please review the draft. If you have additional comments just let her know. It will be brought back to the next meeting.

7. Other Information/Updates
Safety Issues – Brandon
We have had a couple of incidents on the Menifee Campus in the last few days with students fighting and staff not being able to contact any police or get a response. The fighting continues even with Dr. Vincent and Dean Rowley present. We have faculty and staff who are scared to go into the LRC lobby and concerned with their safety. We need security stationed in that area to watch that building and the buildings in that immediate area. We
had problems last semester and we were successful I getting them out of the lobby but they have moved upstairs in the 600 building.

Roger – we had that discussion in EC this morning and Dr. Vincent was given the go ahead to address the safety issues because a secure environment for learning is our priority. Fred has started on the student discipline associated with some of those individuals. Dr. Vincent is very displeased with the situation and will get this resolved.

Roger – Last week CSEA ratified the MOU which allows the District to outsource police services. We are working with our legal team to put the finishing touches on the RFP for police services. Even in the interim period there will be an interim solution while we work to implement a long term solution.

Brandon – what message should we take back to faculty and staff?

Roger – Dr. Vincent was directed to pursue a solution and hire additional personal in the interim.

Dr. Pat – the CSO’s need to be walking around and have a constant presence in the LRC area. We will get additional staff/police on it. In his view those students need to be removed from campus.

Fred – he is on this and he knows that at least one of the troublemakers is not our student.

John – please watch the 600 Building. We have had pot smoking in the restrooms with a lot of action in that area too.

8. **Next Meeting – November 18, 2014**

Motion to adjourn.