
Absent: Alicia Artz, Frank Chong, Doug Roberts, and Julie Thompson.

Guests: Toni Eaton

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: It was M/S/C to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 13, 2014, as submitted.

2. INTEGRATED PLANNING
Minutes from the shared governance and planning bodies (IN BOLD) were attached to the IPC agenda. Council members had no questions regarding the minutes presented.

- Academic Senate
- Associated Students Senate
- Budget Advisory Committee
- Classified Senate
- College Council
- District Facilities Planning Committee
- Educational Planning and Coordinating Council
- Integrated Environmental Planning Committee
- Institutional Technology Group
- Petaluma Faculty Forum

3. INSTITUTIONAL PLANS AND PLANNING
a. Strategic Plan Scorecard – Core Indicator Target/Timeline #2 – Population Participation Rates and #3 Institutional Student Learning Outcomes
IPC members participated in the second of five collaborative discussions designed to set institutional targets and timelines to completion for each of the current Core Indicators selected as measures of progress toward achieving SRJC’s eight Strategic Plan Goals. This session focused on two Core Indicators – Population Participation Rates (PPR) and Institutional Learning Outcomes. The data for those indicators can be reviewed at the following links:

Population Participation Rates: http://strategic-planning.santarosa.edu/participation-rates
Institutional Student Learning Outcomes: http://strategic-planning.santarosa.edu/learning-outcomes-basic

Members were reminded of the goals that these core indicators will be used for: Population Participation Rates will monitor progress on Goal A – Support Student Success; Goal C - Serve our Diverse Communities; Goal E – Establish a Strong Culture of Sustainability; Goal F – Cultivate a Healthy Organization. Institutional Student Learning Outcomes will monitor progress on Goal A – Support Student Success and Goal B – Foster Learning and Academic Excellence.

Population Participation Rates
There was an extensive discussion of the population participation rate (PPR) core indicator, which is a percentage based on the number of students enrolled at SRJC out of every 100 residents aged 18-64 in Sonoma County. During discussion, the following observations/discussion points were made:

- The 2013 rate for SRJC was 7.7%, while state-wide it was 6.2%. This is a 3-year running average, based on the entire student population, i.e., no age range was excluded.
- From prior to 2009 through 2012, the SRJC PPR trended downward, but it has recently trended up a bit, possibly due, in part, to the increase in senior adult classes offered.
Both credit and noncredit classes are included, but classes in Community Education are not included.
This is an unduplicated head count that includes all students enrolled.
It was noted that the figures would be higher if only the adult student population were included.

**Action:** The decision was made to have the charts redone to include only students aged 18-64.

It was noted that because the Strategic Plan website is interactive, when playing around with the data, one can look at PPR by gender, ethnicity, and age. So, for example, one could select, Latino males 20-24 years old or all African-Americans in the 25-34 age group. One potential use for this type of data would be to market to a particular age and ethnic group.

Jane stated that Council members will continue the discussion and look at the revised data at the next IPC meeting. Non-IPC members of the Strategic Planning Task Force will be invited to join the IPC on December 8 for a review and discussion of all targets and timelines.

**Institutional Student Learning Outcomes:**
The institutional student learning outcomes are measured by a student survey conducted every three years since 2001. According to KC, students are administered the survey in a random sample of 10% of all course sections and the response rate is very high, making it a valid and valuable source of data. The data that Council members reviewed were comparative data for the surveys conducted in 2007, 2010, and 2013 in the following area (one of 24 measures on which students are asked to rate their improvement since they began studying at SRJC): To what extent do you think your SRJC education so far has contributed to your knowledge, skills and abilities in the areas of reading, writing and math?

Some concern was expressed that the student self-reporting survey is the primary source of data on student success at SRJC and is not at this time supplemented by direct report data—for example, SLO assessments carried out within departments. However, it was stated that the student survey process is the best widespread method currently available to assess student learning. It is hoped that in time, SLO assessment will be incorporated into the student success data, but that is a challenge because, generally speaking, data from those studies apply only to very limited groups of students.

After reviewing the data, members made the following recommendations:

- Add a critical analysis area to the reading, writing and math areas, specifically: locating, analyzing, evaluating, and synthesizing relevant information;
- Include only students who have taken at least 16 units and who have not earned a college degree;
- Be clear that the data source is a self-report student survey.

Goals for the next meeting: Review the data that will be revised by KC and Greg and then set targets and timelines in each of the four areas—reading, writing, math, and critical analysis. Also, IPC members were encouraged to play around with the data and come back to the next meeting with comments and suggestions.

b. **2013/14 College Initiatives Status Update – FINAL REPORT**
A written report had been distributed to members in advance that summarized the nine 2013-14 SCJCD College Initiatives and the goals within each initiative. It also included links to key planning documents and a status update on each of the objectives.

Jane reported that this document will be presented to the Board of Trustees at their November 12 meeting as an action item and subsequently made available to the college community via the College Initiatives link on the Institutional Planning website.

In providing background to the report, she explained that these nine goals were developed over time and they were linked to the PRPP process for many years, with a status report completed annually during the past six years and presented to the Board. She added that not all of the measurements that were to be done did get done. Now, with a strategic planning system in place, which has a system of implementation and accountability, this is
the last year for this specific type of report. It is a summary of the activities for each College Initiative that were carried out during the previous year and over time. It is a close-out report for the College Initiatives. The document will be posted on the Institutional Planning website.

No action was needed or taken.

c. **PRPP Annual Flow Chart and 2015/16 PRPP Planning Cycle**
Council members reviewed the final draft of the PRPP Annual Flow Chart and a preliminary draft of the 2015/16 PRPP Planning Cycle as submitted by the PRPP Coordinating Committee.

The Annual Flow Chart is in its final version and presents a visualization of the PRPP process. Jane asked that members share the document widely, and she invited critiques of the document.

The Planning Cycle document presents the timeline for completion of the PRPP. Jane explained that in the past there was usually one deadline for completion of the PRPP document. Beginning this year there will be a more realistic sequence so that information is completed as administration needs it. Instead of having a single due date for the entire PRPP document, departments will be given due dates for specific sections of the PRPP. For example, in Academic Affairs resource requests will be due in April, but sections 3, 4 and 6 covering goals, etc., do not need to be completed until May.

Built into the process will be a section for editors to indicate what's working or not working, and that information will be shared with the PRPP Coordinating Committee. She added that the accreditation process now requires public posting of results of the program reviews, so all 2014 reports will be posted on the Institutional Planning website. She stressed the importance of departments carefully scrutinizing their reports before the posting, including removing people’s names. An addition this year is a pop-up screen for approvers, warning them that what they are approving is for public review. In November all of the PRPP documents will be opened up so that departments can make their edits. After that, the report will roll into 2015. The public posting process will allow everyone to view all of the priorities submitted – not just the highest priorities.

d. **Accreditation Self Evaluation Update**
In the absence of Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) Mary Kay Rudolph, Jane reported that Wanda Burzycki was working on the final edits to the self-evaluation. The document will be presented to IPC on November 24th and to the Board in December.

e. **Budget Update**
Jane reported she would be working with Doug Roberts about having budget reports that will be meaningful to IPC. She also stressed the importance of members’ scrutinizing the Budget Advisory Committee minutes and asking questions about them. They often contain information that IPC members should track.