
Members Absent: Alicia Artz, Eli Egger, Omar Paz, Michael Salinger, Julie Thompson.

Guests: Toni Eaton

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mary Kay Rudolph made a motion to approve the minutes of the meetings of November 17, 2014 and November 24, 2014. The motion was seconded and carried.

2. INTEGRATED PLANNING
Minutes from the following shared governance and planning bodies (in bold) were attached to IPC agenda. There were no questions or comments from IPC members.

   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 Review
      IPC members reviewed an updated list of Strategic Plan Scorecard Core Indicators, along with the Core Indicator targets and timelines established to-date (Enrollment, Participation Rates, Completion Rates, Institutional Student Learning Outcomes, Efficiency and Productivity, FTES). The link to the Scorecard data, targets, and timelines is http://strategic-planning.santarosa.edu

      Jane reported that members of the Strategic Planning Committee would attend IPC in January or early February to participate in discussing the core indicators, targets, and timelines.

      At the November 24th meeting, members had addressed Strategic Plan Scorecard Core Indicator Target/Timeline #5 – Efficiency and Productivity; however, the discussion had centered on productivity and on FTES (and not on efficiency), with targets set for each. Therefore, Jane suggested that that core indicator be revised to exclude efficiency. She reiterated that productivity is the ratio of FTES to FTEF. There was no objection to the recommendation. Members also agreed to establish FTES as a separate core indicator to avoid any confusion with enrollment count. In conclusion, members agreed to have separate core indicators as follows: (1) enrollment head count; (2) FTES; and (3) productivity, and there will be no core indicator for efficiency.

      Jane recommended that members review the Strategic Plan Scorecard and the work accomplished to date, including the goals summary. There was a brief discussion about how enrollment is measured and how information is presented in terms of percentages achieved on the Scorecard that Greg Drukala has been developing. A few changes will be made as a result of the discussion, and Jane will send the link out again so that members can take a look at the revisions and percentages achieved.
It was mentioned that SRJC is 39th in the State with regard to productivity, which brought up the question of whether a high number in productivity a good thing. Low student to teacher ratio is considered good pedagogically, so perhaps some further study needs to be done on the issue of what is to be valued in the area of productivity.

Jane said that the Core Indicators with targets still to be set are Fiscal Stability (self-assessment), Great Colleges to Work For (annual survey), Accreditation Process, and Carbon Footprint. Those last three require additional data.

b. 2014 IPEDS Data Feedback Report
Director of Institutional Research, KC Greaney, reviewed the 2014 Data Feedback Report that SRJC received from IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System). (For more information about IPEDS see http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds. To see how parents and students use these data through the College Navigator see http://collegenavigator.edu.gov). IPEDS collects data from about 7,500 institutions that provide secondary education in the U.S. Data is collected on student enrollment, graduation rates, student charges, program completions, faculty, staff, and finances.

The Data Feedback Report includes SRJC in a peer group of 35 similar community colleges in the west, including in Texas, California, Arizona and New Mexico. They are all large, public, two-year colleges with enrollment of a similar size. The data were collected during the 2013-14 IPEDS collection cycle and are the most recent data available. Some of the highlights KC pointed out included:

- Fig. 6 and Fig. 8 indicate that SRJC gave more local financial aid during 2012-13 compared to the other colleges in the group and less in Pell grants and Federal loans.
- Tuition and fees (Fig. 4) at SRJC are lower when compared to the group as a whole.
- Graduation rates are generally higher at SRJC (Fig. 10). For example, the overall graduation rate at SRJC is 33% compared to 18% for the group, and the full-time retention rate at SRJC is 74% compared to 63% for the group overall. The transfer-out rate (which KC explained is basically a drop-out rate) is lower at SRJC for the period studied when compared with the group as a whole. KC emphasized that the graduation data are all solid data that SRJC should be proud of.
- Also of note is that 44% of SRJC students graduated in 200% of normal time vs. only 23% for the group (2009 cohort) (Fig. 11).
- SRJC has a lower productivity rate (Fig. 15). Instruction at SRJC costs $5,719 per FTE enrolled (fiscal year 2013) vs. $4,226 for the comparison group.

It was suggested that a press release be written to publicize the favorable SRJC data.

c. 2014 PRPP Wrap-up Message – FINAL DRAFT
Council members reviewed the final draft of the PRPP Wrap-up message to be sent to dl.staff.all in December from the IPC and BAC co-chairs. The message summarizes the 2014 cycle and announces the posting of resource priorities on SRJC’s Institutional Planning and PRPP SharePoint websites.

Amid the positive aspects of the report is the question of the unrestricted general fund. As stated in the report, “the possibility of a large beneficial swing between budgeted and actual revenue (that we’ve experienced in the past three years) is just not there.” So, for 2015-16, the District will be starting off the budgetary process coping with a “structural imbalance,” which could be in the range of $5-$6 million.

No action was required, and the report will be distributed.

d. 2015 PRPP Launch Message – FINAL DRAFT
IPC members reviewed the final draft of the PRPP launch message to be sent to dl.staff.all from the IPC and BAC co-chairs in early January to launch the 2015 cycle of PRPP. The memo emphasized the important impact of the PRPP reports that departments and units submit annually. As an example, requests made in spring 2014 provided justification for 19 contract faculty positions and $1.31 million in instructional equipment and library materials.

One point of discussion was the question of whether the PRPP was the right place for certain types of concerns, such as safety and facilities issues. In other words, urgent issues may well need a different process so that they can be addressed more efficiently. This matter will be discussed at the PRPP Coordinating Committee meeting on December 12th.
e. **Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan**
Vice President of Human Resources, Karen Furukawa, addressed questions regarding the final Equal Employment Opportunity Plan scheduled for Board of Trustees approval on December 9. The EEO Plan can be accessed via the following File Depot link: [http://www2.santarosa.edu/f/?nAzUZFUP](http://www2.santarosa.edu/f/?nAzUZFUP)

Karen went over the changes in the document that had been made since IPC’s previous review of the document. The EEO Plan now has an executive summary and conclusion, as well as the addition of Appendix B, which lists the source documents. In addition, some pages have been inserted as placeholders, which indicate where there is a component of the report that is not required and that will be added at a later date. Punctuation and capitalization corrections have been made. The earlier version of the report had included implementation steps, which had not been agreed to, so those have been removed in the current version. During the spring 2015 semester, additions will be made to the report that will tailor it to SRJC and how the institution implements the requirements.

No action on the part of IPC was required.

f. **College Council Committee System Survey and Review – FINAL**
IPC co-chairs, Robin Fautley and Jane Saldaña-Talley, presented the final draft of the Committee System Survey and Review pertaining to IPC. The Survey and Review includes information on how the work of the Council supports the institution’s strategic plan goals and strategic objectives, as well as the Council’s major accomplishments. It will be submitted to College Council on December 18 as part of their ongoing review and assessment of the District Committee System. The final draft contains several recommended additions from IPC member Hilleary Izard, including listing Goal E (Establish a strong culture of sustainability) and Goal F (Cultivate a healthy organization) as part of the section that indicates which of the strategic plan goals the work of the Council supports.

g. **Accreditation Self Evaluation Update**
Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Mary Kay Rudolph, presented the final proof of SRJC’s Accreditation Self Evaluation, which can be accessed as a PDF from the Accreditation 2015 homepage at: [http://www.santarosa.edu/accred2015/](http://www.santarosa.edu/accred2015/).

The Self-Evaluation will be presented to the Board of Trustees on December 16th, and Mary Kay recommended that IPC members review the parts of the report pertaining to IPC: The Abstract, Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness, and IV.A, Decision-Making Roles and Processes. She emphasized that the material needs to be read from the viewpoint, “Are we accurate in what we say about the college?” The Report will go to print on December 17th. She asked that recommended edits be sent via email to Wanda Burzycki, Mary Kay Rudolph and Fran Golden.

h. **Spring 2015 Agenda Review**
Jane presented some suggestions for spring 2015 IPC meetings. She will ask groups to present their planning reports in areas such as student equity, emergency and disaster preparedness, distance education, career and technical education, the HR master plan, and others. She asked that members make suggestions for agenda items by emailing them to Jane and Robin as co-chairs.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.