INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
Monday, February 9, 2015
Bertolini Student Center Senate Chambers – Room 4638
1:30 PM – 3:00 PM
APPROVED MINUTES

Present: Alicia Artz, Frank Chong, Greg Drukala, Robin Fautley, Maggie Fishman (for Dorothy Battenfeld), Karen Furukawa, KC Greaney, Ricardo Navarrette, Mary Kay Rudolph, Jane Saldaña-Talley, Eric Thompson, Julie Thompson, and Alicia Virtue.


Guests: Toni Eaton

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The following correction was made to the minutes of the IPC meeting of January 26, 2015: Item 4.a. was corrected to show that Alicia Virtue and not Alicia Artz volunteered as reviewer for “Improve Facilities and Technology.” A motion was made by Eric Thompson to approve the minutes, as corrected. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

2. INTEGRATED PLANNING Minutes from the shared governance and planning bodies (IN BOLD) were attached to the IPC agenda as informational items. 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. ANNOUNCEMENTS IPC Co-chair Robin Fautley announced this was the last meeting Toni Eaton would be attending. Toni has assisted the IPC co-chairs for much of this year by taking and transcribing meeting minutes. Her attention to detail and talent for capturing the Council’s lively and sometimes meandering discussions were valued and appreciated by all. She will be deeply missed!

4. INSTITUTIONAL PLANS AND PLANNING

a. Strategic Plan Scorecard – Website Review/Feedback
IPC member Alicia Virtue presented a summary of suggested edits to the online Strategic Plan Scorecard and led a discussion based on feedback from IPC members who had volunteered to review specific areas of the website. An updated core indicator summary sheet was also reviewed. (To review the Scorecard, go to: http://strategic-planning.santarosa.edu)

Concerns and suggestions were expressed as follows:
- Create a wireframe, which is a way to create, link together, preview and share mock-ups of the web pages. They allow for trying new ideas before settling on a design that everyone agrees to.
- For the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan on the Institutional Planning website, show only the indicators for each goal.
Not all indicators are suited for reporting by percentage of goal reached. Use of percentages to show progress may need to be reassessed.

Reexamine some of the goals and the indicators for those goals, as it may be that some of the indicators do not support the goal. For example:

- “Improve Facilities and Technology”: Consider a different indicator than “Great Colleges to Work for Survey” as a core indicator. However, it was mentioned that there are questions relating to facilities on the survey, and there is an effort underway to purchase data reports that will allow us to abstract useful data from specific survey items.

- “Establish a Strong Culture of Sustainability”: This strategic goal generated much discussion. One opinion was that showing this goal as 50% complete was unrealistic. There are many aspects of sustainability that are not included in the goals, such as giving higher priority to non-motorized wheeled transportation like bicycles, skateboards and rollerblades. It was stated that creating a culture of sustainability is a very big challenge because it tends to go against the tide. At the same time, efforts in the area of green construction on the campus were acknowledged.

A resource that was suggested for campus sustainability assessment was the website AASHE (The Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education), which has campus sustainability assessment tools. The website is at [http://www.aashe.org/resources/campus-sustainability-assessment-tools](http://www.aashe.org/resources/campus-sustainability-assessment-tools). It offers webinars and workshops, as well as many other educational opportunities in the area of campus sustainability.

It was mentioned that the Integrated Environmental Planning Committee (IEPC) was working on (1) continuing to develop ideas for the SRJC webpage on sustainability; and (2) including questions on sustainability in the PRPP reports, which are: (a) What are the implemented sustainable efforts in your department? and (b) What would you like to see and what are your recommendations regarding sustainability? A suggestion was made to utilize that committee to help in developing feasible and effective indicators.

Dr. Chong reminded members that when the Strategic Plan was developed, a set of eight goals were established. He suggested that faculty, staff, and students need to be engaged in helping populate and drive that agenda. Also needed is more administrative support, and Dr. Chong indicated that he had asked Robert Ethington, Dean of Student Affairs and Engagement, to take on a greater role in sustainability at SRJC both because of his passion for developing a culture of sustainability and because of his involvement with students. He added that efforts toward sustainability, particularly with reference to buildings, bike lanes, pedestrian safety, etc., will be included in the Facilities Master Plan.

A suggestion was made to change the strategic goal of “Establish a Strong Culture of Sustainability” to “Establish a Strong Culture of Social, Cultural, and Environmental Sustainability.”

The issue of the carbon footprint was also discussed, and this needs to be added to the Facilities Master Plan, as well.

Another suggestion with regard to Student Headcount as a core indicator for the Sustainability goal was to add a goal that includes ensuring that the College is drawing from the diversity of the people in Sonoma County and/or an indication that the College uses Student Head Count to measure progress toward social equity.

Another suggestion for the Strategic Planning Scorecard overall was to add to it more of the activities that are already being done, and to make decisions about what activities to push for and invest in that need to be done. KC Greaney added that a key consideration in all of this is to select indicators that are broad
and that have a reliable source of data that can be obtained annually. Key performance indicators for each Strategic Objective allow for the reporting of non-standard and local data/evidence.

- Another suggestion was to add a site map, and Greg Drukala said he would check with the IT Department on the feasibility of adding a site map.

**ACTION:** A group consisting of Alicia Virtue, KC Greaney, Greg Drukala, and Jane Saldana-Talley will meet to review all of the suggestions and decide how they can be used to present the Strategic Plan Scorecard information most effectively.

b. **Fiscal Stability Core Indicator**

Jane reported that the Chancellor’s Office Sound Fiscal Management Self-Assessment Checklist had been presented to the Board of Trustees in January and that the document has been posted on the Budget Advisory Committee’s website. ([https://bussharepoint.santarosa.edu/committees/budget-advisory/Committee%20Documents/Chancellors%20Sound%20Fiscal%20Management%20Self-Assessment%20Checklist%202012-09-14.pdf](https://bussharepoint.santarosa.edu/committees/budget-advisory/Committee%20Documents/Chancellors%20Sound%20Fiscal%20Management%20Self-Assessment%20Checklist%202012-09-14.pdf))

IPC members were asked to provide input as to how this information may best be utilized as a Fiscal Stability core indicator for Strategic Plan Goal G – Develop Financial Resources.

The checklist represents what the Chancellor’s Office is looking at regarding fiscal management in community colleges and includes such measures as fund balance, deficit spending, enrollment, stable leadership, cash flow and borrowing, bargaining agreements, and many others. These measures also align with accreditation standards. In each area (such as Deficit Spending) the district is expected to respond to the question “Is this area acceptable?” and then provide a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer and an explanation.

Jane showed the responses in a bar chart configuration. She said that she would like to find an effective way of presenting this information and quantifying it. SRJC’s responses indicate that it needs to improve in the areas of deficit spending, fund balance, enrollment, and the unrestricted fund balance. One shortcoming of the report is that the areas are not weighted, and it would appear that the answers could be construed as the College’s opinions, rather than outright facts. There was also a concern expressed as to the data used to support some of the responses.

Some suggestions were:
- Establish a way to have an effective interpretation of the percentages or move away from percentages because they are not very meaningful.
- Simplify the chart; maybe change to a pie chart.
- Of the 15 areas requesting response, perhaps select three that the College would most like to focus on and weight those.
- Consider the values of quantitative vs. qualitative in presenting the information.

Jane and KC will work with Doug Roberts on how best to represent the data and asked that any member who is interested in working on what this core indicator should look like should contact her and/or KC Greaney.

c. **Budget Update**

Due to the absence of Vice President Doug Roberts, this item was carried forward to the next agenda.

d. **Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement**

IPC members reviewed the ACCJC Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Commission Policies that was recently received and that appears to be a new feature of the Visiting team procedures. It will be used in the accreditation visiting team’s evaluation process at SRJC. Of particular note for the IPC is page 2, Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement, because it relates to the institution-set standards for student achievement that IPC defined in spring 2014 for the ACCJC 2014 Annual Report.
The review included a comparison of how SRJC’s Strategic Plan Scorecard core indicators aligned with those institution-set standards. The only area that was thought to be a challenge was defined student achievement performance elements within each instructional program.

e. Accreditation Preparation
Mary Kay Rudolph and Ricardo Navarrette appealed to faculty to consider serving on an accreditation team at some point in the future, as it is a tremendous educational experience and provides insight into the entire accreditation process through the experience of examining another college.

In preparation for the upcoming accreditation team visit (March 9-12), it was suggested that IPC members review the planning documents online and perhaps past minutes of the IPC to refresh their memories on issues discussed and decisions made. The IPC will be meeting on March 9th, which is day 1 of the accreditation team’s visit, so it is likely that at least one member of the team will attend the IPC meeting and may very well have questions for individual members during the visit.

IPC accreditation preparation will be carried forward to the next agenda.

f. IPC Spring Calendar Review
During discussion of the Planning Calendar activities for the spring semester, suggestions were made to add the following reports to the list of institutional plans to be reviewed by IPC:

- HSI Title 5 Report by Juan Arias and Yolanda Garcia;
- AB 86 report by Victor Cummings and Nancy Miller (April);
- Strategic Enrollment Management Plan by Kris Abrahamson and Vayta Smith

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.