



Chabot College
Institutional Budget and Planning Council
IPBC Summary Notes

Wednesday, March 10, 2004

Present: Ron Taylor, Joe Kuwabara, Debbie Budd, Rachel LePell, Chad Mark Glen, Laurie O'Connor, Carolyn Arnold, Kathleen Schaefer, Chet Rhoan, Carol Baumann, ValJean Dale, Catherine Powell

1. Meeting process suggestions and previous meeting.

Carolyn Arnold called the meeting to order at 3:10. Those present at 3:05 noted the Chabot tendency to start meetings late, and when the meeting finally started at 3:10, it was agreed that from now on, IPBC would start on time. It was also noted that the college's governance structure of open meetings requires that an agenda be posted 72 hours before the meeting, so people can decide whether to attend, that there be a call for additional agenda items, and that minutes be taken and disseminated. It was agreed that IPBC would do this in a more timely fashion. (Minutes for the February 25th meeting were not completed for this meeting, and the agenda was sent out only 4 hours before the meeting.)

Arnold noted these suggestions and committed the co-chairs to following them. The February 25th minutes will be sent out with today's minutes. Arnold called for more agenda items and Chad Mark Glen added the Middle College grant proposal as a discussion item.

Since there were no minutes ready to approve, Arnold reported that the previous meeting contained two agenda items – discussion of the middle college grant proposal, and prioritizing the activities for 2004-05. See the February 25th minutes for details.

2. Report on Mission/Vision/ Values/Student Learning Goals workgroup

Carolyn Arnold reported that this workgroup has started meeting. The purpose of the group is to come up with first drafts of the Mission/Vision/ Values/Student Learning Goals statements as a starting discussion point for IPBC and for the college to discuss at Fall Convocation/Flex days. Chet Rhoan suggested that drafts be sent out to faculty before the end of Spring Semester, so they could review and think about them before the Fall. At its first meeting, the workgroup made progress on defining the difference between Mission, Vision, and Values statements, and is going to solicit input from the college community about the content of the mission statement, via an open-ended Email poll. Value statements may be solicited with a survey. In addition, the group working on creating a learner-centered college, led by Cindy Hicks, will be working on a draft

of college-wide student learning goals, which will be shared with this workgroup and IPBC.

3. Planning for next year: 2004-05 Priority Objectives/Activities

Carolyn Arnold distributed the prioritized list of activities based on last meeting's ratings for review and discussion. Nineteen items had received 10 or more points, and they were listed in ranked order. The group reviewed them and suggested that any PFE-funded activities that are going to take place next year that are not already on the list should be added. There was a discussion about the purpose of the list: Is it an all-inclusive list of what we are doing and if something is not on it does it mean it will not be supported and be done? Or is it an attempt to identify our main projects for the year to communicate with the college and larger community? It was decided to do both - that the list of nineteen plus added items would constitute a list we shared with the college so they would know the priority objectives/activities for the year. Arnold will add those projects to the list and the list would be finalized at the next meeting. At that time, project leaders would be assigned to write action plans for each priority activity.

In addition, the group decided to develop a short list that expresses the major priority themes that could be used to communicate more succinctly both within and outside of the college. Kathleen Schaefer, Rachel LePell, and Laurie O'Connor will come up with that list.

It was suggested that all of these documents IPBC is producing be posted on the IPBC website. Arnold and others expressed a need to know how to do that.

3. Assessing progress this year: 2003-04 Priority Objectives/Activities

Carolyn Arnold passed out the Strategic Implementation Grid: 2003-2006, which was limited only to items that had been shaded for implementation in 2003-04. There were more than 60 items that had been planned for 2003-04! The goal was to review each activity and to assess whether it was being done and how far along it was. Arnold thought that it would be a fun activity and would be a way to acknowledge how much the college had accomplished during the year. However, after reviewing a few activities, it was decided to defer this task to the theme team leaders, who will fill in the status section under each activity, and send it back to Arnold for dissemination at the next meeting. It was noted that we are not yet able to evaluate these activities with measurable performance indicators, because we do not have action plans for all activities, nor time to review them. However, we will expect to do this next year when we evaluate the 2004-05 activities. In the meantime, we will be learning how to use performance indicators when we evaluate the progress of the 2003-04 PFE-funded action plans.

4. Process for evaluating progress on PFE-funded activities

As indicated in their funding letter, all PFE-funded projects are expected to report on their progress to IPBC in April 2004, and IPBC needed to come up with a process for that to occur. The following process was developed: All 20 PFE-funded projects will be asked to turn in their progress report by Monday, April 12th. These reports should include: 1) Their original Action plan with objectives, timeline, performance indicators and budget, 2) A brief summary of their current progress on each of their objectives, timelines, performance indicators, and portion of their budget spent, and 3) They will answer the following additional questions: a) Should this project be institutionalized, and if so, how? b) What is their target completion date? c) How much of their budget do they expect to spend? (Bob Curry needs to ensure that the projects that still do not have budget numbers get them soon.). These reports will be reviewed by IPBC at the April 14th meeting. If IPBC needs further clarification about the type of progress made, the project leader(s) may be asked to attend the April 28th meeting to answer questions and obtain support for the completion of their project.

5. Middle College Grant Proposal

Chad Mark Glen reported that the Humanities & Language Arts Division had expressed a number of concerns about applying for Middle College Grant, and these concerns had also been expressed in IPBC and the Grants Subcommittee. A long discussion ensued about both the process that had been followed to go ahead with the grant, the specific objections to this project by faculty who had heard about it, and how we can take advantage of grant opportunities when there is not time to have a college-wide discussion. (See the February 25th minutes for more details.) It was suggested that with more time and information, a future grant proposal on the same subject might be better received, but that since this was a “hot button” issue it needed to be addressed much more carefully than the process that was followed this month. More IPBC members expressed concerns about the project, and it was proposed that IPBC rescind our support of the grant. However, the group could not reach consensus on this issue. Dr. Carlson serendipitously walked into the room at that point and joined the discussion. After another long discussion, Dr. Carlson concluded that since there was so much resistance in the college to the grant at this point and that this was also reflected in the fact that IPBC could not come to a consensus, it would be better not to pursue the grant.

Respectfully submitted by Carolyn Arnold and edited by Chad Mark Glen.