



Chabot College
Institutional Budget and Planning Council
IPBC Summary Notes

Wednesday, March 24, 2004

Present: Ron Taylor, Joe Kuwabara, Laurie O'Connor, Carolyn Arnold, Melinda Matsuda, Gerald Shimada, Sally Jahnke, Kathleen Schaefer, Chet Rhoan, Robert Curry, Catherine Powell, Rachel LePell (last 20 minutes) [MELINDA: more?]

1. Approval of Feb 25th and March 10th Minutes

Melinda Matsuda called the meeting to order at 3:03. The Minutes for the February 25th meeting and March 10th meeting had been sent by Email earlier. The group approved them.

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

Carolyn Arnold thanked all the theme leaders who updated the status of the 2003-04 objectives/activities in their theme. She reported that when she entered the status updates in the Strategic Planning Grid 2003-06, it came to 17 pages, which she was reluctant to print or send out, because it was not easy to read, and a waste of paper. She proposed taking the objectives/activities and status statements out of the grid and listing them in a simple Word document and sending them out for comment. The eventual goal will be to send it out to the college to acknowledge to ourselves and to the college how much was accomplished this year. This idea was approved.

3. Report on Institutional Research Priorities

Carolyn Arnold passed out a one-page summary of minutes from the Institutional Research Subcommittee, which meets about once a semester to provide the Institutional Research Office a sounding board about research issues and setting priorities for the office. She drew attention to the item about the decision rules for prioritizing research requests, which were approved by the subcommittee. The highest priorities are those that 1) are college-wide priorities, as defined by the strategic plan or other imperatives such as PFE-funded projects or Enrollment management or 2) will be used for a decision or action by a college, division, discipline, or program. In addition, requests need to have a specific deadline, and are prioritized by deadline. The lowest priority requests are those that are just "of interest" to a particular individual or department. Ron Taylor pointed out that most PFE-funded and Enrollment management requests should theoretically be within the strategic plan, and Carolyn agreed, and did in fact consider those requests to be within the plan. Catherine Powell asked if the suggested Research Request form was devised. Carolyn said no because she does not think it would save time, which was the purpose of the suggestion. Most research requests had to be talked through, so she felt a

form would be more off-putting than helpful, and that the information about priorities could be transmitted verbally.

4. Review process for evaluating progress on PFE-funded activities

As decided at last meeting, all 20 PFE-funded projects have been asked to turn in a progress report by Monday, April 12th. An Email was sent out by Carolyn Arnold on March 11th to all project leaders with the questions agreed upon at the last meeting. These reports will be reviewed by IPBC at the April 14th meeting.

In order to make it possible for IPBC members to read the reports by April 14th, she suggested asking project leaders to send their reports electronically if possible, and that we would accept them early if ready! This idea was approved and she will send out an Email. In order to expedite the process of reviewing the reports and discussing them at the April 14th meeting, she suggested creating a grid that IPBC members could use when reviewing the reports. The group discussed what would be on this grid, and settled on a simple status form with the following check-off categories: Completed/In progress(completing objectives)/In progress(not completing objectives)/Delayed start – not much progress yet/Not started/ Have questions and/or may need our support. Members can check any categories that fit, and we will use them as a starting point to discuss each project. With 90 minutes of the April 14th meeting allocated for this process, that works out to 4.5 minutes per project!

A discussion ensued about how will we decide which of these projects should be institutionalized, since we are asking projects to answer that question. It was decided that the review on April 14th is just to determine progress, and that the institutionalization discussion is part of overall planning for next year and beyond. Concern was expressed that if we want to support these projects in the future (with or without funds) we may need to start considering this earlier. The group decided to have that discussion in May, and to keep it as an ongoing agenda item to be discussed when projects are completed.

5. Planning for next year

Melinda Matsuda distributed the planning timetable that had been discussed in February. She and Carolyn pointed out that we were still catching up to the annual planning cycle, and that in a usual year, we would have be planned the following year (2004-05) last Fall (2003). Instead, we are working on the 2004-05 priority Objectives and Activities now. In addition, they noted that this spring's schedule changed. The community data collection project could not be done this Spring, and may be moved to the Fall, and the IPBC retreat about the college vision/mission was not needed since we are doing that project differently.

5. Planning for next year (continued)

a. 2004-05 Priority Objectives/Activities

Carolyn Arnold distributed the list of nineteen activities that had been rated as the top priorities for 2004-05, ordered by Theme and Objective. The list was revised from last meeting to include all the PFE-funded activities that are going to take place next year and that were not already on the list. She pointed out that all of the PFE-funded activities fit under the priority objectives/activities, so they did not force the addition of any objectives to the list. The group approved this list to bring to College Council on April 2nd for review. Sometime after that, this complete list will be sent out to the college at large, to inform them of the 2004-05 strategic planning priorities for 2004-05. Note that action plans still need to be written for many of these activities, and this will be discussed and coordinated in the next 2 months.

b. Report on High level themes of 2004-05 Priority Objectives

Kathleen Schaefer presented the results of the group assigned 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 came up with two versions, with some input from Carolyn Arnold. The group discussed the versions and realized that it was hard to develop a list that was for both the college community and the community outside the college. The group mostly liked the first category, of Becoming a Learning Centered Institution and its accompanying bullets. Suggestions ranged from the need for more specificity to more abstractions, to simpler statements, to the fear of using new phrases, like "Learning-centered Institution." After a good discussion about how to best introduce the new concepts of LCI and SLOs, Kathleen and the group agreed to go back and try for 5 major points that could be used for the internal college community. Afterwards, we would work on one for the outside community.

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

Carolyn Arnold provided the minutes of the latest meeting of this workgroup. She reported that an Email asking for input on the Vision, Mission, and Values had been sent to the college community last week, with a deadline of march 29th. It was decided to address all three areas in one request for input. The workgroup will use that input to come up with very preliminary first drafts to present to IPBC and other councils and senates. It is expected that the drafts will generate more input than the original input request, which is the point of them. The question today was whether IPBC needed to see these first drafts and maybe modify them before they went to the rest of the college. It was decided that yes—the workgroup would send it to IPBC members before Spring Break, and that we would discuss it briefly at the April 14th meeting, and input would be taken into account before disseminating it to the college. The group hopes to complete

final drafts by the end of the semester, so that the college can turn to the more interesting task, that of defining college-wide student learning goals/outcomes. That is the project that we hope can be started at Fall Convocation and Flex Days.

5. Planning for next year (continued)

d. Report on March 12th workshop on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

IPBC funded 20 people to attend this workshop, so Carolyn Arnold reported on two follow-up meetings she had held, where the 20 Chabot staff shared what they had gained and how the information could be used at Chabot. The following people who had attended spoke at this meeting of how valuable the experience was – Laurie O'Connor, Kathleen Schaefer, Denise Noldon, Gerald Shimada, Ron Taylor, and Carolyn Arnold. In addition, Sally Jahnke shared her experiences from the same workshop on Nov 7th. Main points included the value of working student learning outcomes with people from different disciplines, norming grading/evaluation practices within disciplines, and how the process of developing and thinking about how to measure SLOs was valuable for faculty in both academic and student services. In addition, the group felt strongly that the administration needed to strongly commit to and support this effort in order for people to invest time in this one new thing.

The follow-up group wanted to keep meeting to keep the discussion going. They represent a core of people who see the potential for using SLOs at Chabot, and who would like to help make it happen. We then discussed the best way to introduce SLOs to the college at large without causing a negative reaction. Kathleen Schaefer related that at the workshop her Chabot group suggested that it be assumed that faculty already know about and are concerned about student learning outcomes, and that they be asked to contribute their expertise to address this institution-wide goal of becoming a Learning-Centered Institution. It was suggested that Fall Convocation and Flex days be used for an introduction of college-wide Learning goals, and SLOs, if it could be done in a way that was positive. Ron Taylor and Carolyn Arnold also reminded the group that Cindy Hicks is forming a faculty group to work on the issue of becoming a Learning-Centered College. It was suggested that perhaps the groups could be combined, and that the work of both groups, as well as Staff Development planning about Flex Days, could be coordinated and communicated through IPBC.

e. Update on Title III proposal planning

Rachel LePell gave a quick update on Title III proposal planning. The core writing team has come up with a draft problem statement and a three-pronged solution/set of activities for the proposal. The proposed set of activities are based in the strategic plan priorities of educating the college about SLOs and becoming a learning centered college, and the writing team wants to get feedback from the college by bringing it to divisions. It was suggested that they also attend the college councils and senates. The input will then be brought back to IPBC for the

next draft. IPBC members expressed strong support and appreciation for the draft proposal ideas, since the team met the mandate of conceptualizing Title III as a way to fund major activities in the strategic plan.

6. Report from Facilities committee

Rachel LePell had attended the Facilities committee, which is gearing up to plan the bond construction projects. She pointed out that this was an important moment of change for our college both architecturally and in how we teach and learn together. It is an important opportunity to plan new buildings based on the new thinking about teaching and learning and becoming a learning-centered college, and she encouraged a strong link between IPBC and this committee. IPBC members on that committee include herself (although she may not be able to continue), Bob Curry and Sally Jahnke. IPBC members asked this group to make sure to keep IPBC informed of the work of this committee and visa versa, in order to get our planning visions into the discussions about the new buildings, and they said they would.

Respectfully submitted by Carolyn Arnold and edited by Melinda Matsuda.