



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

May 9, 2007

Members Present: Mark Bealo, Norma Bean, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Candi Francis, Katheryn Garlow, Terry Humphrey, Chantal Maher, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith, Mark Vernoy

Members Absent: Linda Cox, Karen Huffman, Becky McCluskey, Tina Riley, Debi Workman

Recorder: Suzanne M. Holt

I. **Approval of April 25, 2007 Minutes**

MSC Katheryn Garlow / Terry Humphrey to approve the minutes of April 25, 2007, with two corrections. Mark Bealo stated that his off-campus video production company was nominated for two Webby awards. In Section IV-2007-2008 Budget, the fourth sentence should read: Berta Cuaron stated that IPC might be asked to make minor budget adjustments at the division level or the department level.

II. **75/25 Requests**

Stan Levy requested \$244 for one Jamestown Comprehension Print Program for Reading Services.

The request was approved by consensus.

III. **IPC Self-Evaluation Summary**

The handouts, "IPC Self-Evaluation Frequencies" and "2006-07 Instructional Planning Council – Self Evaluation – Questions/Comments" were discussed. Nine council members participated in the self-evaluation. The self-evaluation gives input on how IPC has functioned this year and reflects on what the Council is doing and what the roles are of the Council.

The self-evaluation summary indicates a need for more focus on numbers 1, 3, and 4 and IPC's role and responsibilities need to be clearer and better understood.

It was noted that it would better serve IPC if it could focus on one or two goals. The AIP summary will have to be brought back to IPC in the Fall, 2007. Next year, IPC might take some time to review its roles and responsibilities again and to rethink the overall roles and responsibilities of all the Planning Councils.

The handouts, "2006-07 Instructional Planning Council – Governance – Questions/Comments", "Overall Governance Evaluation", and "Governance Self-Evaluation – ALL Respondents" were discussed. The first handout involves the governance of only IPC, the second handout involves the overall governance of

all of the Planning Councils and the third handout lists the comments from all respondents of the Councils.

There were thirty-five council members that completed the governance self-evaluation form. It is evident that work needs to be done in reviewing the overall governance structure. The roles and responsibilities have to be reviewed and improvement made on how information is communicated between the Councils.

There needs to be additional focus on numbers Q5 and Q6 on the second handout. This includes the planning councils spending the appropriate amount of time discussing and acting upon issues and topics and that the planning councils operate more effectively. IPC needs to find out what the other planning councils are doing effectively and how their ratings compare to IPC.

The actual roles and what actions are appropriate for each of the planning councils need to be better defined. This governance structure is in its third or fourth year and it continues to change. In Fall, 2007 IPC will discuss its roles and responsibilities and what can be done differently in order to be more effective as the college moves forward.

IV. **Institutional Review and Planning**

The handout, "Palomar College – Institutional Review and Planning, Instructional Programs" (Draft #2, 5/9/07) was discussed. It was noted that the 3-year quantitative data is provided from Research and Planning (R&P). It was suggested that the table be populated with data by R&P, per discipline and in the PDF format with smaller margins.

The following changes will be made to the document:

- 1) The line item of the name of the area to be reviewed should be - Instructional Discipline Reviewed, and drop the word department.
- 2) In #1, it was suggested that the line items of Retention Rate and Success Rate should each have definitions via windows online.
- 3) In #2, boxes should be inserted for answers to be in a better format.
- 4) In #3, the word discipline should remain and drop the word department.
- 5) In #4e, should read: Staff position (s) – changes in instructional or support needs due to program growth, new technology, etc.
- 6) In #5, the word discipline should remain and drop the word department.
- 7) In #6b, add the word explanation in parentheses.
- 8) In #8, the word discipline should remain and drop the word department.
- 9) In #9, accreditation (last visit, recommendations, progress) should be added.

Student success rate used by the CCC System Office. This data is related to semester retention as students who successfully complete a course or courses in one semester are more likely to take another class the following semester.

A question was added regarding accreditation findings in programs like Nursing, Dental Assisting, and Police and Fire Academies and the status at the time that institutional review and planning is taking place.

The timeframe for the institutional review & planning process is mid Fall to early Spring. This timeframe will allow appropriate time for everyone to complete the process thoughtfully, to ensure broad participation, and to reflect data that are used in other procedures.

When a department has more than one discipline, such as Physical Education and Athletics, there should be a separate institutional review for each of the disciplines.

Wilma Owens recommended that the review for Career and Technical programs include a two-year cycle and must address Title 5 requirements. This can be achieved by developing a form as an addendum to the IR&P document with the necessary data and questions.

The revised institutional review and planning process will be a two-year cycle, one year for planning and the following year for implementation and assessment.

The overall institutional review and planning process is to plan and to project needs over two years in order to realize progress. It will take at least two cycles to plan and project needs and to begin linking resources to planning. It was suggested that the IR&P document be attached to other funding procedures so that the planning document becomes central to all decisions. The key is to plan and project needs and allocate resources to planning. This process is essential to comply with accreditation standards, as it has been a recommendation in the two previous site visits.

The recommended changes will be made and a third draft will be sent to the Faculty Senate in Fall, 2007 for review, adoption and implementation.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.