



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

February 13, 2008

Members Present: Mark Bealo, Norma Bean, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Linda Cox, Berta Cuaron, Candi Francis, Terry Humphrey, Chantal Maher, Steve McDonald, Michael Mufson, Wilma Owens, Lisa Romain, Mollie Smith, Mark Vernoy

Members Absent: Becky McCluskey, Debi Workman

I. Approval of January 23, 2008 Minutes

MSC Mark Vernoy / Judy J. Cater to approve the minutes of January 23, 2008.

II. Institutional Review and Planning

The chairs/directors meeting on February 1, 2008 was a good meeting discussing the institutional review and planning process and purpose. The departments were encouraged to have discussions on curriculum, programs, certificates and degrees as well as other issues that dictate scheduling faculty, equipment needs and so on. The departments are working hard and in earnest. The institutional review and planning documents are due to the Deans on March 7, 2008 and then forwarded to the Instruction Office on March 14, 2008, in order to bring to IPC for review. It was noted that Student Services is using a similar format and timeline for institutional review and planning.

IPC will synthesize the institutional review and planning information and the document becomes the guide in order to make decisions and recommendations of funds such as block grants, one-time funds, and foundation funds, plus enables us to tie into our planning process. This is a good process, although the first process is the most difficult, the process will be refined in following years with planning and vision. The goal is a two year cycle, with planning, reviewing and updating the process. IPC will have to decide how to synthesize, focus and review the submitted institutional review and planning documents. It was stated that equipment needs are embedded in these documents and that the division deans make decisions for the departments and funds are allocated and distributed accordingly.

III. Accreditation Self-Study

The handouts, "Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review, Part II: Planning, and Part III: Student Learning Outcomes," were reviewed and discussed. These handouts were distributed by WASC last Fall, 2007. Accrediting entities around the country are under scrutiny and have to tighten their evaluation procedures with greater definitions for site teams in order to have better guidelines in reaffirming institutions. This requires the accrediting commission to give recommendations and shorter timelines to schools and colleges, as mandated by the U.S. Department of Education. Evaluation team members are to use the Rubrics for evaluations and make recommendations of standards, and colleges are to be at a sustainable level for all three parts of the Rubric, with ongoing improvement in the planning and review process. The institutional review and planning process is the

cycle to be used with the review evaluation as a process. This is a new thrust for the ACCJC, as they need to justify their existence and hold colleges to the standards and apply them uniformly. Palomar is at the development stage doing part I of program review and part II of planning, relevant to the accreditation process and we'll be working on part III of student learning outcomes soon.

IV. **Budget Update and College Forum**

There is an all college Budget Forum scheduled by President Deegan on February 19, 2008, from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m. in the Governing Board Room. There will be supporting documents sent out via web links that should be printed and reviewed. Everyone is encouraged to go to the forum and ask questions.

V. **Student Learning Outcomes**

The handout, "Student Learning Outcomes as a part of Course Outline of Record Review," was reviewed and discussed. This document is a pilot that was adopted by the Curriculum Committee and was sent to the Faculty Senate. As the faculty reviews a course, there is a link to participate in documenting student learning outcomes for a particular course. This process is integrated in the course outline of record review, but is a separate process at this time as a supplement, in order to give feedback and make recommendations to Monika Brannick or Teresa Laughlin by next Fall and Spring. It has been created for Curricunet, but is not on line yet, but will be soon.

VI. **Question of the Day**

The question was asked what the four Indian gaming propositions that recently passed, would mean for Palomar College, and at this time we do not know.

With upcoming budget constraints, the question was asked on how we can be more efficient to save. In the next 2-3 weeks, the District will make decisions regarding the budget at the Strategic Planning Council meeting and how to apprise the budget process for next year, and how to save this year. It was stated that we should focus on the information already shared with District, that there will not be any layoffs and that we will keep the same benefits. Then we can look at what can be done outside of these areas in order to save. The schedule can be reviewed and might have to be pared down, since we are only growing 1%, there will have to be a balance. When the May revise comes out, then we can look at the Fall classes, especially low enrollment classes.

VII. **Other**

The question was asked if the TRC--Technology Resources Committee, is being disbanded. The proposal came forward to dissolve the TRC, as a recommendation made a long time ago at a Strategic Planning Council (SPC) meeting to disband the TRC for several reasons. Some of these reasons were that the TRC was ineffective, it was too big and there was never a quorum and they never did anything. The tasks of TRC are being handled by the Faculty Senate and SPC. The first reading has taken place at SPC and the second reading will be done at next week's SPC meeting. No one had any objections to dissolving TRC.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.