



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

May 7, 2008

Members Present: Mark Bealo, Norma Bean, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Candi Francis, Terry Humphrey, Chantal Maher, Steve McDonald, Michael Mufson, Mollie Smith, Mark Vernoy, Debi Workman

Members Absent: Richard Borden, Linda Cox, Jesse Lyn, Becky McCluskey, Wilma Owens, Lisa Romain

I. Approval of April 9, 2008 Minutes

MSC Judy J. Cater / Mollie Smith to approve the minutes of April 9, 2008.

Approval of April 23, 2008 Minutes

MSC Debi Workman / Terry Humphrey to approve the minutes of April 23, 2008, with the correction of Mollie Smith not being in attendance at this meeting.

II. Summary of Institutional Review and Planning Documents

Committee members presented their summaries and observations on the planning documents. The following planning documents were summarized:

- 1) Accounting
- 2) Administration of Justice
- 3) Africana Studies
- 4) Anthropology
- 5) Arabic
- 6) Astronomy
- 7) Aviation
- 8) Botany
- 9) Business
- 10) Business Management
- 11) Chicano Studies
- 12) Chinese
- 13) Drafting Technology
- 14) Engineering
- 15) English
- 16) Family and Consumer Sciences
- 17) Fire Technology
- 18) French
- 19) Graphic Communications – Imaging & Publishing
- 20) Graphic Communications – Multimedia & Web
- 21) German

- 22) Humanities
- 23) Interior Design
- 24) Italian
- 25) Judaic Studies
- 26) Library Technology
- 27) Medical Assisting
- 28) Microbiology
- 29) Multicultural Studies
- 30) Reading
- 31) Zoology

Committee members are to turn in the “Institutional Review and Planning – Spring 2008” grids for their assigned disciplines and any details as backup to Berta Cuaron. A list will be developed of common themes, issues, priorities, observations, etc., in order to give departments general feedback. The ultimate goal is to link the institutional review and planning documents to funding priorities and resource allocation procedures.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.



Instructional Planning Council

MINUTES

April 23, 2008

MEMBERS Present: M. Bealo, N. Bean, R. Borden, C. Francis, T. Humphrey, C. Maher, S. McDonald, M. Mufson, W. Owens, M. Smith, M. Vernoy, D. Workman

Members Absent: J. Cater, L. Cox, B. McCluskey, L. Romain

I. Approval of April 9, 2008 Minutes

Minutes were not available and will be presented at the next meeting.

II. 2009-10 Faculty Position Priority List Recommendations

A question was posed as to why the Math position requests were not pared as had occurred in the past. It was stated that the question did not come up as the IPC Subcommittee prioritized. There were so many positions requested (32) and it seemed that committee members wanted to be objective and to judge each request on its own merit, particularly given the budget constraints the College is facing these next couple years. Discussion also included concerns that as membership changes each year in the subcommittee that some of the general understandings that exist should be reviewed before members do their individual reviews and before the prioritization begins. Next year, we should make sure all members know the history, any general understandings, and that all agree on the game plan before the process begins. It was also stated that we may want to consider inviting each chair or a discipline representative to give a 3-5 minute brief on the request and respond to any questions that committee members may have. This would take some of the burden off of the Deans and other committee members who may have requests from their own discipline or department. It is difficult for each member to be completely impartial in the process. In looking at the final list, it is clear that each member takes the process seriously and each is trying to be fair in establishing the list. How many faculty will be hired is determined in mid-September and despite budget constraints, it is always important to plan.

It was suggested to (1) establish an earlier timeline if possible to allow for more dialog in process; (2) discuss and review parameters or previous understandings, what is the game plan before starting the review process; (3) committee members review applications to determine any questions then; (4) invite department chair or representative to answer any questions (clarification) and make a brief pitch for position request (3-5 minutes only). Before we begin the process next year, we need to be certain that the two Faculty Senate representatives participate in the discussion and agree on the game plan.

It was understood by the subcommittee that the Theatre Arts (#6) position request will be filled only if a pending retirement actually occurs.

Discussion continued regarding how so many departments that had more faculty at one time now find themselves with less full-time faculty. The reality is as the College has grown and more programs are added, it means that more faculty position requests come to the table. In reviewing the Institutional Review and Planning documents, it is clear that departments are stating full-time faculty positions are a high priority for many. It was stated that we may need to be willing to take a step back, look at our budgeting process and ask ourselves what are our priorities. Perhaps we could consider this an unfunded

liability and set aside a percentage to fund new full-time faculty positions. There are lots of ways to do this but as a college we have to be willing to change our budgeting process. As the Instructional Planning Council, shouldn't we drive this message and make a recommendation to SPC. As an example, in our own personal budgets, we budget for what we have to have; shouldn't we be doing the same in our district budget. It's about choices; it's about priorities. Having so many part-time faculty requires time from the chair or faculty member to evaluate, to schedule, to follow-up. A question was asked about what the 75/25 work group was doing. The hope is that the group will come back with some recommendations and strategies that would be brought to SPC and other planning councils for consideration. With so much facility planning taking place, we also need to take this opportunity to plan for faculty and staffing needs. Clearly, as we review the IR&P documents, the plea for faculty positions is there time and time again. There are ways to do this but it will cost us something; we can't have everything. There is only one pot of money.

MSC Vernoy/Bean – Approve 2009-10 Faculty Position Priority Recommendations for 2009-10. The recommendations will be presented to SPC on May 6.

III. Summary of Institutional Review & Planning Documents

Committee members presented their summaries and observations on the planning documents. The following planning documents were summarized:

- 1) Art Department
- 2) CSIS Department
- 3) Automotive Technology
- 4) Diesel Mechanics Technology
- 5) ESL Credit
- 6) Physical Science
- 7) Physics
- 8) American Studies
- 9) American Indian Studies
- 10) Philosophy
- 11) Religious Studies
- 12) Sociology
- 13) Economics
- 14) History
- 15) Physical Education Department

The Committee members will present their summaries and observations on as many planning documents yet to be reviewed, as time will allow at the next meeting.

The intent is to develop common themes for general and faculty/staff needs, plus general observations and concerns in learning outcomes. The goal is to make recommendations and give feedback to departments and to identify instructional priorities.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

April 9, 2008

Members Present: Mark Bealo, Norma Bean, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Candi Francis, Terry Humphrey, Jesse Lyn, Chantal Maher, Steve McDonald, Michael Mufson, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith, Mark Vernoy, Debi Workman

Members Absent: Linda Cox, Becky McCluskey, Lisa Romain,

I. Approval of March 12, 2008 Minutes

MSC Judy J. Cater / Chantal Maher to approve the minutes of March 12, 2008,

II. 75/25 Requests

Wilma Owens requested \$1,200 to pay for the removal of the temporary office used by staff at the Poway site, per Poway Unified School District's request, the Poway and Mt. Carmel sites will be merged this summer.

The American Indian Studies Department requested \$329.66 for purchase of a DVD and My Book.

The Behavioral Sciences Department requested \$162.73 for purchase of a DVD.

Tutoring Services requested \$4,756 to upgrade student computers.

MSC Judy J. Cater / Wilma Owens to approve the four requests from the 75/25 funds.

These are the last requests from the 75/25 funds for the year. This is the third year and last year for using these funds. Approximately \$23,000 will be returned to the general fund.

III. Institutional Review and Planning Documents

Berta Cuaron distributed the spreadsheet of assigned disciplines for the Institutional Review and Planning (IR&P) documents two weeks ago, asking each council member to review 5 documents by using the grid of agreed upon categories. There are a few disciplines that need to be assigned, including the Sciences and Non-Credit Programs, Reading, ESL and Library Technology, etc. It was pointed out, as in the case of English and Reading, the discipline is the department. After further clarification of each person's responsibilities, the following assignments were made:

- 1) Non-Credit Programs – Richard Borden
- 2) Chemistry – Mark Vernoy
- 3) Dental Assisting, Mathematics and Nursing – Jesse Lyn
- 4) Reading – Judy J. Cater
- 5) Library Technology – Debi Workman
- 6) ESL – Credit & Non-Credit – Berta Cuaron

Joan Decker in the Research and Planning Office will update and make sure all disciplines are completely posted and she will contact the Deans to verify that there are not any disciplines missing.

There was further discussion in reviewing the IR&P documents in reference to general common themes, commonalities in learning outcomes and any similarities in general observations among the departments. Specific comments regarding learning outcomes included what actually addressed the process; if there are comments or issues that identify the process; does the learning outcomes questions (#6), in the IR&P document really address learning outcomes; some purposes would be evidence for accreditation or delayed application of learning and the real focus of learning outcomes. It was suggested that there could be two questions on learning outcomes at the program level and the assessment of those program level outcomes. It was agreed by the council to leave the learning outcomes questions as they are in the IR&P document to glean responses. The Learning Outcomes Council will be reviewing these documents and give feedback.

Berta Cuaron will send out the Sharepoint link and resend the updated spreadsheet that reflect the changes made today to all council members. All previous documents are to be shredded/recycled and just the new, updated documents are to be used. Great work has been done on the IR&P documents and shows positive thinking and vision. The IPC Subcommittee will be using the IR&P documents in their deliberations in prioritizing faculty position requests, the divisions will be using these documents in funding allocations for the block grant, and the Foundation is interested in getting copies for campaign themes for needs for the college. These planning documents will be the primary documents used in decision making for the college. There will be general discussion of the general observations and themes and all of the grids will be collected but will not be shared with the general public. IPC will give general feedback to each of the disciplines. There is one more IPC meeting, so all of the IR&P documents have to be reviewed and the faculty prioritization must be completed. If necessary, there may be the need to call additional special meetings in order to get everything completed.

IV. **Other**

Wilma Owens made the announcement that the Perkins Planning Committee had its initial meeting and she has received all of the proposals for 2008-09 and will be allocating approximately \$420,000 for programs and services through the Perkins process. The remaining funding will cover administrative costs. The five-year plan is due to the Chancellor's Office in two weeks and the one year plan with the allocations is due on May 15, 2008. There is one more meeting for the actual allocations.

Michael Mufson announced the upcoming performing arts events that include opera performed by the Chamber Singers and guest opera singer, Rebecca Ramirez performing in D-10. Also, Dr. Peter Gach will be performing at the California Center for the Arts in Escondido.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

The Faculty Position Priority Subcommittee met after the IPC meeting.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

March 12, 2008

Members Present: Norma Bean, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Candi Francis, Terry Humphrey, Jesse Lyn, Chantal Maher, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Michael Mufson, Mark Vernoy, Debi Workman

Members Absent: Mark Bealo, Linda Cox, Wilma Owens, Lisa Romain, Mollie Smith

I. Approval of February 27, 2008 Minutes

MSC Candi Francis / Mark Vernoy to approve the minutes of February 27, 2008, with the following corrections under Section II, second paragraph, the first bulleted sentence should read: "Some departments provide more detail than others. How can IPC be fair to all departments when the detail will be different." Also, delete the fourth bulleted sentence.

II. Institutional Review and Planning – Process for Review

Berta Cuaron stated that she had read a dozen of the institutional review and planning (IR&P) documents which were submitted. A lot of thought and vision went into preparing these documents, as many departments see where they are and where they are going as the college moves forward. It is evident that these departments had earnest and meaningful discussions of the planning process and wanted to ensure that the integrity of their programs was reflected in the documents. The questions asked flowed well and made sense as the document planning was completed.

IPC must review the IR&P documents and decide how to make decisions of resource allocations for the college. Small working groups can be formed to review these documents and highlight common themes. It is important to give feedback to departments so they know their information is being used in the process. The documents can be printed out and copied and priorities can be identified for the academic departments, which will help when the Strategic Planning Council asks what the instructional priorities are. Also, common themes should be identified in the learning outcomes. It is a valuable exercise to read all of the documents, you learn much about the vision and direction of each academic program as you read.

It was suggested that a list of important items or a summary could be done of the documents in order to verify with the departments if anything was overlooked. It is important to have access to all of the documents in order to share ideas. Another idea would be to create a share drive for an entire department as a great tool to use in sharing documents. All of the IR&P documents are available on Research and Planning's Sharepoint.

A recommendation was made to have 3 work groups read 5-10 IR&P documents per each group over a period of 2 meetings and report their observations and commonalities or themes in learning outcomes, position/staffing needs and general needs. The groups can gather elements of learning outcome responses. At a later time, a database for learning outcomes could be developed to compare the department data. It was stated that the deans should read documents from other divisions. It is important

that the IR&P documents are made available for the Faculty Position Priority Subcommittee (FPPS) as they review the faculty position requests. The rationale form for faculty positions are due on March 14, 2008, as are the IR&P documents. The FPPS is meeting on April 9, 2008 after the IPC meeting and again on April 16, 2008.

After further discussion, IPC agreed to assign five (5) IR&P documents to each council member to read/review and to be prepared to report back with specific and common themes and needs that are clear. Berta Cuaron stated that she will do a chart/grid that she will send out to IPC members to use in reviewing the documents. If anyone has a special request as to what disciplines they would like to review, they should send an E-mail request to Berta and Suzanne. The disciplines that have requested faculty positions will be assigned to the FPPS.

III. Accreditation Self-Study – Volunteer Readers

Berta Cuaron and the accreditation co-chairs, Brent Gowen and Tom Medel, and the accreditation assistant, Glynda Knighten are working through the first drafts of the accreditation self-study. They will give general feedback on observations, concepts and content to consider to each of the writing teams before spring break. The writing teams will be asked to submit revised drafts by mid-April and after that the self-study drafts will be brought to IPC and SPC at the same time for their review. Volunteer readers are welcome and if anyone is interested, they can contact Glynda Knighten. For those who are on writing teams, they can still be a volunteer reader by reading other drafts.

IV. Budget Development Process

There was a budget meeting yesterday and it was stated that the State, system-wide budget was projected to be down \$75 to \$80 million. Part of the reason is due to Orange and Sonoma counties having over-reported property taxes, which is part of the revenue base. This reduced revenue base may result in all community colleges having to share the burden by paying their fair share based on allocations from the State. Palomar College would have to reduce this year's budget by \$1.4 million.

The Governor's budget for 2008-09 projects funding for only 1% growth, which means Palomar will have to reduce its total class schedule in Summer 2008, Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 by approximately 500 to 1,000 class sections. Berta Cuaron stated that from the beginning, the college should be careful in scheduling classes and to avoid scheduling classes that typically do not enroll well. In the past three years, we have very positively developed a class schedule that provides a balanced and comprehensive program for the fall and spring semesters. We want to sustain this balance even through difficult budgetary constraints. We are being proactive now and looking at decisions on reducing the number of summer classes before registration begins. Next, we will begin to look at the fall schedule after the May revise budget is released and then start work on the Spring schedule. The focus is to be proactive and not over-reactive in reducing the class schedule so much that we then struggle to meet our base and 1% growth. As the budget picture becomes clearer, schedule reduction decisions will continue to be made.

It was suggested, that since some classes are not offered each semester, it might be a good idea to review students' education plans in order to serve students to see if some classes are weighted to fit their plans through Counseling's data. If students are not able to stay on the path of their educational plans, then they have to stay another semester or year or more to complete their plans. There is not any data from educational plans, but we do know the number of majors and number of transfer students, etc. There are

ongoing, very methodical discussions with the departments, department chairs and the deans on a regular basis regarding the students' specific needs of classes.

The best process is to review the class schedule over the entire year and to develop a plan that provides comprehensiveness and as much as possible having minimal impact on students being able to move through the curriculum and realize their goals.

The approximate savings for cancelling one 3 unit class is between \$2,600 to \$3,000. This is just the teaching salary that is saved. Since Palomar is looking at a reduced budget both this year and next year, and we know that we are generating more FTES than we will receive funding for, it is necessary to reduce the total number of classes offered. The CSUs have the ability to turn away up to 10,000 students, so in turn the students attend community colleges. Overall, it is much better to plan now in order to make better decisions for our class schedules through Spring, 2009 and minimize the impact on class offerings.

Jesse Lyn stated, after recently returning from a conference in Washington, D.C., that the federal government will be passing the Higher Education Act in subcommittee, which means funds will be increased for Pell grants. It was pointed out that the State legislature is contemplating increasing enrollment fees, moving them back to \$26 per unit.

Some state organizations are mobilizing in numbers to maintain as much funding as possible. Jesse Lyn, as Associated Student Government (ASG) President, has tried to organize an ASG event in April, 2008 to address state funding concerns, but it was cancelled. She stated the State Senate at the student level is trying to organize an event in Sacramento in reference to funding. Students at Palomar are not interested in a letter writing campaign to address state funding, although our region is strong and Palomar is well known around the country.

Mark Vernoy stated that the Budget Committee is discussing hiring and we will continue to hire faculty for Fall 2008. The college is moving toward a hiring freeze for all other employee groups and there will be no layoffs for any contracted employee. The decision of how many faculty to hire next year will depend on circumstances.

V. **75/25 Request**

The Emergency Medical Education (EME) Department requested funds in the amount of \$3,300 to pay for the EME accreditation team costs for their site visit on April 7-8, 2008. IPC approved this request. It was noted if there were any monies remaining at the end of this year, these funds would be returned to the general fund.

VI. **ROP**

The Regional Occupational Program (ROP) is in a three-year transition plan. The handout was prepared by a task force primarily consisting of faculty appointed by the Faculty Senate, "Palomar College ROP Transition Schedule, Appendix A to MOU dated January, 2008." There is still a question of the space at the Shadowridge facility. As many as possible, full-time ROP faculty will be transitioned into the appropriate academic departments where the ROP program can complement or enhance the college credit program. Discussions as to how these faculty are transitioned need to take place between the District and PFF. The county office requested a three-year plan of the ROP transition schedule be submitted to them

no later than March, 2008. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) along with the ROP three-year transition plan will go to the Governing Board in April, 2008.

There will not be any ROP programs on campus after June 30, 2011. There will be three years for Palomar to transfer faculty and staff to college positions which will be funded by the general fund. The Faculty Senate has embraced how the academic programs can blend with ROP programs. If the college does not offer some of the ROP programs and pieces of the curriculum does not fit into the college mainstream, decisions will have to be made that affect those faculty. There are six full-time faculty that teach through ROP, which can affect the number of faculty that are hired in the future and may have to be taken into consideration by the IPC Subcommittee.

There have been long, hard discussions with the members of the ROP task force and the Faculty Senate. It was noted that each ROP faculty member is on a year to year contract and is not tenured.

VII. Learning Outcomes – Course Level

Berta Cuaron stated that she meant to bring copies of the pilot program of developing course level learning outcomes as part of the course review process. Faculty are encouraged to participate and to provide feedback as they complete their course reviews. .

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

February 27, 2008

Members Present: Mark Bealo, Norma Bean, Richard Borden, Berta Cuaron, Candi Francis, Terry Humphrey, Jessica Lyn, Chantal Maher, Steve McDonald, Michael Mufson, Wilma Owens, Lisa Romain, Mollie Smith, Mark Vernoy, Debi Workman

Members Absent: Judy J. Cater, Linda Cox, Becky McCluskey

I. Approval of February 13, 2008 Minutes

MSC Mark Bealo / Chantal Maher to approve the minutes of February 13, 2008.

II. Institutional Review and Planning – How Will IPC Review Documents

Berta Cuaron stated that three institutional review and planning (IR&P) documents have been completed and submitted. IPC will use these documents to make recommendations for funding, resource requests and any priorities identified in the strategic plan. The departments are doing a lot of work and thinking forward, giving the process significant meaning with our mission in mind. These documents will be the primary source in making recommendations for the whole college. The IR&P documents are posted on the Sharepoint website, submitted to Research and Planning. IPC must decide how the IR&P documents will be used in the faculty position priority process, as well as distribution of funds, such as block grant and one-time funds and the planning for Perkins IV (formerly VTEA) funds.

Some comments and ideas shared at the meeting were:

- Some departments do all of the work and some do not, how can IPC be fair to all departments when the detail will be different
- How can IPC evaluate all of the documents due to the volume, possibly develop a Rubric next year or components of the plans with timeframes
- IPC will use these documents to make recommendations to the Strategic Planning Council (SPC)
- IPC can review and discuss more/less detail with the departments' submitted information
- It is important that departments get concrete feedback from their submitted documents
- There is concern with volume of documents and having the time to review all of the documents
- Possibility of forming workgroups to review all of the documents then report back to IPC
- Look for common themes, priorities, needs and issues in the documents that could be compiled into a report to SPC
- The whole process warrants the time to read/review all of the documents, but must decide how to accomplish this
- What is the role of IPC? Is it to evaluate or to process these documents, as each discipline is setting its goals and vision
- No preconceived notions. What can be learned from themes of common vision for the college.
- Must respond with gratitude and contributions to overall vision of the whole college
- Three-pronged approach of departments/disciplines seeing where their programs are going, that planning is essential for the college and that resources must be linked to planning and priorities

- IPC can give responses to departments with several disciplines, whereby, some multi-discipline departments are too different and would need separate feedback
- Need to note unique situations of disciplines in departments, as the purpose and outcome of these departments may be different, where some just need resources and staff and some have summaries of plans for change
- Needs of departments will not be understood, unless there is the context of the planning parts and vision
- Faculty should be discussing plans; many faculty have embraced this process
- Planning and vision of the departments should address changes in the community and the students who come to us; it's a great opportunity with Proposition M for programs to expand
- The summaries of the IR&P documents can be reviewed later. The process should not be viewed primarily as a way to get funding
- Since the college is presently in the development of its accreditation self-study, the IR&P documents are evidence of planning and resource considerations
- In looking for common themes, some kind of chart could be created to reduce volume
- IPC will have to review documents. Summarization did not work well with the previous process. Feedback and action are important

The next two meetings will be devoted to determine how to review the documents and actually spending the time doing so.

III. **Accreditation Self-Study – Volunteer Readers**

The first drafts of the accreditation self-study were submitted by the writing teams two weeks ago. The co-chairs, Brent Gowen and Tom Medel, and Glynda Knighten are reviewing the information in order to give feedback to the writing teams. Any volunteer readers are welcome to assist in this process. The accreditation self-study drafts will be sent to each Planning Council in April, 2008.

IV. **Budget Development Process**

Bonnie Dowd at the last Budget Committee meeting explained the budget outlook for this year and next is not good. The college is waiting for clarification of its apportionment for this year. The growth numbers don't match with the Chancellor's Office. The funded FTES growth is 1%, but the Chancellor's Office P1 report indicates a 2% growth, so the college is asking for clarification from the Chancellor's Office. The college grew slightly last year and we will get funded from last year, as we met our base but did not reach our growth cap.

If the college exceeds the 1% growth and actually grows 3-4%, we are still only funded for 1% growth. This means we are paying for extra classes that do not receive funding. The Summer, Fall and Spring classes will have to be reviewed.

The budget development timeline is still in the process of being finalized. Fiscal Services is projecting salary, benefits and other fixed costs, such as insurance, and then will see what remains in discretionary funds. With 85% of the District's budget committed to salaries and benefits, the college only has a 15% fluidity in the budget and must determine how best to distribute to the departments funding for the 4000,

5000 and 6000 accounts. It was asked if the proposed budget would affect the Performing Arts Department and if they should cut back on the performance season and the answer at this time is no.

The proposed tentative budget goes to the Governing Board in June, 2008 for adoption. Then SPC recommendations would be considered for additional funding being put back in August-September, 2008, before the final budget is adopted.

V. 75/25 Request

CSIS has requested funds in the amount of \$2,500 to print new brochures for their programs, as they revised their curriculum and had just reprinted brochures with the old marketing information.

IPC gave approval of \$2,500 to CSIS for printing costs of brochures of their revised programs, from the 75/25 department distribution funds.

VI. Question of the Day

Mark Bealo inquired about the Regional Occupational Program (ROP) draft of new recommendations for the next three years. This draft went to the Faculty Senate on February 25, 2008. Berta Cuaron will forward the ROP draft to the IPC members via E-mail.

VII. Other

Wilma Owens stated that there is going to be a meeting on March 3, 2008 to discuss the Perkins IV 5-Year Plan for 2008-2012. The Perkins IV represents funds from the federal government for program improvement in career/technical areas. The Perkins legislation has significantly changed and we have to meet new accountability standards. If anyone on campus has a career or technical program that qualifies for Perkins funding, they are encouraged to come to the March 3, 2008 meeting for valuable information. This meeting will be a 45 minute presentation and the community will be involved, with three people from local businesses participating. The businesses represented will give input in reference to what faculty can do to prepare students for work in their particular industry and to improve the curriculum. It was suggested that members of the Governing Board attend this meeting on Perkins IV funding, so they can see what is needed for students in the workforce. Students have been asked to serve on the Committee in reference to Perkins IV funding and Jessie Lyn stated that she would have a student attend and would E-mail Wilma Owens accordingly.

The Perkins IV funding mandates planning for program improvement based on the data collected and proof has to be provided that students are getting jobs and getting higher wages, as a result of going through these programs. It is very important to have faculty participate in order to properly complete the 5-Year Perkins IV Plan.

Wilma Owens will send out a campus-wide announcement of the Perkins IV 5-Year Plan for 2008-2012 meeting that will take place on March 3, 2008, from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. in the Governing Board Room. Any faculty attending will receive professional development credit.

Michael Mufson announced that there are 6-7 very entertaining one-act plays by students, called “Welcome to the Moon” and “The Wild Goose,” being performed this weekend, February 29 and March 1&2, 2008, in the Performance Lab D-10. Also, there is a new lighting system in D-10.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.



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.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

January 23, 2008

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

Members Absent: Linda Cox, Becky McCluskey, Debi Workman

Members of the Council introduced themselves.

I. Approval of September 26, 2007, October 10, 2007 and October 31, 2007 Minutes

MSC Judy J. Cater / Richard Borden to approve the minutes of September 26, 2007.

MSC Terry Humphrey / Candi Francis to approve the minutes of October 10, 2007, with one correction. On page two, second paragraph, the second sentence should read: "The department has concerns regarding what is happening with their program, as it is a small program in a small department, but Multicultural Studies is a very vital department and it is important to consider its needs and the students it serves."

MSC Judy J. Cater / Terry Humphrey to approve the minutes of October 31, 2007, with one correction. On page one, Section I, Institutional Review and Planning, third paragraph, the first sentence should read, "When the position requests are completed, a day will be selected for preliminary data for Fall 2007."

II. Institutional Review and Planning Timeline

The handouts, "Palomar College – Institutional Review and Planning, Instructional Programs" (10/31/07), "Instructional Program Review and Planning Timeline - 2007-08" (1/23/08) and "Rationale Form for Faculty Positions" (1/29/07) was reviewed and discussed. Berta Cuaron stated that the final institutional review and planning document and timeline was presented to the Chairs and Directors in November, 2007 and was approved by them, and has been approved by the Faculty Senate. Originally, the departments were asked to submit the institutional review and planning document by February 14, 2008. Given the tight timeline, the recommendation was made to extend the deadline two weeks so the departments can spend more discussing their plans in their meetings and reviewing the data. The departments have three years of solid data to be used from Fall 2004, 2005 and 2006. The research and planning office will determine preliminary data for Fall 2007, which is the same data to be used for the faculty position requests. In order to prevent confusion, it was suggested that a 4th column of the preliminary Fall, 2007 data be added to the institutional review and planning document, which will enable departments to use this data for faculty position requests. The Fall 2007 data will be pulled on January 31, 2008 and will be posted no later than February 7, 2008. Richard Borden explained the simple process of accessing and populating the Fall, 2007 data in the 4th column of the institutional review and planning document.

After further discussion, it was agreed by the Council members to extend the due date to submit the institutional review and planning document to March 14, 2008, with the Instructional Division Deans receiving it on March 7, 2008. The revised dates will be posted on the website for everyone's information. The institutional review and planning document becomes the primary planning document to consider when allocating funds such as block grant, one-time allocations, and budget increases, and may be used as a guide for the Perkins grant requests. This process will directly link to curriculum planning and the effect it has on class scheduling, faculty positions, and equipment and facility needs. It was pointed out on the last page of the institutional review and planning document, where it asks to identify faculty and staff who participated in the development of the review and planning, it is expected that the process will be an inclusive and participatory process of many faculty and staff.

The next Chairs/Directors meeting is February 1, 2008. In order to clearly see and demonstrate the process for completion of the institutional review and planning document, two departments or disciplines will be asked to volunteer the use and analysis of their data for discussion. The IPC members are welcome to attend the February 1, 2008 Chairs/Directors meeting.

Wilma Owens stated that she is working on the institutional review and planning document that fits areas that are non-instructional but support services for instruction.

III. Mt. Carmel and Poway Sites

The status of the Mt. Carmel and Poway sites was discussed. The Poway site has historically offered few class sections, starting with less than 20 and due to cancellations ending up with less than 15 classes each semester. In Fall 2007, only 11 sections were retained after cancellations due to low enrollments. It has continued to be a struggle to offer classes with any demand and the academic departments have become more and more reluctant to offer classes there, knowing there is potential to cancel and to disappoint students and a faculty member who loses an assignment.

Over five years ago, a task force recommended that the Mt. Carmel and Poway sites combine as one location. Last summer, due to construction projects at both Mt. Carmel and Poway, classes had to be moved to one location at Twin Peak Middle School. This is the second summer that this consolidation was necessary and it was found that enrollments did well at the one location and still seemed to serve the community. Discussion on the consolidation of both locations occurred at two meetings with the Chairs/Directors in the Fall semester. The overall consensus was that it made sense and would provide for a more comprehensive instructional program at Mt. Carmel, where currently 40-50 classes are offered each semester and generally do well with fewer cancellations. With the recent renovation of Mt. Carmel, the environment is positive and also provides opportunity for additional classes to explore a larger schedule of classes.

The plan is to consolidate section offerings this Summer, 2008. The District has been working with the CCE/AFT to discuss the process for reassigning employees who work at both sites. Berta Cuaron and Theo Brocket met with the Poway Unified School District Assistant Superintendent to discuss the Mt Carmel site to serve the Poway community. As needed, Palomar will continue to respond to any special class needs at Poway High but will not have a formal presence with a staffed office.

IV. **Accreditation Self-Study**

Berta Cuaron thanked everyone that was on an accreditation writing team. There are 11 writing teams that have met frequently. The goal is to submit a rough draft of each writing team's standard on February 14, 2008. The accreditation tri-chairs will work on each of the drafts to edit them and IPC members are encouraged to assist with editing also.

Everyone is encouraged to complete the accreditation employee survey that is due February 1, 2008.

V. **Budget Update**

The handout, "Overview of 2008-09 Governor's Budget" (1/16/08) was reviewed and discussed. Last year the District had a banner year for funding, this year is just the opposite with very little funding. The Governor made an initial budget proposal on January 10, 2008 with a 10% cut across the board for 2008-09, which means \$40 million proposed cuts to community colleges. We will have to wait to hear about mid-year cuts and the overview of the Governor's budget proposal. President Deegan has called a special meeting next week of the Strategic Planning Council and the Budget Committee to begin planning for the forthcoming budget reductions. Part of the proposed budget cuts for 2008-09 include no COLA, deeper cuts in categorical programs with reductions from 4-11%, directly affecting the Disability Resource Center, EOP&S, CalWORKs, and Matriculation programs and services.

The District always needs to grow 2% just to keep pace with increased costs such as utilities, health benefits, insurances, employee movement on the salary schedule. The State has mandated growth for this year has been reduced to 1% and is proposed to be the same for 2008-09. It is generally good to grow slightly above the "funded growth" percentage, because the State will recalculate how growth funds are distributed several times and will distribute only to those colleges that do grow. However, FTES not funded by the State becomes a cost for each college so it is a fine balance between meeting the growth CAP and not exceeding too much. The District (SPC and Budget Committee) will have to work on a process on how to deal with the proposed budget cuts.

As an example of reduced funding, this year's block grant allocation is only 213,000, whereas last year Palomar received \$1.6 million in block grant funds. The block grant funds will be allocated through the institutional review and planning process to ensure that resources are linked to planning priorities. An initial allocation of \$30,000 was provided for faculty computers to address some immediate needs. Academic Divisions will determine funding priorities for the block grant based on the institutional review and planning documents and more global instructional needs such as equipment repair and classroom technology will be developed by the Division Deans and VP Cuaron, also based on the IR&P documents.

It was suggested that IR&P process plan for the next academic year, in other words, this year's planning process should be for 2008-09. .

VI. **Question of the Day**

Richard Borden asked a question on the "Rationale Form for Faculty Positions", on page 3, section D: "Additional Factors". Does this information enhance the process and should we continue to have it on the form? It is separate data from the institutional review and planning data currently provided. After

Discussion, it was agreed that the Faculty Position Priority Subcommittee will discuss this section on the form.

All of the data from the Fall, 2007 column of the institutional review and planning document can be filled in on the rationale form for faculty positions. It was noted that the 4th column of Fall, 2007 data will be frozen on January 31, 2008.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

The Faculty Position Priority Subcommittee will meet, following IPC's adjournment.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

October 31, 2007

Members Present: Mark Bealo, Norma Bean, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Katheryn Garlow, Terry Humphrey, Chantal Maher, Mark Vernoy

Members Absent: Berta Cuaron, Linda Cox, Candi Francis, Becky McCluskey, Michael Mufson, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith, Debi Workman

Dean Mark Vernoy chaired the meeting for Berta Cuaron.

I. Institutional Review and Planning

The following handout, “Palomar College – Institutional Review and Planning, Instructional Programs” was distributed and discussed. This document has been reviewed by the Faculty Senate. It is proposed that this document be used by the entire District.

Dean Vernoy demonstrated the institutional review and planning form that has been pre-populated as of today’s date by Institutional Research and Planning on the web site they created. Each department with all of their disciplines is listed with each having their own data, and there are 3 years of data listed, for Fall 2004, 2005 and 2006. Richard Borden stated that he would have Fall 2007 numbers by August/September of next year for the final numbers.

When the job requests are completed, a day will be picked for the end of February for the Fall 2007 numbers for each department and discipline. Mark Vernoy explained that this process is done for any discipline, department or division and for the whole college.

There will be training for departments to learn how to fill out the Institutional Review and Planning form, as it is simple to do with instruction. Richard Borden explained that on the Institutional Review and Planning website, under the institutional data and form, it is recommended that everyone read the prose for the divisions, departments and disciplines, for further explanation. Enrollment trends and percentages will be reviewed to decide whether to add classes, to be used for future planning.

MSC Norma Bean / Judy J. Cater to approve the “Palomar College – Institutional Review and Planning - Instructional Programs” (10/31/07) document.

II. Other

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

September 12, 2007

Members Present: Norma Bean, Richard Borden, Berta Cuaron, Linda Cox, Candi Francis, Katheryn Garlow, Terry Humphrey, Chantal Maher, Michael Mufson, Wilma Owens, Mark Vernoy,

Members Absent: Mark Bealo, Judy J. Cater, Becky McCluskey, Mollie Smith, Debi Workman

Guest Present: Molly Faulkner

Recorder: Suzanne M. Holt

I. Introductions

Members of the Council introduced themselves.

II. Approval of May 9, 2007 Minutes

MSC Terry Humphrey / Katheryn Garlow to approve the minutes of May 9, 2007, with one correction. Under Section III, third paragraph, the first sentence should read: It was noted that IPC would be better served if it could focus on one or two goals.

III. Role and Responsibilities of IPC

The attachment, of the “Governance Structure of the Instructional Planning Council” was discussed. It is important to review the roles and responsibilities of IPC, as the roles continue to evolve and be redefined. The functions of IPC include prioritizing faculty positions for the hiring process and having a role in the institutional review and accreditation process. It was noted that IPC should also be involved in recommending overall staffing needs necessary to support instruction.

Council members were asked to review the governance structure and roles of IPC and to discuss with their constituencies, in order to consider revisions. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

IV. Institutional Review and Planning

The attachment, “Palomar College – Institutional Review and Planning, Instructional Programs (8/29/07)” was discussed. This document was approved by the Faculty Senate on 9/9/07 with the following corrections:

1) in #1, the 3-year trend of quantitative data will be populated for each discipline and department (by Research and Planning) and stating as such, and including the data element definitions on the far right-hand side of the table

- 2) in #4, reword the sentence to clarify and revise the subheading “Assessment/Outcome – 2008-09 to “Progress – 2008-09.”
- 3) in #7 – insert the word discipline and remove the word department in the sentence
- 4) on page 4, add signature and date lines for Chair/Director and Division Dean (for review) and also add the sentence at the end stating – “Forward to IPC.”

There are two purposes for planning and having a vision in order to continue to move forward. Central to the planning is curriculum and having a process in place to implement program goals and growth with resources.

It was stated that a timeline is needed for the institutional review process, which will span the Fall semester and early Spring semester. The IRC document will be revised and populated with data and the timeline will be discussed at the next meeting.

V. **Accreditation Self-Study**

The handout, “Introduction to the Accreditation Standards” was distributed. The accreditation standards that are specific to instruction will be discussed in order to receive IPC’s feedback and can be forwarded to the Accreditation Steering Committee.

VI. **Other**

A suggestion was made to have a “Question of the Day” at the IPC meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.