



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

May 12, 2010

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Berta Cuaron, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Susan Miller, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith, Chris Wick for Debbi Claypool

Members Absent: Judy J. Cater, Zeb Navarro, Debi Workman, John Jang – ASG Rep.

I. Approval of April 28, 2010 Minutes

MSC Candi Francis/Norma Miyamoto to approve the April 28, 2010 minutes.

II. IPC Subcommittee Faculty Hiring Recommendations for 2010-11

The “Faculty Hiring Priority Recommendations for 2010-11,” (5/7/10) was distributed. The IPC Subcommittee met three times and had very productive meetings, where the Subcommittee discussed and went through many requests and data. The finalized list represents a diversity of all curriculum that is offered at Palomar College. The process used is a good and fair process that works well.

MSC Michael Mufson/Alan Aquallo to approve the Faculty Hiring Recommendations for 2010-11.

This list is valid for one year, 2010-11 only. The list will be forwarded to President Deegan and sent as an information item to the Strategic Planning Council. The question was asked if the formula was applied to determine the ratio of counselors and librarians, as to when they are included in the process. The explanation was that the process “Guideline for Hiring/Replacing Counselors and Librarians” will be followed. The full-time faculty count is taken every year during the first week of September. In normal fiscal times, we receive the faculty obligation number from the System Office by mid-September, but last year we received it in November, which delayed the determination if we needed to hire. The full-time faculty obligation (FTFO) must be met and if we don’t meet this obligation, we are penalized \$60,000 for each full-time Faculty position under the obligation, or we can request a waiver. In applying the Guidelines, first, we must ensure that the full-time teaching faculty is at baseline, and then we can consider counselors and then librarian positions. To note, the State Legislature is seriously looking at suspending the faculty obligation for next year, due to fiscal constraints at many colleges. Also, the May revise for the State budget is coming out May 14, 2010.

It was suggested that if members of the IPC Subcommittee cannot attend the meetings, they need to submit their lists for each meeting. Departments need to submit a separate request for each position.

Berta Cuaron stated that she would send the hiring guidelines for counselors and librarians to IPC members.

III. Update on Accreditation Follow-up Report

Berta Cuaron stated that the ACCJC report from Dr. Kinsella was received last week, it was fourteen pages, and had a positive tone. The report stated that recommendation #1 was partially implemented and recommendations 2, 3, and 4 were fully implemented. Additional work on recommendation #1 has included drafts of the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Plan and the Technology Plan. The timeline of the student learning outcomes (SLOs) process has been updated along with a minor update on the Evaluation#Kit, which is a software program for improving student participation of evaluating online courses. The updated drafts of the plans and other updates will be sent to ACCJC this Friday, May 14, 2010. The report cannot be posted until the Commission accepts it, but if anyone wants to read it, it is available in the Accreditation office.

Berta Cuaron acknowledged the hard work done by many this past year and commends the college for taking this work seriously. The co-chairs are in the process of completing factual corrections and will send these along with additional documents to Dr. Kinsella and ACCJC by the end of this week. The college will receive notice from ACCJC in late June, 2010.

The ACCJC meeting in San Francisco is scheduled June 9, 10 & 11, 2010, and Berta Cuaron and Michelle Barton of Research and Planning may be attending. Hopefully, Palomar will be taken off warning status and the college's accreditation is reaffirmed for six years.

IV. Resource Allocation Model 2010-11

The "Budget Line Items Rev 4 and Budget Line Items + FTES Rev 4," (5/12/10) was distributed. Berta Cuaron thanked Richard Borden of Research and Planning for all of his work on the budget scenarios. IPC is to make initial recommendations for a tentative budget and complete this process when we return in September, 2010.

The budget scenarios are by fiscal year and categories, listing expenditures by division and department for the last three academic years. It begins with initial allocations of 70% to 80% from the fiscal year 2008-09 expenditures, effective July 1, 2010, with any remainder of funds being allocated in September for PRP priorities. If 70% is allocated for departments, then readjustments will have to be done once the 2009-10 budget is done. The other side of the sheet lists FTES, but there seems to be no rhyme or reason (no correlation) between the budget a department has and the FTES it has generated.

Berta Cuaron stated that we can request Fiscal Services to allocate 70% of funds spent in FY 2008-09 to establish the budget for July 1, 2010, and in September once the 2009-10 budget has been adopted, we can fund some of the PRP priorities. We need to have a tentative budget by July 1, 2010, in order to have operating funds and then see what happens in September when the final budget is adopted by the State. Although, it does not have to be 70% for the initial budget allocation, it can be a different percentage agreed upon by the Council. The other Planning Councils are asking for 75% of the 2009-2010 budget.

There was extensive discussion which included:

1. establish a tentative budget now to give us operating funds for the first quarter of the new fiscal year with possible augmentation once the 2010-11 budget is adopted

2. there would have to be a very clear explanation for people to understand that the 70% allocated may not be the final budget
3. there are too many unknowns from a planning standpoint using the base of 70% for the initial budget, as some funds must be used for PRP allocations
4. departments will ask what the 30% reduction means, as most departments will take the wait and see mode and spend their funds and will run out of money
5. we need to know what amount we can count on and plan accordingly
6. shift decisions as we go along with a percentage now and in September
7. departments are different, some are more complex and difficult to manage with concern of changing scenarios, it would make chaos
8. some programs in the CTEE division have community programs that are offered which have higher costs
9. how much of the funds for the PRP allocations could be determined by backing into it by a step-by-step process
10. reallocate resources as part of the whole process and see where the real priorities are in September
11. departments did a lot of work on the PRP requests to validate them
12. commitment to make the process valuable and have to see the impact of the 2010-11 budget in September in order to have a balance
13. 70% is too much doing this the first time, we don't have a real process for IPC to make decisions that have a long term impact on departments
14. using a form that is less than perfect, so we must approach the process conservatively
15. anticipate cuts from the State and do the same in departments, with a separate issue of allocating for planning
16. it is very important how the initial budget is presented to departments
17. start with an initial worst case scenario budget and plan for it at 70%, plus funding for PRP priorities
18. tell departments the initial budget will be the same as last year and state we are working on the PRP process for PRP priorities
19. the old formula is being used for the base allocation for departments and we have to develop a new formula
20. show linking planning to the budgeting process.

Berta Cuaron stated that the total expenditures of the 2008-09 budget is \$2,192,647 and ½ of 1% is \$100,000. We have to determine what portion to set aside to fund PRP priorities by trying different percentages. IPC has to follow through on the PRP process and work toward a new budget model that set asides a small percentage as a contingency if something unusual happens in Fall, 2010 when the budget is adopted.

It was suggested to set aside 10% of the 2008-09 expenditures of \$2,192,647, for the base allocation of funding PRPs, giving 90% of the 2008-09 total expenditures to the departments.

MSC Mollie Smith/Wilma Owens to establish a base allocation of 90% of expenditures of the fiscal year 2008-09 budget, for the 2010-11 budget.

Berta Cuaron stated that she would revise the amount from 70% to 90% of the 2008-09 fiscal year budget and would communicate to Fiscal Services to allocate accordingly for base allocation of the 2010-11 budget. Departments will have to be informed very carefully and thank them for all of their work. She thanked the IPC members for their work this year as it has been a challenging year and there will be a lot of work in the Fall and the process will not be easy. She stated that we would re-evaluate the budget allocations for departments in the Fall once we know the 2009-10 expenses and can compare them to 2008-09.

Candi Francis distributed, "Observations/Recommendations on the PRP Prioritization Process, Team 4s and 5s," which is her working group's observations to share in the Fall.

V. Other

Berta Cuaron reminded the IPC members to complete the Council evaluation that was sent to them from the Research and Planning Office.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

April 28, 2010

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Richard Borden, Debbi Claypool, Berta Cuaron, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Susan Miller, Norma Miyamoto, Zeb Navarro, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith, Debi Workman, John Jang- ASG Rep.

Members Absent: Mark Bealo, Judy J. Cater, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Michael Mufson, Sue Norton

I. **Approval of March 31, 2010 and April 14, 2010 Minutes**

MSC Debbi Claypool/Steve McDonald to approve the March 31, 2010 minutes.

MSC Debi Workman/Becky McCluskey to approve the April 14, 2010 minutes.

II. **PRP Workgroup Reviews and Priority Development**

Berta Cuaron stated that the working groups will continue their work on developing criteria and focusing on department requests, as we need to know the priorities and what the fundamental needs are for the instructional departments. IPC members were to print out whatever summaries each of them has been working on. The first run of going through this cycle will not be perfect, but it will start to engage everyone in conversation and what it takes to run academic programs from the budget and staffing standpoint.

The Facilities workgroup had only seven requests, so members in that workgroup have been reassigned: Steve McDonald – staffing - classified, contract and hourly; Zeb Navarro – technology; and Debi Workman – equipment. The Facilities Master Plan will have to be reviewed to see what requests have been made and if they are included in the Master Plan update currently in progress.

III. **Resource Allocation Model 2010-11**

Berta Cuaron stated that Dick Borden of Research and Planning had given her more data that she still needs to review with him. He did scenarios of how departments spend in the 2000, 4000, 5000 and 6000 categories and if there is any relationship to the FTES generated. There are programs, such as in the Sciences and Nursing Education, which have high supply costs and are also limited to classroom/lab capacity due to safety concerns or accreditation mandates.

We are still waiting for the State Legislature to pass a budget, and for our budget development, we will have to speculate on the percentage of funding we will receive next year based on what we received last year.

At the next meeting, we will focus on the budget formula and receive feedback from the working groups on how they have identified criteria for each process and receive ideas from the larger group.

Instructional Planning Council

April 28, 2010

Page Two

The meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m. and workgroups began their work.

The IPC Subcommittee met from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m. – after the IPC meeting.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

April 14, 2010

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Debbi Claypool, Berta Cuaron, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Susan Miller, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith, John Jang- ASG Rep.

Members Absent: None

The IPC Subcommittee met from 2:00 to 2:30 p.m. - prior to the IPC meeting.

The next IPC Subcommittee meetings will be held on:

April 21, 2010, from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m.

April 28, 2010, from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m.

May 7, 2010, from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. or until finished

An E-mail will be sent in reference to the above scheduled IPC Subcommittee meetings, plus noting the meeting room. The IPC Subcommittee will be ready to present the recommended faculty position priority list for 2010-11 to IPC on May 12, 2010.

I. Approval of March 31, 2010 Minutes

The minutes will be considered for approval at the next meeting.

II. Strategic Plan 2013 Action Plan

The “Action Plan Steps and Timelines 2010-11, Updated 4/13/10” was distributed, which is a draft of IPC’s recommendations of project steps and timelines to objectives #1.1, 1.2 and 5.1 of the Strategic Plan 2013 – Action Plan. The document was reviewed by IPC. The document is all projections and is a working document that IPC will continue to revise. It is a roadmap of what IPC will be doing next year.

Berta Cuaron will forward the document to the Strategic Planning Council, as all of the information is gathered and is to be completed by tomorrow, April 15, 2010.

III. PRP Supplemental Reviews and Priorities

VP Cuaron and the Deans discussed the PRPs and decided that doing PRP review and prioritization via assignment would be difficult and would result in assignments not being equal. It was recommended to have small working groups each focusing on one category would be more manageable. The categories and working groups assigned are:

Equipment: Dean Wilma Owens, Sue Norton, Mollie Smith

Technology: Interim Dean Judy J. Cater, Alan Aquallo, Craig Forney, John Jang

Budget: Dean Candi Francis, Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Becky McCluskey

Facilities: Dean Steve McDonald, Zeb Navarro, Debi Workman

Staffing – Classified, Contract, Hourly: Dean Norma Miyamoto, Debbi Claypool, Susan Miller,
Michael Mufson

Berta Cuaron stated that she would be pulling data together by category in order to summarize the spreadsheets, and will send them out Monday, April 19, 2010. The working groups are to come up with criteria and initial priorities for each category. The work will start Spring 2010 and will be finished in Fall 2010. The working groups will do their work during IPC meeting time. An allocation for a contingency account will be set up for Instructional Services.

The “Budget Line Items & Budget Line Items + FTES Review 1” was distributed, completed by Dick Borden of Research and Planning. Dick Borden summarized on a spreadsheet the total expenditures and FTES by department for the last three academic years (no salaries or benefits are included on the handout). This will enable the working groups to do 3-4 budget scenarios as a place to start the process. This enables us to see how much departments are spending in the 2000’s, 4000’s, 5000’s and 6000’s and how it compares to their programs and FTES generation. The working groups are to look at allocations with a formula driven by FTES and other qualitative information and leave enough money to fund some of the PRP priorities. The summary data was reviewed by IPC. We have to ask if departments can still function with this budget. IPC has to give the process a first attempt and still have a contingency amount to fall back on for adjustments. The working groups met during the rest of the IPC meeting time.

At the next IPC meeting, we will do “what if” budget scenarios to see how it looks and how it compares to the funding departments have received in the past. After we go through the cycle, we will have to make changes to refine the PRP and the supplemental.

IV. Reminder – April 28, 2010 IPC Meeting Time – 2:00 to 3:30 p.m. in Room SU-18

The next IPC meeting is scheduled on April 28, 2010 from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m. in room SU-18.

V. Other

Michael Mufson announced the upcoming play, “American Dream – 2.0 Festival” consisting of 3 shows, 15 performance groups and 5 stages.

Alan Aquallo announced the production, “2007 Firestorm” taking place on April 15, 2010, at the Travel Hall on the Pauma Indian Reservation.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

March 31, 2010

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Debbi Claypool, Berta Cuaron, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Becky McCluskey, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith, John Jang- ASG Rep.

Members Absent: Steve McDonald, Susan Miller, Debi Workman

I. Approval of March 10, 2010 Minutes

MSC Judy J. Cater/ Norma Miyamoto to approve the January 27, 2010 minutes, with one correction, Zeb Navarro was not in attendance.

Berta Cuaron stated that the ACCJC Commission team is doing a follow-up site visit to the campus on Monday, April 5, 2010. The team members will be meeting with workgroups that are directly responsible for working on the recommendation, so representatives are needed from IPC to discuss the Council's role and the implementation of planning and budgeting. The representatives are as follows: two Deans - Candi Francis and Wilma Owens; two faculty members - Alan Aquallo and Michael Mufson; 1 CAST member – Zeb Navarro; and one classified employee – Debbi Claypool. The team will meet with the IPC representatives on April 5, 2010, from 9:15 to 9:45 a.m. Berta Cuaron will send the E-mail from Glynda Knighten in reference to recommendations #1 and #2 regarding the PRP supplementals and how to insure they are incorporated into the new planning process. It is highly suggested that the representatives read recommendations #1 and #2, as well as the entire report on the accreditation website. Berta Cuaron stated she has a call into Anna Davies, member of the accreditation follow-up visit team, to see if ACCJC needs anything else from IPC. Confirmation of the final schedule for the designated IPC members will be sent out. The rest of the team meeting schedule will be finalized and posted on the accreditation website by tomorrow. There will be an open college forum on April 5, 2010, between the timeframe of 10:45 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. in the Governing Board Room, and everyone is encouraged to attend.

II. & III. Criteria and Formula for Baseline Funding & Criteria for Funding PRP Priorities

The formula for baseline funding will include linking to the Strategic Plan and PRP planning priorities and student learning outcomes. There will be data analyses done of the different types of funding requests.

In the PRP supplemental, the resources requested must reflect a priority based on data analysis, linked to a Strategic Plan goal or objective and linked to student learning outcomes.

After discussion, the supplemental form was changed on the last page by make #5 – 5c. and the previous paragraph – 5b. and the first paragraph on the page – 5a.

Berta Cuaron will send out a sample form to work with, so everyone can do one of the supplemental forms in order to give feedback before anything else is done on the form. All data is by category on the spreadsheet with room for additional comments next to the actual request. The Council will need to determine criteria to review the supplementals.

IV. **PRP Reviews and Assignments**

The PRPs are categorized by staffing, budget, equipment, technology and facilities, with each one in a grouping. We are to use the 10/28/09 version of the PRPs. Berta Cuaron will send the link to the supplementals to the IPC members. The supplementals must be completed by April 14, 2010.

The EME supplemental was reviewed by the Council. It was stated when the supplemental was completed, a thorough data analysis in #2 from the PRP should have been done. The goals or priorities should have been described for the next two academic years. All resources must be listed that are necessary to support the goals, based on the goals identified in numbers 4a. through 4c. The accreditation recommendation must be considered for #4c. - facilities. The goals and priorities are tied to the Strategic Plan and departments have to address courses and program student learning outcomes. The process is a complete circle of linking curriculum and student learning outcomes to the resources that support them. The legislature has state mandated student learning outcomes and taxpayers expect to see students succeed and move into the workforce.

The PRPs and supplementals are both on the Research & Planning website and are linked by division.

V. **Action Plan Responsibilities**

The Strategic Plan 2013 has group assignments for each goal and objective and IPC has a few of these assignments. IPC is responsible for the following objectives of the Strategic Plan 2013: 1) Objective 1.1 - update the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Plan, Technology Master Plan and create a staffing plan and equipment plans in accordance with the Resource Allocation Model; this will require timelines and steps; 2) Objective 1.2 – Method to evaluate how well the planning priorities and allocations were addressed and evaluate in one year; 3) Objective 2.1 – open a Teaching and Learning Center on the San Marcos campus; 4) Objective 2.2 – Berta Cuaron will get clarification on this one, as it involves examining how students progress through English, Mathematics, Reading and ESL sequences; 5) Objective 2.4 – implement student learning outcomes assessment cycles, of which the Learning Outcomes Council is responsible for, and service area outcomes assessment cycles, of which IPC gives support. The rest of the objectives in the Strategic Plan 2013 were reviewed with IPC.

IPC needs to establish timelines and steps for objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2? and 2.4 of the Strategic Plan 2013. IPC members are to review these objectives and at the next meeting we will set steps and timelines for achieving the objectives.

VI. **Other**

Berta Cuaron stated that in the next few weeks, IPC will be working on a budget formula with help from Research and Planning on some budget scenarios. The formula may include linking budgets to FTES, qualitative needs and one-time allocation for funding PRP priorities. For the PRP reviews and assignments, all data will be assembled based on categories and priorities will be developed for staffing, budget, equipment, technology and facilities.

At the next meeting, budget scenarios will be brought for discussion. Scenarios will be based on FTES and actual department expenditures for the last three years. The resource allocation process is tied to the discipline and IPC will only be working with the 2300, 2400, 4000, 5000 and 6000 accounts.

In Fall 2010, time will be set aside for contingency allocation and wrap-up, in order for IPC to take more time with the entire process. This is a whole new approach and the more time we take with it, the better we are in the long run.

Berta Cuaron stated there might be an extra IPC meeting in May and will send out a tentative schedule of the rest of the IPC meetings for the semester. The next IPC meeting is April 28, 2010, scheduled from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m. in room SU-18.

Michael Mufson announced the upcoming play, "American Dream 2.0" which has performances on April 30, 2010 and May 1 & 2, 2010. The play has music, dance and theatre and each performance is different and unique.

Alan Aquallo announced the "Firestorm 2007," a compilation of finest tunes on April 15, 2010, 7:00 p.m., at the Travel Hall on the Pauma Indian Reservation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

March 3, 2010

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Debbi Claypool, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Susan Miller, Michael Mufson, Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith

Members Absent: Norma Miyamoto, Debi Workman, John Jang – ASG Rep.

I. **Approval of January 27, 2010 Minutes**

The minutes will be considered for approval at the next meeting.

II. **Strategic Plan 2013**

The revised “Strategic Plan 2013” was distributed and reviewed. Berta Cuaron stated that the revised Strategic Plan 2013 was completed and endorsed by the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) and was adopted by the Governing Board. The “Values” were updated by adding, “**Mutual respect and trust** through transparency, civility, and open communications,” and “**Physical presence and participation** in the community.”

The “Strategic Goals and Objectives” were reduced in number from the original ten goals to six goals to enable the District to reach and implement these goals. In the next two SPC meetings, timelines will be established and council and committee responsibilities will be assigned.

The goals were reviewed and discussed.

Goal 1 is in response to the accreditation recommendation to ensure planning processes are linked to resources with funding priorities as defined in the Strategic Plan.

Goal 2 is to enhance and strengthen services for our students, to include establishing a larger Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) on the San Marcos campus.

Goal 3 is to ensure the college’s shared governance structure operates effectively and decision-making is clearly defined and participatory.

Goal 4 is to recruit, hire, and support diverse faculty and staff to meet student needs.

Goal 5 is to ensure existing and future facilities support learning, programs, and services.

Goal 6 is to optimize the technological environment to provide effective programs and services for the District.

Many of the updated, revised goals were ones we had before but are more specific and now better respond to ACCJC recommendations. We must follow through to implement these goals with flexibility.

The question was asked if the 75/25 ratio of full-time to part-time faculty was addressed as a goal in the Strategic Plan 2013. The reply was that it was not that specific in goal #4 which deals more with diversity of staff. Berta Cuaron stated that she would take this comment to SPC that the 75/25 ratio should be stated somewhere in the Strategic Plan as a goal.

III. SLOAC for Instructional Support Areas

The “Instructional Support Program Learning Outcomes or Service Area Outcomes” form was distributed and reviewed. Berta Cuaron stated that we have to start looking at service area outcomes for instructional support service areas. The form was adapted from the form used by Student Services. Areas such as the Library, the Tutoring Center and Math Center will use this form, with directors of each area being responsible for implementing the process..

It was suggested in the third box of the document where it says “ Identify the Assessment Timeline – When (what semester or month/year will the outcome assessment be conducted,” to add the words “how often.” Berta Cuaron will take this suggestion to the next Learning Outcomes Council meeting.

IV. Progress on SLOACs

The “SLOAC Implementation Plan and Progress” document was distributed and reviewed. There are 1,726 active courses inventoried since last June and a recount will occur in June when we report again. Work has to start on the service areas outcomes, using the document created. Efforts need to be accelerated in order to have service area outcomes integrated with ongoing practices. All courses and programs are to complete one cycle by Fall 2012. More important to the SLOAC process is having it be meaningful to faculty and staff as well as positively affecting students. It was noted on the document that the second “Spring 2010” was an actual count as of February 22, 2010.

The Learning Outcomes Council is recommending a revision to the timeline to the Faculty Senate next week.

V. PRP Change

The “Palomar College – Program Review and Planning, Instructional Programs” form (Revised 2.22.10) was distributed and reviewed. The accreditation recommendation #3 requires that student achievement rates are compared between face-to-face and distance education. This PRP form change ensures that this data is reviewed regularly by disciplines.

A question was asked if previous historical data was requested, (past the three years listed on the form) could it be provided, and the response was “yes.”

VI. RAM

The “Integrated Planning, Evaluation , and Resource Allocation Decision-making Model” and “Resource Allocation Model (RAM)” was distributed and reviewed. Berta Cuaron stated that for the ACCJC follow-up report, the biggest challenge was to develop a process that links resources to planning and priorities.

The updated Strategic Plan links with the Program Review and Planning (PRP)s and gleans out the information for the Facilities Plan, the Staffing Plan, the Technology Plan, and the Equipment Plan. There is a significant difference in the non-discretionary budget, where it lists, ½ of 1% for planning priorities to support the Master Plans and 3-year Strategic Plan, and ½ of 1% other reserves, (operating uncertainties). The PRPs play a key role in allocating for the 2000, 4000, 5000 and 6000 budget categories based on criteria and formulas that IPC will develop to allocate budgets for everyday department needs. The 2009-2010 Instructional Program Review and Planning Supplemental forms are due on March 5, 2010 with hard copies sent to Instructional Services and electronic copies sent to Research and Planning.

It was asked if the funds are not allocated, can the funds be moved to the next fiscal year, this is an item for discussion at SPC. Another question, what happens if the State takes funds back from the college, this is another item for discussion at SPC.

At the next meeting, there will be discussion of criteria for the budget by looking at FTES numbers, size of programs, number of faculty and staff, licensing and qualitative and assessment of these programs.

Also, at the next IPC meeting, there will be three members of Information Systems to gather information from IPC members on technology needs for the future.

VII. **Other**

It was pointed out that other community colleges in the State are having very difficult times during the fiscal crisis we are all experiencing. At Palomar, we are very fortunate to protect everyone's position but it does not come without sacrifice, made by significant scheduling changes next year.

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

Berta Cuaron conducted a brief Faculty Position Priority Subcommittee meeting following the IPC meeting.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

January 27, 2010

Members Present: Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith, Chris Wick for Debbi Claypool, John Jang – ASG Rep.

Members Absent: Alan Aquallo, Zeb Navarro, Debi Workman

Guest Present: Sandra Andre, Design & Consumer Education

I. Approval of December 9, 2009 Minutes

MSC Steve McDonald/ Judy J. Cater to approve the September 9, 2009 minutes, one abstention, and one correction that Steve McDonald was present at the meeting.

II. New Program Proposal – Green Building Professional (Sandra Andre)

Sandra Andre of the Design & Consumer Education Department gave a presentation of the new program proposal for Green Building Professional, Certificate of Achievement. The “Process for New Instructional Program Approval,” was reviewed.

Sandra Andre stated that the program proposal takes existing courses in Interior Design and Architecture and packages them into a new certificate program. The program focuses on new training developments on sustainability skills. Since construction is at a standstill, except for some commercial construction, it is expected to improve in the future. There is a need for students going into this career to understand procurement and construction skills as it is a very different process in the green technologies. Students must learn the supply system and materials that are sustainable to make students more marketable in the workforce. Jobs are specific in all aspects of architecture and construction, including some technologies, permits and paperwork with green influences. Students that complete the certificate may need to do an apprentice type program with architects in order to be competitive in the workforce. Employment in green industries is one of the largest growth sectors involving brand new technology in architecture, construction, and cogeneration. Some of the courses, such as hybrid courses will be online. Other colleges have similar programs, including UCSD’s environmental design and toxicity program and Cuyamaca College’s gray water systems program. This field is evolving and changing and as a college, we must train people for the future. It was pointed out that these types of programs are always reviewed and revised on an ongoing basis. Judy J. Cater offered any assistance from the Library for the program. The program will be taken to the SCICCA County Vocational Deans as a first reading and approval in April, 2010. The program will be on the Curriculum agenda February 17, 2010. This is a good opportunity for students and Palomar needs to offer the program.

III. **Accreditation Follow-up Report**

The accreditation follow-up report is posted on the website. Input provided on content is changing constantly and feedback is appreciated and should be forwarded to Glynda Knighten. The accreditation report must be sent in by March 15, 2010 and a site visit will follow.

IV. **Budget Allocation Model**

The “Resource Allocation Model (RAM), Approved by SPC 2/2/10” was distributed and reviewed. The model links resources to planning, with a discretionary and non-discretionary budget. The District must maintain 20,000 FTES in order to continue its “large college” status which makes it eligible to receive \$1 million, so we must continue to develop a schedule that ensures this. The formula has been discussed by all of the Planning Councils, plus the Program Review and Planning (PRPs) documents. We must keep the focus on teaching in the classroom, with base allocations to academic departments addressed by the Planning Councils. The PRPs and the supplemental form will be used for resource allocation requests to support their priorities. For the General Fund 2000, 4000 and 5000 budget categories, IPC must develop a formula that is based on FTES, qualitative measures, and PRP priorities. The new budget process is a big paradigm shift for the college but necessary to satisfy accreditation standards. The plan is for IPC to begin working with the new budget allocation model in March, 2010 for the fiscal year 2010-2011.

The RAM document will be considered by SPC for a second reading and adoption on February 2, 2010, and becomes effective with the 2010/2011 budget process.

V. **PRP Supplemental Draft**

The new draft of the PRP supplemental form was reviewed with the RAM model where departments are being asked to review its data analysis from last year, develop priorities, and submit these priorities for resource requests in staffing, supplies and materials augmentation, equipment, technology, and facilities. Departments are to submit one to two priorities to implement or sustain their program goals. The PRP requests are for over and above base budget needs to address PRP priorities. The PRP planning should include broad-based participation in the department. It was suggested that the departments should prioritize their PRPs in order to help IPC review the requests for real needs. Also, a box should be included on the form for any discipline that does not have any requests, so they can be accounted for overall. Hard copies with signatures by those who completed the documents need to be submitted to Instructional Services. Berta Cuaron will work with Research and Planning for submitting the documents online.

Suggestions of changes on the PRP supplemental draft form include: 4a. Equipment – to include the unit price and dollar amount for categories of items requested, and add examples; 4b. Budget Augmentation – change to “Budget for Supplies or Printing.” Also, on page two, the first sentence should, “How will you evaluate whether or not you have met your goal/priority with the requested resources provided?”

Berta Cuaron stated that the first draft of the PRP supplemental form is a working document to start the first cycle. This information will be shared with the Chairs/Directors at its meeting on February 5, 2010 and with SPC on February 9, 2010. Departments are to submit their priority requests the first part of March so that IPC can begin its work and complete it by the end of April, 2010.

The next IPC meeting will include discussion on the budget formula allocation.

VI. **Strategic Plan 2013 – Draft of Goals/Objectives**

The draft of the Strategic Plan 2013 will be presented to the Governing Board at its meeting in February, 2010. The goals and objectives are better defined and are more quantifiable. The document was presented to the whole college last week. The revised document along with evidence provided will ensure that we have fully implemented the accreditation recommendation.

VII. **Question of the Day**

Mark Bealo stated that he cannot send/receive E-mails on campus from an E-mail client that does not have a Wi-Fi device through his carrier. With new technology products coming out, there should be a way to correct the connection at Palomar. Judy J. Cater stated that the issue is with Information Systems (IS), with the number of devices that might overload the network. She asked IS about this problem but never received an answer.

Berta Cuaron asked Mark Bealo to send her an E-mail that she could forward to Don Sullins in IS to ask what plans there are, if any, to address this request.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

December 9, 2009

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Kathleen Sheahan, Mollie Smith, John Jang – ASG Rep.

Members Absent: Debbi Claypool, Becky McCluskey, Debi Workman

I. Approval of September 9, 2009 Minutes

MSC Judy J. Cater / Steve McDonald to approve the September 9, 2009 minutes.

Approval of September 23, 2009 Minutes

MSC Michael Mufson / Mollie Smith to approve the September 23, 2009 minutes.

Approval of October 14, 2009 Minutes

MSC Steve McDonald / Norma Miyamoto to approve the October 14, 2009 minutes.

Approval of October 28, 2009 Minutes

MSC Judy J. Cater / Wilma Owens to approve the October 28, 2009 minutes, Candi Francis abstained, with the following correction on page two, number ten, the word Native (students) should be capitalized, as it appears twice in the paragraph.

Approval of November 18, 2009 Minutes

MSC Candi Francis / Steve McDonald to approve the November 18, 2009 minutes.

II. PRP Supplemental Draft

a. Revisions

Berta Cuaron stated that she worked on the PRP supplemental draft incorporating recommendations in order to bring them back color coded to see where the changes have been made on the document. Resource allocation still has to be defined, so the supplemental draft cannot be completed until that process is defined, which should be done by the next IPC meeting in January, 2010. The resource allocation requests will have to be prioritized and a form will be required for each request from each department.

There are many needs with limited resources, so there must be careful prioritization for basic needs. It was suggested that departments be asked to limit their requests to two to three priorities, plus the Deans could also review the resource allocation requests.

b. Instructions to Complete the Supplemental Form

Detailed instructions are needed for the supplemental draft in order to put it into use. Also, another form needs to be developed for non-instructional areas, such as the Library and Tutoring. The other Planning Councils are adapting IPC's form to use in their areas. The PRP evaluation form should be modified since everyone doesn't complete the PRP form in the same way. The supplemental draft should be developed on the same standards since the PRPs are different. There are concerns with more forms and more quantification so the forms need to be as flexible as possible. Research and Planning could assist with these forms and how they might be completed in an online database. We must summarize and synthesize the process and it will take going through the process the first year to see what worked and fix what did not work.

c. Timeline

The timeframe has been adjusted from February 1, 2010 to late February or early March, 2010.

d. Criteria for IPC Review and Assignments

It was agreed that everyone use the existing data and not use the new data in order to have a level playing field by using the same elements. Priorities and criteria needs to be established for departments.

e. Other

Berta Cuaron stated that she will send draft number two of the supplemental draft with instructions before the January IPC meeting.

III. Refreshed Web Page – Judy J. Cater

Judy J. Cater gave a presentation on the refreshed or transition version of the web page. It has been four years since the Academic Technology home page has been updated. Terry Gray and Academic Technology developed a new and refreshed home Web page version. There are quick links in a better format with new information, and includes an area for emergency notices and changes in advertising boxes. The improvements change the face of the institution with clear links for safety.

It was stated that it was hard to read the buttons at the top of the page and Judy J. Cater replied that she would make sure it meets ADA requirements. The changes will also include a contrasting border with colors and quick links.

IPC members stated the refreshed web page was a definite improvement.

IV. Credit Unit Enrollment Limits

Community colleges are facing an enrollment crunch with some colleges limiting the number of units for students. The San Diego Community College District has limited students to 16 units and other colleges

have done the same. Currently, Palomar College students do not have any limits on the number of units they can enroll in.

There will be discussion at the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) meetings and IPC members are to share their thoughts and concerns of credit unit enrollment limits. It will not affect Spring 2010 semester.

The Spring 2010 enrollment has 45% of the sections closed as of last Friday (12/4/09), with FTES 9% greater than last Spring. There are many more students attending Palomar and at the same time we are not offering more classes, with the possibility of trimming more classes in Spring 2010. We are 1,200 FTES above our cap, which is at least 400 classes being offered above cap without any apportionment coming from the State. We are overloaded with students and the question is how many can we really serve comfortably and reasonably. We must look at methods of equity for our students.

The Systems Office is suggesting an increase of \$40 to \$60 per credit unit and also looking at differential fees and reconsidering the appropriateness of offering recreational classes (PE).

Palomar cannot serve the masses of students coming to the college. There are safety issues in crowded classrooms, especially when it is difficult for faculty to say no to students who want to get into their classes. We do not have supply and printing budgets to support so many students, so we have to make tough decisions. We cannot delay in making these decisions or wait on legislation. Palomar has to provide stability to enrollment and access for our students and one way is by limiting the number of enrollment units. The CSU system last Fall allowed 13 units per student and then reopened to students for an additional 6 units as a two-layered enrollment process.

Discussion included limiting the number of units students can enroll in, especially for those that can take 20-30 units for successful students. Who decides who can and who cannot take the number of units. Many students enroll in extra classes to try them out and then after the first day they drop out. Many students enroll in online classes and then drop out. In the past, at one time if a student wanted to take more than 18 units, he had to have the Dean's signature, a possibility for first semester students or students with later registration dates. It is unprecedented times, but students should be allowed to take 18-19 units, although very few students take 18 units and finish. There should be access for students but service is an issue. The problem of too many students could grow as the actual number of students could increase by limiting the number of units students take. The Financial Aid office has received triple the number of applications, plus Counseling Services has an overload of students waiting for appointments. It was stated that the college wouldn't end up with the same number of students with limiting the number of units for students. The Research and Planning office has data that classes are at 89% capacity of all seats in all sections and the Centers' capacities are up too. In creating a two-tiered system, it could make it more equitable for students to get into classes. If students do not pay their fees by the first week of class, they should be dropped. There should be more enforcement of student fees, plus if there is an increase of fees to \$40-\$60 per unit, affordability is an issue compared to the current \$26 per unit. We don't know how long legislation will take with an outgoing Governor. It was suggested that fees per unit should be raised for the next academic year. Any averaging of students is not fair to the rest of the students. Data is needed first in order to make these decisions. According to Research and Planning, the most frequent number of units students take is 3 units. Full-time students must take 12 units for insurance purposes. There could be a first round of registration for students and an appeals process for the second round of registration. Misuse of the system must be reduced. There could be 18 or 19 units offered in the first round of registration with the exception students taking more units. John Jang of ASG pointed out

that students take classes they can get at Palomar and when they can't get the classes here, they go to other colleges for the classes they need. Students could be asked or polled to get their opinions.

Herman Lee is pulling data of students who take more than 18-21 units and then will track to see how many units they actually end up with at the end of the semester.

V. **2010-11 Full-time Faculty Obligation (FTFO)**

The full-time faculty obligation is based on FTES generation and the number required from the Systems Office was received on November 17, 2009. Legislation has stated that community colleges will be responsible to meet the obligation as it was in 2008. Growth is not being funded last year or next year. Palomar must meet the obligation because if we don't, a penalty is assessed against the District of \$63,000 per position, under the obligation, or can submit a waiver with justification to waive the penalty fees.

Palomar has not hired any full-time faculty in the last two years and there have been 2 retirees this year, 10 retirees last year, and 7 retirees the year before. It is a delicate balance and we cannot afford not to hire a few faculty especially when some departments are struggling. The full-time faculty obligation number is 285. President Deegan and the Vice Presidents have met and Michelle Barton has projected that to meet the obligation we need to hire 3 full-time faculty for next Fall (2010).

The decision was made to hire 6 full-time faculty to meet the obligation with some cushion. The 6 full-time faculty positions are on the priority list for 2008-09 and 2009-10:

1. Health, PE, Athletics (Baseball)
2. Chicano Studies
3. Mathematics
4. Health, PE, Athletics (Women's Head Coach)
5. Business Education
6. Theatre Arts

The commitment was made to hold to the faculty hiring priority list for two years. The District is doing what is responsible and what makes sense fiscally too. Palomar has been in a hiring freeze for two years but we must try to sustain viability of our instructional programs. The Deans and departments have been notified of the 6 full-time faculty positions to be filled and the timeline via an E-mail today (12/9/09). The 6 new full-time faculty positions will be hired in Spring 2010 to start teaching in Fall 2010. Departments have been asked to submit position authorization requests and send them to Instructional Services. In determining which six faculty would be hired, the baseline formula was applied to ensure that Counseling and librarian faculty were considered.

Other community colleges in the State have done furloughs, layoffs and have eliminated Summer classes, in comparison Palomar who has been frugal in its expenditures and by doing the best we can and doing more with less.

Shawna Hearn of Employment Services will contact departments to post the position announcements as soon as possible.

VI. **Accreditation Follow-up Reports**

The first draft of the accreditation follow-up report has been given to SPC for the first reading. Recommendations 2 & 3 have been worked on by working groups appointed by the Faculty Senate. Other Planning Councils are working on service area outcomes. Overall, there has been a tremendous amount of work and dedication in preparing the follow-up report.

The draft report will be brought to IPC in January for input. The final report goes to the Governing Board at its meeting in February, 2010 and then will be submitted to ACCJC in March, 2010. A follow-up visit by 2-3 people will take place in April, 2010. The ACCJC Commission will take action at its June, 2010 meeting with the hope that the District is removed from warning status.

Berta Cuaron thanked everyone on IPC for their work during the Fall semester and wishes everyone happy holidays and a happy new year.

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



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

November 18, 2009

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Craig Forney, C. Francis, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith, Debi Workman, John Jang – ASG, Fari Towfiq for Kathleen Sheahan

Members Absent: Debbi Claypool, Berta Cuaron, Kathleen Sheahan

Wilma Owens chaired the meeting for Berta Cuaron.

I. **Approval of September 9 & 23 Minutes and October 14 & 28 Minutes**

The minutes will be considered for approval at the next meeting.

II. & III. **PRP Spring 2009 Reviews – IPC Member Assignments & PRP Supplemental Draft**

Wilma Owens and Debi Workman volunteered to use the Emergency Medical Education (EME) program as an example for completing the Program Review & Planning (PRP) supplemental form. Even though the supplemental is still in draft form, this would give IPC members an opportunity to review and provide feedback.

There was overall discussion of the PRPS. After lengthy discussion and input from Richard Borden about whether or not to add a column for new data, there was consensus among members that we should use only the existing this first time through. Adding new data would mean that the same elements were not being evaluated on the PRP. Some other issues pointed out were:

- Not all forms were completed in the same way. This makes it very difficult to use the standardized form in the evaluation.
- All data should be on one form so that the evaluator has all data at hand in the review. Having to go to different sources to review the data increases the chances of not having a thorough review.
- This supplemental form would not work for non-instructional areas such as the Library and the Center/Site Operations. Those types of instructional programs or departments would need a different form because they don't evaluate the same kinds of data or performance measures.
- If each goal or priority needs a supplemental form, the packets will become bulky. There needs to be an inclusive form with all data and one list of priorities for a program.
- Completing the boxes left too much room for individual discretion or interpretation.
- Not knowing the budget situation or the budgeting process we will use to allocate resources makes it difficult to use the PRPs or the supplemental form. It seems that those issues should happen first. We could then design the forms to incorporate that process.

Some suggestions for immediate change to the supplemental form included:

- Develop a process to put priority requests in order, as it must have priority number order to enable disciplines to receive funding.
- Put the following statement under **Program/Discipline** (page1) – “Choose one priority from box #2 from the original PRP document, or formulate one which is based on box #2.”
- The first three boxes should be numbered 1, 2, 3 and should refer to the same number on the PRP.
- Put letters or numbers to identify boxes, not just bullets.
- Put links in box #5 to the Strategic Plan and Student Learning Outcomes.
- In box #5 for the column **Program(s) and SLO(s) addressed by this priority**, take this column out, or leave it in and define it better, or put in “Discipline/program review.” It was noted by the Faculty Senate that some disciplines don’t have SLOs, so they would have to put programs in this box.
- The gray header column should be on each page and should include specific directions as to what is being asked for.
- In **Resources Requested** gray column, add “Estimated Amount of Funding Requested” or take this column out.
- In box 4.a., **Technology**, add clue words in parentheses.
- In box 4.b., **Budget Augmentation**, add clues or examples such as “membership fees” or “accreditation visits”.
- Box #4a and #4b should be parallel.
- There should be a reference in box #4, to see the “Priority,” as an example.
- It should be clear to everyone reading this first draft that it is being used on a trial basis this first time around.

Because of time constraints, the discussion will continue at the next meeting.

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



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

October 28, 2009

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Mark Bealo, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Craig Forney, Becky McCluskey, Norma Miyamoto, Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Kathleen Sheahan, Debi Workman

Members Absent: Richard Borden, Debbi Claypool, Claudia Duran, Candi Francis, Steve McDonald, Michael Mufson, Wilma Owens, Mollie Smith

I. **Approval of September 2, 2009 Minutes**

MSC Becky McCluskey / Norma Miyamoto to approve the September 2, 2009 minutes.

II. & III. **PRP Spring 2009 Reviews – IPC Member Assignments & PRP Supplemental Form**

Berta Cuaron stated that the Program Review and Planning (PRP) Spring 2009 reviews have to be reassigned. The revised “Instruction – Institutional Program Review and Planning (PRP), Year 2 Progress Reports – Spring 2009” document with the reassignments for IPC members will be distributed. Several procedures used by colleges were consulted when developing the supplemental form. Data from Fall 2006, 2007 and 2008 can be used by departments to update their information or just use the existing information. Priorities must be identified by each discipline and resources are needed using the supplemental form. All departments must identify their priorities and it must speak back to the Strategic Plan (SP) with goals and priorities that affect Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

The PRP for Emergency Medical Education Department was used as an example for discussing how the supplemental would be used. The supplemental form would be used to identify one overall priority and all the resources needed to achieve that priority. Each priority must identify how it addresses course or program level SLOs. All disciplines will participate in this process. The supplemental form will be discussed with the Chairs/Directors and the recommended form will be forwarded to the Strategic Planning Council (SPC).

It was suggested that a cover letter be sent with the form to the Chairs/Directors and others to sunshine the document, as all IPC members are asked to discuss the form with their constituents. It was pointed out that each overall priority requires a supplemental form be completed.

Another suggestion was made to add data on retention and success rates for students by ethnicity and underserved students in order to identify priorities and resources needed to improve the outcomes of these students, particularly in online courses.

The Research and Planning Office will repopulate the 2006, 2007 and 2008 data in the PRP documents, if requested by departments. A new list of themes will be created from this process. Other Planning Councils will review the supplemental form and consider how it can be adapted to their areas. It was noted that the Vision Statement was finalized at SPC and the vote was to keep it “Learning for Success.”

Berta Cuaron stated that the IPC members are to share the PRP document and the supplemental form with their constituents and explain it to them. If the November 11th meeting of the Education & Facilities Master Plan 2022 Update Task Force (EFMPTF) does not take the whole two hours, then IPC can meet briefly to further address the supplemental form. IPC's next meeting is scheduled on November 18, 2009, from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. The updated PRP and the supplemental forms are due on February 1, 2010 to Instructional Services and Research and Planning.

IV. **Question of the Day**

The question was asked if the recent issue of E-mail complaints could be discussed at IPC since it was going to be discussed at an upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. It was stated that there needs to be protocols for use of campus E-mail with specific parameters. There could be a specific area, like a blog to address a specific issue, instead of using general E-mail. After the initial E-mail is sent, and after so many responses to the E-mail are sent, they should go to a specific area. It was stated that E-mail is used as a way to get attention, and if another venue is created, it may not solve a particular problem that someone has concerns with. The college could get to the point of libel and could have very broad implications. People have rights to privacy, and if students don't come forward with confidentiality issues through the right procedure, privacy rights of the faculty or staff member may be violated.

Does IPC have a role in E-mail complaints? Berta Cuaron stated that she will take today's feedback to SPC as general comments. President Deegan has told the Governing Board that an investigation has begun and he will report back if appropriate, at the next Governing Board meeting.

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



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

October 14, 2009

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Debbi Claypool, Berta Cuaron, Claudia Duran, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Wilma Owens, Kathleen Sheahan, Mollie Smith

Members Absent: Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Debi Workman

I. **Approval of September 2 & 23, 2009 Minutes** – Pending and forthcoming.

Berta Cuaron stated there will be a meeting of both the Education & Facilities Master Plan 2022 Update – Task Force (EFMPTF) and the Instructional Planning Council (IPC) on October 28, 2009. EFMPTF will meet from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. and IPC will meet from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. On November 11, 2009, the entire meeting, from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. will be for the EFMPTF meeting. IPC will meet on November 18, 2009, from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. All meetings will take place in Room SU-18. Both the EFMPTF and the IPC meetings on November 25, 2009 will be cancelled. Notices will be sent out and calendar changes made to update these meetings.

II. **Goals for Strategic Plan 2010-2013 (based on recent PRPs)**

Berta Cuaron stated that updating the Strategic Plan (SP) 2010-2013, is part of the recommendation from ACCJC, to ensure that planning is integrated with resource allocation. The SP has to be updated for the next three years, to reflect global goals and objectives and inclusive of the Program Review and Planning (PRPs) process. IPC has done an excellent job developing themes from the PRPs. The college needs to determine what to focus on in the next three years regarding student learning outcomes (SLOs) and student achievement. The Accreditation Recommendation #3 focuses on distance education including faculty preparedness, defining regular and effective communication between faculty and student, and evaluation from the faculty and student perspective and how well distance education serves students and supports their success. The Faculty Senate, the Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Technology Committee are discussing and developing policies and procedures on this issue. One area of focus is how well do students do in distance education classes versus face-to-face classroom instruction. The Teaching Learning Center (TLC) is serving the student population at the Escondido Center and it must be determined how/when the TLC will be replicated at the San Marcos campus.

There was discussion on broad goals and/or objectives for SP 2010-2013, which included the following comments:

1. Even though these are extremely difficult fiscal times, planning and resource allocation needs to occur to ensure that full-time faculty continue to be hired to protect academic programs, curriculum development, participation in college governance, and the development of SLOs. Along with hiring more faculty, planning should also sustain a basic level of classified staff and administrators to support the academic programs and all support services to operate Palomar.

2. Given Recommendation #3 from ACCJC and all the planning strategies being developed and implemented to address it, plan to evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies in delivering Distance Education and the outcomes on student learning and achievement. Also evaluate data and compare the achievement of students who take traditional instruction versus distance education. In addition, consider a continuity and unified look in online courses that make students feel comfortable accessing any course.
3. With the open of the TLC at Escondido, how effective has it been in supporting the needs of students and how has it affected their performance? How effective has the concept of “integrated and interdisciplinary services” been from the perspective of the students served as well as the faculty, staff, and administrators involved in the project? What have we learned, what changes would improve this project, and how can it be replicated at San Marcos and future centers?
4. Even though new construction will gradually address classroom needs, continue planning and funding for the basic and fundamental needs to maintain adequate classroom furnishings, appearance, and technology.
5. With the discussions of the new resource allocation model, compare Palomar College to other community colleges state-wide regarding what percentage of their entire budget is allocated for instructional needs and what percentage is allocated for facilities needs. Have regular reconsideration of fund amounts in each area. Have consistent policies and procedures for the budget every fiscal year. Planning should precede resource allocation and the District has to tie planning to resource allocation, which requires a major change in our resource allocation model.
6. With the difficult fiscal times and the effect on hiring, consider staffing needs and possible realignments to support instructional needs.
7. Continue supporting and providing for professional development opportunities for both faculty and support staff.
8. Continue working on strategies to improve college-wide communication and dissemination of important information and procedures for making and streamlining decision making.
9. Since the Technology Committee disbanded, there is the need for clarification of the technology process and the decision making process for district technology needs. It was noted that the Academic Technology Committee still exists.
10. The enrollment of native students at the Pauma Center is shrinking. These students need to feel overall connected with an interactive campus at the San Marcos campus and all of the Centers. How can we improve the perception of native students in reference to distance education, the need for continuity and consistency and a unified look of online education, including physically in the classrooms, students feel connected in the community.
11. Find better methods for students to give feedback on barriers, challenges, and opportunities at Palomar in order to learn about areas needing improvement that will benefit students and faculty.
12. Identify barriers, eliminate them, and provide resources to better integrate Instructional Services and Student Services. These two divisions should be integrated for student success.

13. Consider integrating labs at the Centers to maximize resources and to better serve students in one location.
14. The new Strategic Plan should be as inclusive as possible, so faculty and staff have opportunity to give input. Do a college survey to gather input of what to add to the new Strategic Plan and provide opportunity for additional comments and recommendations.
15. It is very important that the Instructional Planning Council members regularly share information with their constituencies.

III. **PRP – Amended Format for 2009-10**

Berta Cuaron stated she has been working with Michelle Barton on developing a supplemental form for the PRPs of Spring 2009 for departments to submit resource requests with more current data from Fall 2006, 2007 and 2008, if they choose to do so. It is necessary to do the supplemental form to identify priorities and to link them to budgeting and resource allocation. A draft of the supplemental form will be brought to the next meeting and will need IPC and Faculty Senate endorsement. Then departments will be asked to complete the supplemental form. The due date for the revised PRPs and completed supplemental form is no later than February 1, 2010. IPC will review them using the new planning and resource allocation models for 2010-2011.

Budget development will wait until the resource allocation model is finalized through the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) and will include the budget assumptions, obligations and formulas. IPC will review the PRPs and make recommendations for funding allocation for the accounts in the 2, 4, and 5s of budget categories. A formula will be needed to ensure base funding for each academic department for operational budgets and PRP documents will be used to fund priorities. IPC's responsibility is to look at all resource needs globally. Each Planning Council is going through the same process as IPC. The resource allocation model is being determined by SPC and the Budget Committee and the PRP documents and the SP will be the driving force of resource allocation. It still has to be determined what the base operational formula for each department will look like for day-to-day functions. Elements to consider in the base formula for instruction will be driven by FTES plus number of students served and classes taught and what happens on top of that which is unique to the department. The SP goals need to be addressed first and priorities identified at the global level which is being thoroughly discussed at the Strategic Planning retreats. It was stated that there should be a clear and more defined process to articulate to everyone involved in this planning and resource and measurable outcomes justified by the SP.

At the next meeting, the PRPs will be reassigned and be a draft of the supplemental form will be discussed. The ultimate goal is to have these documents ready for departments to use in November, 2009. The departments will be asked to update their PRPs and complete the supplemental form by February 1, 2010.

IV. **Question of the Day**

Michael Mufson asked if there was any information from the System Office in reference to hiring new faculty next year, and to date, there hasn't been any information received from the System Office.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

September 23, 2009

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Mark Bealo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Debbi Claypool, Berta Cuaron, Claudia Duran, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Kathleen Sheahan, Mollie Smith, Debi Workman

Members Absent: None

I. **Approval of September 2, 2009 Minutes** – Pending

II. **PRP Revisions and Timeline**

Berta Cuaron stated that a supplemental form will have to be developed to support the existing PRP form, which includes the Fall 2006, 2007 and 2008 data. Once the departments have completed the supplemental form, then criteria can be developed for resource allocation.

The revised “Mission Statement, September 22, 2009 SPC Draft” and the “Values September 22, 2009 Draft” were distributed. SPC has spent time working on these drafts for three to four meetings. The latest draft of the Mission Statement has attempted to embrace culture, Title 5 and the ACCJC recommendations.

The “Mission Statement” was discussed and the following suggestions were made:

The first sentence should read –

- “Our mission is to provide an engaging teaching and learning environment for students ~~of~~ with diverse origins, experiences, needs, abilities, and goals”.
- “Our mission is to provide an engaging teaching and learning environment for students ~~of~~ who have diverse origins, experience, needs, abilities, and goals”.
- “~~Our mission is~~ To provide an engaging teaching and learning environment for students of diverse origins, experience, needs, abilities, and goals”.

The “Values” was discussed and the following suggestions were made:

The last bulleted sentence could read - “~~Our presence~~ “Presence in the community.”

“~~Our presence~~ “Contribution to the community.”

“~~Our presence~~ “Partnership with the community”.

“~~Our presence~~ “Engagement with the community we serve”.

The “Vision Statement” under “Suggestions for our Vision” was discussed and the following suggestions were made: “~~Changing~~ “Enriching lives.” ~~through education~~ or “Enriching lives through education.”
“~~Transforming~~ “Changing lives through education.”

It was stated that the logo would not change, just the words in the logo.

Berta Cuaron will take these suggestions to SPC for discussion.

It was suggested to send these documents to students or to have a focus group of students in order to get their feedback.

III. **Update on ACCJC Recommendations**

The ACCJC newsletter was distributed last Wednesday (9/16/09). Everyone needs to be engaged with their responsibilities and share with their constituents and gather their input in all areas being addressed.

IV. **Question of the Day**

Kathleen Sheahan stated that in the Faculty Senate meeting this week Marty Furch shared updated questions and items in Curricunet for faculty in reference to SLOS. One of the questions related to SLOs in question #4 of the PRP asks faculty to identify resource needs to accomplish their SLOs. The question was where are these needs going and who is reading these needs listed by faculty for SLOs? Is there a process or plan for IPC to look at these needs and how to tie budgeting and planning to them.

Berta Cuaron stated that Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) will also be tied to resource allocation and planning. So when the PRP document is modified, an additional question will be added on SLOs to the PRP review process. A report can be generated to pull the data included in question #4 on SLOs. A grid will be developed for using the PRP document, creating a line item for each one of those areas where a resource might be identified and linking each resource request to a strategic plan goal and SLO in a course or program. The PRPs will be the foundation for resource allocation to departments. The process will be shared at the Chairs/Directors meeting with the expectation that all disciplines will work on this process this Fall.

V. **Other**

Michael Mufson distributed a brochure of the upcoming Performing Arts comedy, "Light Up the Sky" at the Howard Brubeck theatre from October 2-11, 2009

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

September 9, 2009

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Steve McDonald, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Kathleen Sheahan, Mollie Smith, Debi Workman

Members Absent: Claudia Duran, Becky McCluskey

I. **Approval of September 2, 2009 Minutes** – Pending

II. **PRP Revisions and Timeline**

Berta Cuaron stated the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) adopted the first three pages of the Planning Cycles (PC), driven by Program Review Planning (PRP), the Strategic Plan (SP), the Master Plan (MP), etc. The second page of the PC defines the timelines for each process and the third page validates the planning process for each of the Planning Councils. The fourth page on resource allocation is still being discussed by SPC. The Instructional Planning Council (IPC) will be taking a much more significant role when the planning process is implemented. The key elements of the Planning Cycle – PRP, is driven by the department or unit level, relying on experts in the classroom and support areas to clarify needs for their departments.

The Planning Cycle was presented to the Governing Board last night (9/1/09), taking a major step in the planning process and recognition of addressing Recommendation #1 of the ACCJC Commission. The goal is to adopt the Resource Allocation Model before the end of the semester in order to put it into place for 2010-2011. This is a huge shift for the college with more people engaged and information shared with constituents.

The two-year planning cycle of the PRPs will require creating an addendum for completion next year. It will include requests for funding amounts for priority items on PRPs. The addendum will ask departments to identify resource needs, with categories for faculty, staff, technology, capital equipment and supplies, as well as maintenance and software agreements. Departments can look at three or four year patterns of needs. Unique department needs such as annual fees and site review fees will have to be built in with annual variations. A baseline formula based on FTES will probably be established for annual general operating needs.

The PRP addendum will also focus on how allocated resources affect student learning outcomes (SLOs). This will address the ACCJC recommendation to link resources to support student learning outcomes (SLOs) and to evaluate if resources make a difference on student learning and success at the course or program level. There will also be a review of equipment purchases and how it affects student achievements in SLOs at the course or program level.

There was discussion of when departments need new classrooms and how to request and determine the costs of new classrooms. It was stated that there is a document established each year listing ongoing facilities requests of identified needs, and this information goes to the Facilities Master Plan. The PRP process is important at the department level, as they are the experts of needs in their areas. Discussion included that the planning process would involve extracting each component from the planning documents. There has to be some level of standards and criteria used for the priority process before departments complete the forms again next time. In the past, the chairs/directors have made requests that were not received and nothing resolved, so it is very important to have a planning process cycle for resource allocation.

Berta Cuaron stated that we will ask for more thorough analysis of data with detail. First, the addendum will be developed and then the criteria will be developed before the next planning process. IPC previously agreed to use the PRP data for two years, starting the new planning cycle in Spring 2009. The goal is to get a new process in place for 2010/2011 and to modify the addendum before the next planning cycle.

Further discussion included that this semester an addendum can be created without any years of data added. Then in Spring 2010 redo the form with new data and a new planning cycle. It was stated that Fall 2007 and Fall 2008 data could be added to the addendum now, using the more current and updated information. This could be a concern, as departments were told that the documents are being used for two years in resource allocation. The department chairs are willing to go through the planning process annually with concrete resource allocation requests. Two extra columns could be added that might affect comments in the progress reports and assist in the evaluation process. The reality of resource allocation is that there is just so many shrinking dollars. There are concerns when departments are asked to do resource allocation and then have to redo it again in Spring 2010, the addendum should have a note where it states it will be a part of the full report. It was stated that some departments exaggerate their needs, so departments have to prioritize, and departments will be asked to be frugal. Each of the departments looks at its needs differently.

There should be a method in the process to track allocations on a year-to-year basis, to look for trends, and this could be accomplished with priority lists. If it is a formula based allocation without funding, it could end up being a rollover budget. It is difficult to promote this change from past practice. Berta Cuaron stated that the formula driven budget has not been defined, as it is still in discussion at SPC and has to be determined in part by WSCH and FTES.

Berta Cuaron stated that the present planning documents could be used for resource allocation and IPC can decide if three or four years of data will be used. The addendum sample will be taken to the Chairs/Directors meeting. The planning process must take place before resource allocation, which was the recommendation six years ago from ACCJC. The IPC focus is to be a comprehensive community college and what it means to us as a community college. It is a difficult path that forces us to make choices. The draft of the addendum will be brought to the next meeting.

III. Update on ACCJC Recommendations

There will be an accreditation newsletter update next Wednesday, 9/16/09. Recommendation #1 was shared with IPC today. Recommendation #2 on (SLOs) gives an update on the number of courses and programs completed with the assessment plans.

It is very important that everyone stay well informed in time before the ACCJC April site visit.

IV. **Question of the Day**

The question was asked if the campus will be closed during Intersession due to the SDG&E upgrade. Berta Cuaron stated that the shut-down of the campus, basically meaning classes closed, has been planned for two years for the end of the Fall 2009 semester. SDG&E is coordinating the upgrade for the campus energy structure with the approximate start date the week of December 26, 2009 through January 4or5, 2010.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

September 2, 2009

Members Present: Alan Aquallo, Richard Borden, Judy J. Cater, Berta Cuaron, Craig Forney, Candi Francis, Becky McCluskey, Steve McDonald, Norma Miyamoto, Michael Mufson, Zeb Navarro, Sue Norton, Wilma Owens, Kathleen Sheahan, Debi Workman, Claudia Duran-ASG Rep.

Members Absent: Lisa Romain, Mollie Smith

Members of the Council introduced themselves.

I. Approval of April 8, 2009 Minutes

MSC Judy J. Cater / Debi Workman to approve the April 8, 2009 minutes, with the following correction, under V. AMB&CS Division Name Change, the first sentence should read: Norma Miyamoto stated that the AMB&CS division name will change from Arts, Media, Business and ~~Computing Systems~~ to Arts, Media, Business and Computer Science. The following motion should read: **MSC Mark Vernoy, Wilma Owens to approve the AMB&CS division name to Arts, Media, Business and Computer Science.**

Approval of April 22, 2009 Minutes

MSC Candi Francis / Wilma Owens to approve the April 22, 2009 minutes.

II. Accreditation Recommendations

The “Recommendations from ACCJC Commission – June 30, 2009” and “Recommendation #3 from ACCJC Commission – June 30, 2009” were distributed. Berta Cuaron stated that these documents were shared at the Faculty Plenary. The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) has been working very hard on addressing Recommendation #1 (integrated long range planning, evaluation, and resource allocation) and the planning model will be reviewed today. In Recommendation #2 (student learning outcomes) the Student Learning Outcomes Council and leadership group is taking the revised timeline to the Curriculum Committee today. Recommendation #2 was taken to the Curriculum Committee last week, and then to the Faculty Senate, who has adopted the revised timeline. In addition, revised questions for the program SLOs are being developed and a small group has been convened to look at two software programs that will house all of the assessment information that faculty and others have begun to gather. We have been aggressive in moving forward to address this recommendation. One of the key steps will be to move us into the assessment cycle starting with a very small percentage of courses going through the assessment cycle this fall semester.

Recommendation #3 (distance education-ensure all aspects are comparable to face-to-face instruction). The Faculty Senate has working groups looking at this recommendation. The three items called out in this recommendation include a process of professional development and a plan that ensures there are some minimums that all faculty participate in if teaching any portion of a course via distance education,

including through online, TV, and other media. Second, we need to address distance education in the curriculum process and define a minimum for regular, effective communication and interaction between faculty members and students, just as is expected from traditional instruction. This part of the recommendation was made more specific in Title 5 changes two years ago. Third, steps need to be taken to improve student feedback and evaluation of their distance education learning experiences. Like many other colleges, it is a struggle to have a good return rate and at best we get 6-8% of students that take courses through distance education that complete the online evaluations. This doesn't really give us a lot of feedback from students, especially when there is an evaluation process for a probationary faculty member or a faculty member going through the tri-annual evaluation period. We are looking at a number of venues to improve student distance education evaluations. Some colleges have imposed the evaluation as a requirement before students have access to the mid-term or final exam. This might be the direction to go to ensure more student feedback. The Faculty Senate working groups have aggressively been working on this recommendation.

The follow-up report to the ACCJC Commission needs to be completed in December, 2009, as the report must go to the Governing Board in January or February, 2010 for approval, and submitted to the ACCJC Commission in March, 2010.

In Recommendation # 4 (Board of Trustees policies), Monika Brannick and Brent Gowen have been working on this very closely with John Tortarolo and Berta Cuaron, looking at ways to remedy this recommendation.

The original site visit exit report included 13 verbalized recommendations and after hard work, the Commission gave 4 recommendations, with two of them being part of our self-study planning agendas. There is much work to be done and each and every one of us needs to be fully engaged in this work, however it affects your responsibilities. The key point is documentation, and more documentation, with evidence and proof that we have completed the work and implemented the recommendations. As important, when a follow-up team visits the campus and talks to individuals in the Spring, there needs to be more awareness that the entire college community has been engaged in all the work and not just a small number of people. Regular accreditation newsletters will be sent monthly, so everyone is apprised as to how we are proceeding. We cannot become complacent; this work is on the shoulders of each and every one of us.

Clarification on Recommendation 4 (Board of Trustees policies) concerns the evaluation process of senior administrators and the process that had been used by the Faculty Senate. This process was used outside of the evaluation process currently approved in the Governing Board policy and therefore violated policy and had to be discontinued.

III. Proposed Planning and Resource Allocation Model

Documents entitled, "Community-Master Plans-Educational Plans-Strategic Plan-Program Review & Planning-Students"; Palomar College Planning Cycles"; "Program Review and Planning Flowchart"; and "Integrated Planning, Budget Development, and Resource Allocation Model," were distributed and discussed.

Berta Cuaron stated that during summer, SPC held several special meetings with an expanded working group with representation from all constituencies to continue work on the revised planning process.

One of the issues in Recommendation #1 was that our planning cycles did not speak to each other and more importantly our resource allocation did not necessarily reflect the planning we say we are doing. There were two key issues that we had to address but were not able to do so. First, we need to define all of the planning cycles, and second, to show how we are allocating our resources based on what we say are our priorities based on planning.

Yesterday, SPC adopted the first three pages of this document, the fourth page deals with resource allocation and is still being discussed separately. The planning cycle is defined for the Master Plan to be every 12th year and a check-in every 6 years, to coincide with the accreditation timeline. Part of Recommendation #1 was that we don't have a staffing plan but only have a procedure for identifying priorities for faculty positions. A staffing plan should address priority needs for classified staff, supervisors and administrators. An updated technology plan, staffing and capital plans will be developed on a 6-year cycle to complement the two-year program review and planning process. The strategic plan will be a 3-year cycle and is short term in nature. Program review and planning (PRP) that IPC is very involved in will be a 2-year cycle with the 1st year being the plan and the 2nd year being the check-in, progress report and update. The PRP process will be the key document that will drive most of the resource allocation of discretionary funds.

The ultimate focus on planning and resource allocation should be to positively affect the classroom and the educational experience for our students. The driving force should be our 2-year (PRP) process that will be defined based on the goals and objectives from the SP. In our program review and planning, we'll be asking departments and units that everything they do should speak back to the SP. The first two years we've done in program review has been outstanding with a lot of forward thinking and vision from faculty. The key piece that has to be done is to modify the program review process so there is always a resource request within that planning document and there is always a link back to the SP. IPC will be much more involved in program review and planning, and even more so in setting priorities, depending on the resource allocation model that is adopted. We've defined our planning cycles with a bottom-up approach that starts at the department or unit level, speaking up to the 3-year strategic planning process, the 2-year program review, and the other planning cycles for facilities, staffing and capital equipment plans. There has not been a capital equipment plan in the past. With good planning, we should not be surprised when a large or expensive piece of equipment goes out and it has not been identified as needing funding. We have to be able to anticipate those expenses much as we do now when software licenses need to be renewed or updated. We cannot operate in this method anymore and with good planning for future needs we can avoid this. The challenge will be putting the planning cycles into practice.

The PRP documents start at the department level, submitted to the Dean, Instructional Services, and then to IPC for review and analysis. Based on the PRPs, IPC will establish priorities as a Planning Council. Whether or not we send the priorities to SPC is still a discussion taking place. SPC may look at the planning priorities and if something is out of place and does not fit into one of the strategic goals or objectives, then SPC can ask for more information. It's more important to keep decision making and prioritization at the council level where more of the expertise exists. The resource allocation model discussions at SPC have been on what are budget assumptions, what are obligations, and what might be funded off the top, either as a percentage or dollar amount. There is still a lot of extensive discussion to take place on the resource allocation model.

At the next meeting, we will look at the PRP document to get the funding cycle into the process. The real goal is to implement the new resource allocation model in 2010-2011. We won't know until we try it,

implement it, give it a year or two, then take a step back to see what is working or not and revise it. It was suggested that the first page of the new planning cycles document have a box drawn outside the words Community and Students, so it is all encompassing, as both are embedded at all levels. Berta Cuaron will take this suggestion to SPC.

IV. Program Review and Planning

The Program Review and Planning (PRP) will be discussed at the next meeting. Departments will be asked to add approximate costs of items requested for the documents to be used next year. The Institutional Review and Planning form will have to be revised with an addendum being considered to adapt to the new resource allocation model.

V. Education & Facilities Master Plan 2022 Update Task Force (EDMPTF)

The Education & Facilities Master Plan 2022 Update Task Force (EDMPTF) meetings have been scheduled for September 23, 2009 – from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. in Room SU-18 and October 14, 2009 – from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. in Room SU-18.

VI. Question of the Day

Judy J. Cater asked if the current faculty hiring priority list would still be used if faculty are hired or if it would be revised since it is now almost two years old.

Berta Cuaron stated that last year it was agreed that the same faculty priority list would be retained for one more year, and this was the IPC recommendation to SPC. If the District does not hire faculty this year for 2010-2011, there will be a discussion with the IPC Subcommittee as to whether or not the priority list is retained for one more year or if new requests will need to be submitted and a new priority list developed.

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