

ACC Meeting Name: Institutional Planning Council

DRAFT Minutes

Meeting Date: April 18, 2008

Time: 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

Location: HBC Room 201.0

Chair: Soon Merz

Members Present: Richard Armenta, Stephanie Diina-Dempsey, Dan Dydek, David Fonken, Rebecca Francis, Donetta Goodall, Lyman Grant, Richard Griffiths, Mary Harris, Eileen Klein, Mary Kohls, Brette Lea, Soon Merz, Bill Mullane, Jim Nelson, Suzanne Ortiz, Charles Quinn, George Reyes, Patty Salazar, Gaye Lynn Scott, Kirk White, Voncille Wright, Neil Vickers, Roslyn Wallace

Absent: Terry Bazan, David Borden, Lisa Buck, Yolanda Chapa, Kathleen Christensen, Maggie de la Teja, Mariano Diaz-Miranda, Ivan Doyle, Ben Ferrell, Sharon Frederick, Virginia Fraire, Sandy Gaskin, Gary Hampton, Mary Hensley, Amber Kelley, Maria Lyle, Mike Midgley, Imad Mouchayleh, Lynn Persyn, Luanne Preston, Linda Smarzik, Richard Smith, Louella Tate, Marilyn Lee Taylor, Julie Todaro, Gerry Tucker, Hazel Ward, Gary Weseman, Josh Whitcomb, Linda Young

Agenda Items A & B: Welcome & Agenda Review

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

Soon welcomed everyone to the IPC Meeting and reviewed the agenda for the day's meeting which included a review of the SACS 5th Year Interim Report, review of Master Plan process, and review of IPC functions.

Agenda Item C: Review Minutes of the Council

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

IPC members reviewed minutes from the February 15, 2008 council meeting.

Decisions:

Dan Dydek motioned to approve the minutes and was seconded by Charles Quinn. The minutes were unanimously approved by the council members.

Agenda Item D: SACS 5th Year Interim Report

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

Soon explained to IPC that ACC is responsible for completing a more detailed SACS 5th Year Interim Report than previously thought. After the last reaffirmation which was finally completed in 2005 it was expected that ACC would only have to respond to the two recommendations on faculty credentials and the roles of the Board and Administration. Soon, however, recently talked with Jack Allen, ACC's SACS representative and was told that SACS now requires the completion of a more complex report and that the next reaffirmation will now be in 2013. The SACS 5th Year Interim Report is divided into five parts.

- I. Signatures Attesting to Integrity
- II. Abbreviated Institutional Summary Form Prepared for Commission Reviews
- III. Abbreviated Compliance Certification
- IV. Additional requested information
- V. Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan

Soon said that the federal government is requiring reports to be more frequent than every 10 years. The goal is to have the 5th-year interim report completed by the end of June to be reviewed by the SACS on-site team which will be visiting in August. Soon wants to receive their feedback on the report before officially submitting it in October.

Decisions:

Soon said that this report will be shared with IPC. Any help members can provide will be appreciated. The due date for the report is October 1, 2008.

Agenda Item E: Review MP Process

Presenter: Soon Merz and Roslyn Wallace

Discussion:

Soon reminded IPC members that every year IPC has debated possible modifications to improve the Master Plan process. With this in mind, Soon divided the IPC members into three small groups to discuss what works, what doesn't work and whether or not the Master Plan meets SACS requirements. The groups debated among themselves these issues and wrote their key points on easel pads. A representative from each group then reported back to the IPC as a whole. The key points are listed below for each group:

Group 1 responded:

1. Some Cluster Groups may not have representatives.
2. The Master Plan process is not easy to explain.
3. Do we meet SACS definition?
4. Allotment of initiatives should be weighed.

Group 2 responded:

1. The process is more functional than in the past.
2. Facilities are not tied to initiatives.
 - a. Where in the process do you want to plug in facilities?
 - b. Some areas do not need facilities at first; others need to be considered up front.
 - c. We do not have flexible space. The college needs to add a lot of space.
 - d. We need to consider Master Plan initiatives vs. funding availability.
3. We are improving the process but not to the 3 year plan.

Group 3 responded:

1. The process is well organized and improved over the years.
2. The Master Plan should be who we are and where we want to go.
3. Think plan should be 3 to 5 years.
4. Meet SACS requirements? We are not sure, as we do not go back to check to see if we met the requirements.

Soon said that initially she separated the planning from the budgetary aspects of the MP because the budgetary side tended to obfuscate the planning function. The goal was to strengthen the planning function by emphasizing the importance of planning first and then budgeting based on our plans. However, all along it was her intention to re-integrate the two functions. What we now may need to do is to introduce a three year time frame for the initiatives into the budget. Although the budget may be an annual process at least the second and third initiative cost estimates can be reminders of potential costs. If IPC thinks this is a good idea, we will start talking about making this happen. Neil responded that incorporating cost estimates into the budget facilitates the budgetary process especially with the Board. The Board can then be better informed of potential costs when approving items and when these items come up again at future meetings does not need to rehash old issues as they have already considered, debated and approved plans based on the long-term costs.

1. Soon said that when initiatives are put in the Master Plan, they should have where feasible a three year time-frame with careful cost estimates.
2. Donetta said that we will need to leave some wiggle room on the three year cost estimate.
3. Neil said to be sure you add all components in original request.
4. Dan pointed out that plan needs to be flexible and a three year time frame may soon become dated and not reflect best practices.

Although this item was not on the agenda a related issue is the performance measures for the initiatives. Soon stated are considering incorporating the core indicators into the process and hopefully relating the initiatives to the core indicators.

IPC discussed the need to identify the impact of initiatives on facilities. Facilities needs a year or two lead time to accommodate new requests for space with a few exceptions. Bill noted that new faculty and staff are often hired and show up for work with no space having been allocated for them. In the past facilities has been able to find space but right now ACC frankly doesn't have any new space -- we are out of closet space! Donetta also noted that the faculty hiring plan initiative does not incorporate plans for offices. Soon said in the future initiatives there will be a question on what are the facilities needs. Neil observed that there are initiatives that have been approved but cannot implement because of a lack of space.

Soon asked IPC if they have any other suggestions to improve the Master Plan process. Gaye Lynn noted that IPC needs more data to make informed decision. Soon responded that OIEA was working to provide more data in addition to the retreat notebook. The addition of the DB programmers to the OIEA staff should facilitate the production of more data to assist in the decision making process. They had just came back from a visit to Baylor and were gaining some important information on developing a longitudinal database and facilitating report production. Soon also suggested that next year, we invite programs that are in the IPR cycle to present the results of their review before the IPC.

Agenda Item F: Review IPC Functions

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

This topic will be handled by email.

Agenda Items G : Adjourn

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

Soon thanked everyone for a profitable meeting. Meeting adjourned at 3:30

Next Meeting Date: June 20, 2008

Time: 1:30 to 3:30pm

Location: HBC # 201