

# ACC Meeting Name: Institutional Planning Council

## Minutes

**Meeting Date:** October 19, 2007

**Time:** 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

**Location:** HBC Room 201

**Chair:** Soon Merz

**Members Present:** Richard Armenta, Yolanda Chapa, Kathleen Christensen, Mariano Diaz-Miranda, David Fonken, Sandy Gaskin, Donetta Goodall, Richard Griffiths, Mary Harris, Carla Jackson for Linda Young, Brette Lea, Soon Merz, Mike Midgley, Terry Mouchayleh for Gerry Tucker, Bill Mullane, Suzanne Ortiz, Gaye Lynn Scott, Louella Tate, Marilyn Lee Taylor, Terry Thomas, Rosyln Wallace, Kirk White

**Absent:** Terry Bazan, David Borden, Lisa Buck, Maggie de la Teja, St ephanie Diina-Dempsey, Ivan Doyle, Dan Dydek, Ben Ferrell, Sharon Frederick, Lyman Grant, Gary Hampton, Mary Hensley, Amber Kelley, Eileen Klein, Mary Kohls, Linda Kluck, Maria Lyle, Imad Mouchayleh, , Virginia Murillo, Jim Nelson, Lynn Persyn, Luanne Preston, Charles Quinn, George Reyes, Linda Smarzik, Richard Smith, Susan Thomason , Julie Todaro, Gerry Tucker, Neil Vickers, Hazel Ward, Gary Weseman, Josh Whitcomb, Voncille Wright, Linda Young

---

**Agenda Items A:** Welcome & Introductions

**Presenter:** Soon Merz

**Discussion:**

Soon welcomed everyone to the IPC Meeting.

---

**Agenda Item B:** Review Minutes of the Council

**Presenter:** Soon Merz

**Discussion:**

IPC members reviewed minutes from the September 21, 2007 council meeting.

**Decisions:**

Louella motioned to approve the minutes and Sandy seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

---

---

**Agenda Item C: Performance Indicators FY 07-09**

**Presenter:** Rosyln Wallace

**Discussion:**

Rosyln distributed Master Plan Initiative assessment plans for 2007 to Cluster Group Leaders at IPC. The assessment plans were entered into ULEAD in the fall of 2006 and must now be updated with the results and improvements (if any). Rosyln noted that even if the unit did not receive funding for an initiative, the assessment plan still needed to be updated; the fact that the initiative was not funded was important and should be entered into ULEAD. Soon also noted that it is important to document when some initiatives are only partially funded because the Master Plan report is reviewed by the Board. Rosyln reiterated the importance of setting target values. Kathleen asked if the targets can be adjusted if an initiative is not fully funded. Rosyln stated they cannot; rather the fact that they were not funded (or implemented) should be documented. Donetta asked what is the outcome of not getting fully funded and Soon responded that is what we want to document.

Potential changes to the initiative process and the need for both an additional step and/or for more details to be entered were discussed. Bill Mullane mentioned that initiatives with a facilities component sometimes were funded but then needed remodeling. The problem is a subsequent initiative would say “remodeling needed” but there was no specific information provided. Mike noted that there needs to be an additional step inserted into the process. Soon responded that there is not a specific place in the MP database for more specific information, and perhaps we need to insert a step where the cluster group leaders consider how initiatives will impact facilities. Louella suggested bundling more information together to facilitate decision making. Soon interjected that the IPC’s 5-year plan will help with bundling information together and estimating the costs of the full project. Terry also noted the need for details to be entered (staff, additional capital) for initiatives. Soon responded that we will look at the MP database to see if we can add more details.

---

## **Agenda Item D: Core Indicators Revisions**

**Presenter:** Soon Merz

### **Discussion:**

IPC members were split into four groups and asked to answer 3 questions about core indicators, in part using the “Core Indicators of Effectiveness for Community Colleges” :

1. What are core indicators?
2. Why do we need core indicators?
3. How do we use them?

Each group then reported back to the entire IPC and a lively discussion ensued.

The following is an example of one of the group’s answers:

1. What are core indicators? “Performance data gathering structures to compare performance to mission.”
2. Why do we need core indicators?
  - a. Track progress, assess performance and goal achievement
  - b. Demonstrate performance to stakeholders
3. How do we use them
  - a. To determine where we are in relation to mission
  - b. To discover what/where we need to improve

Another group mentioned that the core indicators can be revised because at times we need to refocus and revise our mission. Kathleen stated the graduation rate is an example of a need to redefine or clarify our mission: the graduation rate should be based on a cohort composed of students who come here to obtain a degree and graduate. Soon mentioned that it is important to note that there is a difference between an indicator and a core indicator, and that the process involves making choices about what is important to measure. Kathleen pointed out that institutional averages are not useful to units. Terry and Richard agreed with Kathleen. Terry stated that we have to figure out a way to tell the true and accurate picture, and Richard stated that way to change is at the unit level. Soon, in response, stated that we cannot have 100 core indicators, and Rosyln pointed out that we need to think as an institution and not just as units. Soon stated, to provide an accurate context, that what we have to do is to have our own core indicators and have good data behind them. Mariano pointed out that Kathleen’s suggestion is not in conflict with this goal. Mike summarized the discussion and crystallized the main point by observing that the key is to have the unit level and the core indicators align and that what Rosyln was saying was that in the past some units had developed their own measures on an ad-hoc basis. Soon thanked everyone for lively discussion and noted that each group contributed unique points to the discussion

---

## **Agenda Item E: Seven Wonders Questions & IPC 5-year plan process**

**Presenter:** Terry Thomas & Soon Merz

### **Discussion:**

Terry distributed 2 handouts to IPC members. The first handout on strategic planning summarized the purposes of strategic planning and how a strategic plan can best be implemented. On this handout, Terry also outlined the functional & mission-related areas that are or should be addressed in a Master Plan. Terry stated that she developed these functional areas to categorize the initiatives with the goal of helping IPC focus on the institution's goals during the prioritization process. On the second handout Terry categorized the Seven Wonders Questions, Master Plan Initiatives and ongoing initiatives from FY07 under each of the functional areas. Terry stated that she converted the Seven Wonders Questions into statements. We need to consider whether there are any other functional categories and within each category whether we have covered everything. Terry stated at the next IPC meeting we can brainstorm and review the categories.

Soon distributed a flow chart of the relationship between the IPC 5-year plan and the Master Plan. Soon stated, in reference to the flow chart, that IPC will use the 5-year plan to monitor what goes into the Master Plan. Mariano asked if the cluster groups are going to be providing input to the IPC. He noted that the members of the cluster groups are not appointed through the shared governance process. Mariano also pointed out that the cluster groups are a parallel structure that is not beholden or accountable to the people they represent. Rosyln provided some history to the discussion of the cluster groups. Rosyln stated that before we had cluster groups, individual units did their own planning and provided individual input into the Master Plan. In 2002, President Kinslow wanted functional areas to meet together and function as a team "cluster". Mike and Donetta both noted the cluster groups did have some advantages. Mike observed that cluster groups disseminate draft initiatives to department chairs for review and their input. Donetta also noted that cluster groups facilitate planning across administrative lines, greater understanding, and that they remove an element of competition. Gaye Lynn commented in reference to the organizational structure and reporting relationships that IPC has representation from all constituencies. Terry, however, agreed with Mariano that the cluster groups bypass shared governance, and that an example of this is the instructional cluster group which has one faculty member who was not appointed by the faculty senate. Terry also pointed out there are no adjunct faculty or classified employees in the 11 cluster groups. Mariano then observed that the lowest level of input into the cluster groups is actually the lowest level of administration and not the highest level of faculty.

Soon responded that we should stick with the cluster groups for now. The membership concerns could be addressed by appointing IPC members to the cluster groups. In conclusion to the discussion, Mike stated that cluster groups do work fairly well to have issues discussed at the micro level, and to open up the process because most of the initiatives ultimately come from the departments. Mariano suggested considering having the cluster groups be formal subcommittees of IPC, and that the faculty senate will discuss cluster groups. Soon stated that it has been a concern of hers that not every member of IPC is on a cluster group and we will discuss cluster groups again at the next meeting.

---

**Agenda Items F & G :** Announcements & Adjourn

**Presenter:** Soon Merz

**Discussion:**

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

---

**Next Meeting Date:** November 16, 2007

**Time:** 1:30 to 3:30pm

**Location:** HBC # 103.2