

ACC Meeting Name: Institutional Planning Council

Minutes

Meeting Date: November 16, 2007

Time: 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

Location: HBC Room 103.2

Chair: Soon Merz

Members Present: Richard Armenta, Terry Bazan, Lisa Buck, Yolanda Chapa, Kathleen Christensen, Dan Dydek, David Fonken, Sandy Gaskin, Donetta Goodall, Richard Griffiths, Lyman Grant, Gary Hampton, Amber Kelley, Eileen Klein, Mary Kohls, Linda Kluck, Brette Lea, Soon Merz, Virginia Murillo, Jim Nelson, Suzanne Ortiz, Charles Quinn, George Reyes, Gaye Lynn Scott., Marilyn Lee Taylor, Terry Thomas, Rosyln Wallace, Gary Weseman, Kirk White

Absent: David Borden, Mariano Diaz-Miranda, Maggie de la Teja, Stephanie Diina-Dempsey, Ivan Doyle, Ben Ferrell, Sharon Frederick, Mary Harris, Mary Hensley, Maria Lyle, Mike Midgley, Imad Mouchayleh, Bill Mullane, Lynn Persyn, Luanne Preston, Linda Smarzik, Richard Smith, Louella Tate, Susan Thomason, Julie Todaro, Gerry Tucker, Neil Vickers, Hazel Ward, Josh Whitcomb, Voncille Wright, Linda Young

Agenda Items A: 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 an overview of the master plan prioritization process and a group discussion and small group exercise on the Core Indicators. After the Core Indicators discussion and exercise Terry was scheduled to review the functional mission-related areas from her handout at the last meeting. Soon noted at future meetings we will have an agenda review at the beginning of the meeting to introduce the topics to be covered as well as to provide another opportunity to council members to add a topic to the agenda.

Agenda Item B: Review Minutes of the Council

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

IPC members reviewed minutes from the October 19, 2007 council meeting.

Decisions:

Rosyln voted to approve the minutes but she is ex-officio. An IPC council member then moved to approve the minutes and a second concurred with the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved by the council members.

Agenda Item C: Overview of the MP Prioritization Process**Presenter:** Soon Merz**Discussion:**

Soon stated that at that moment the cluster groups should have been entering MP initiatives into the MP database. If we had been on schedule at this November meeting we would have had the presentations of the initiatives but we are behind in the process. Soon stated that the presentations are important and worked well last year because they provide an opportunity for the cluster group leaders to provide additional information and it is very beneficial to hear the rationale for the initiatives in person. Soon explained the need to have the prioritization of the initiatives completed before the budget opens at the end of February or the beginning of March. Cluster group leaders have to have enough time to notify the units which initiatives have been moved over to the budget so the units can start preparing their own budget requests. As a consequence IPC only has December or January to meet to prioritize. Terry and Soon with council members discussed various possible meeting dates in December and in January. Various dates in December were discussed but eliminated as not being feasible. IPC members then discussed various dates in January; the 18th seemed to be the best.

Terry stated that because she is new to the process when the cluster group members present the initiatives what exactly are they going to tell us? Soon responded that generally the cluster group leaders tell us what the initiative is, and its rationale, that is, why it's important. The presentations also provide an opportunity for the cluster group leaders to respond to any questions about the initiatives including their components such as their objectives. Kathleen noted that these initiatives are for the 09-11 MP. Soon stated that was correct. Kathleen then asked about the 07-08 initiatives. Soon clarified that we are reporting on the 07-08 initiatives and that we are also inputting the 09-11 requests for the Master Plan. Soon then asked council members if they thought they could do both and that is this a workable plan by January 18th?

Terry asked about how we conduct the voting. Soon stated we create a ballot. Rosyln added that everybody gets a certain number of votes and they choose that ones that they think the college should be paying attention to for the 2009-2012 year.

Rosyln asked about the presentation format. Soon stated that the cluster group leaders will have a limit of 5 minutes. Soon then asked if council members had any more questions about the timeline?

Soon asked for a vote regarding January 18th as a meeting time. A majority of IPC council members approved January 18th as the next IPC meeting time. Soon then summarized the process that on January 18th the cluster group leaders will present their clusters' initiatives and IPC members will have the opportunity to see if some of the initiatives are related or can be combined in any way. After the presentations IPC will conduct the vote via e-mail.

A council member, that also is a member of the facilities taskforce, noted that there needs to be an additional step added to the process because many of the initiative have an impact on facilities. Soon asked at what point then does facilities want to see the initiatives. Rosyln responded that at the last meeting Bill Mullane said that facilities does not want to see all the initiatives only those that have been prioritized to go into the budget.

Another question was asked whether or not there is a field, when the initiative is entered into the system, that asks if this initiative has an impact on facilities?

Soon responded “no” the field is in reference to the objective. Soon noted that she will work with facilities, and the facilities taskforce in anyway she can to facilitate the process.

Rosyln asked for a clarification of the new program review cluster group.

Soon stated that this year we are adding a program review cluster so that all of the initiatives from the program review cluster will have a doorway into the master plan process, and it’s a direct doorway. Each program that does an in-depth self-study this year will have one initiative that they can enter into the cluster as an initiative. They will have another month to do this. The leaders of this cluster group have yet to be determined but for right now the initiatives can be submitted to OIEA and we can enter them in. A discussion then followed about the review process for the initiatives generated from the program review cluster group. Soon noted that because the schedules of the MP & Program Review process are not synchronized it does not look like that the initiatives will have a chance to be reviewed, but that we can certainly share the initiatives with the IPC council members and that we should give credit instruction clusters access to the program reviews.

Rosyln then noted that it would be worth revisiting the program review schedule and that it may be better to start the process at a different time of the year. If the process was started in the spring semester as opposed to the fall it would give programs the ability then to know when the planning process starts, what they’re going to put in as their initiatives and then they can go through the regular process. Rosyln added that the aspect we loss sight of is that supposedly all the initiatives that go into the master plan process should be related to one of the college-wide goals. Rosyln concluded that we should be trying to set up a document or a process that we can point to when SACS asks “Are you all doing planning that is related to the budget.” If it is simply as list of requests for new money then she does not think they are going to be too convinced that we are actually planning.

Decisions:

IPC council member voted to hold an additional meeting on Janaury 18th to prioritize initiatives.

Agenda Item D: Core Indicators Revisions

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

Soon stated in reference to Rosyln's comments about planning that this topic segways into the next activity which is the core indicators. The core indicators are going to become an integral part of the planning and assessment. Dr. Kinslow's goal is for the core indicators to measure our institutional effectiveness specifically our progress towards student retention, success, etc.

Soon then introduced to IPC the small group exercise. IPC members were split into three groups and each group was assigned one of 3 core indicators, and provided with a handout (listed below). Soon stated what we would like for you as a group to do is look at what the core indicator is and answer the following questions: What is the importance of the indicator?, How are we tracking this information currently?, Where are we in terms of performance? Where do we want to be? and How do we get there?

Core Indicator 1: Student Goal Attainment

Definition:

The proportion of students whose goals for attaining a college education upon enrolling or during attendance in a college were met upon exit from the college.

Recommended Data Collection Method: Using a survey

- Capture students' goals at entry
- Determine whether their goals have been met
- Determine if goals have not been met, have they changed

Additional Methods:

- At entry, ask students to rate how important it is to achieve specific goals
 - Learning to communicate better in writing
 - Work more effectively in groups
 - Learn skills that will enable them to advance in their jobs
 - Etc.
- At exit, ask student to rate how well they achieved these goals

Core Indicator 2: Persistence

Definition:

The proportion of students who enrolled for the first time at the beginning of one academic year and who

1. were still enrolled for at least one credit at the beginning of the next academic year, and
2. had not yet completed a degree or certificate.

Recommended Data Collection Method: For each fall semester

- Identify entering student cohort (first time students) for the fall semester
- In subsequent fall semester, determine the percentage of students from the identified cohorts that are enrolled for at least one credit hour.
- Develop longitudinal database to track students from entry to exit
 - Enrollments
 - Degrees/certificates awarded

Core Indicator 3: Graduation Rates

Definition:

The proportion of students who enrolled in and subsequently completed a degree or certificate program.

Recommendation Data Collection Method: Develop a database to track student completions

- In addition to the standard graduation rates required by IPEDS, include graduation rates for all students, full- and part-time.
- In addition to the standard 3 year calculation, include longer periods of time

Additional Methods:

- Report data for full-time, first-time-in-college students versus other students in the cohort.
- Report data according to whether students completed 12 or more credits
- Report data according to whether students reports "degree attainment" as an initial or current goal.
- Report data separately for students reported as successfully transferring to a 4-year college or obtaining program-related employment without having earned a degree or certificate from a community college.

Soon then moderated a discussion of the three indicators beginning with Core Indicator # 1 Goal Attainment. Group # 1 reported that they considered this indicator, goal attainment, to be important because it helps the college understand and align the goals of the college with that of the students. The spokesperson for Group # 1 in response to the question, how are we tracking the information currently? stated ACC asks them what their goals are during the registration and application process. And then of course, we measure graduation, follow-up studies etc. In reference to where we want to be, ACC needs to identify what helps students achieve their goals and also to identify barriers to goal attainment. How do we get there? One suggestion from this group was exit-interviews of those who didn't complete their goals, and then the other suggestion was to interview students who did complete their goals to determine how and why they were successful.

Dan pointed out that just because something is salient to the measurement process does not mean that it is necessarily of value. He also raised the issue of what happens when a student's goals change. Richard and other IPC members discussed the issue of at what level should we measure goal attainment: course goals, semester goals, time at ACC.

Richard also cautioned that just because a student articulates a goal doesn't mean that it has been informed by the advisory process.

The group discussion then shifted to graduation rates and the need to consider more than one core indicator at time. Kirk mentioned that what is interesting is comparing graduation with transfer rates. Kirk noted that the numbers aren't necessarily showing that we are doing a bad job and that other institutions may have a different mix of students than ACC.

Soon responded to Kirk's comment by concurring with him about the importance of triangulating data from several indicators to obtain the full picture. Soon noted that our students are primarily part-time and though they may start out full-time they often switch to part-time status. Therefore they take longer to graduate and if we examine ACC's 6-year graduation rate it is higher than our peer averages in the state and higher than the state average.

The discussion continued with important points made by the following council members:

Mary pointed out that when we do an articulation agreement it is really no advantage to the student to graduate because they don't take them in after the first two years.

Soon mentioned we also need to think about completions. The performance funding that has been instituted by the legislature provides for a certain amount of money for every completion.

Donetta suggested that an additional factor to consider is urban institutions and that we need to consider how we look compared to these institutions.

Roslyn commented that what we need to consider about we as an institution believe should be the outcome for the students in terms of graduating. Do we care if we have our students achieve degrees or is that something we see as not necessity because we have a belief that they will all transfer anyway or be employable with a certificate.

Terry observed that we are using graduation rates for two different purposes. We are using them: 1) to show outside agencies that we are successful and to obtain more funding; and 2) we are supposed to be using these to figure out how we can be better as an institution, that is how can we improve curriculum, facilities etc. Terry noted that these two uses can be at cross-purposes --on the hand you are trying to come up with data that shows that as an institution we deserve more money, but we are also trying to figure out how to improve as an institution.

Richard noted that we need to understand our student and that their academic progression is not linear. Richard emphasized that the students don't come to ACC, complete all their coursework here, and then leave. Some of the students are co-enrolled at other institutions and that we cannot necessarily expect that they are going to complete a program here or that it is to their advantage to complete a program here.

Donetta commented that so much of what we as an institution do is related to what is happening at other institutions and that other institutions have higher graduation rates because of state-wide matriculation agreements.

Virginia noted that one of the reasons students leave is they don't have anyway to pay and that sometimes we act like we don't want them here.

Soon observed that community college's value serving community and as a consequence we don't have a lot of rigid rules.

Sandra commented that ACC does not provide very good customer service by allowing students to enroll in courses they are not ready for.

Gary suggested that we make a broad assumption that all students have a goal. Actually we are here to help them set goals.

Soon thanked everyone for their contributions and a very lively and informative discussion. The discussion on the core indicators will continue at future meetings.

Agenda Item E: Review Functional & Mission-related Areas (Terry's handout)

Presenter: Terry Thomas

Discussion: Due to a lack of time this discussion was postponed to a future meeting.

Agenda Items F & G : Announcements & Adjourn

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

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

Next Meeting Date: January 18, 2008

Time: 1:30 to 3:30pm

Location: HBC # 201