

## ACC Institutional Planning Council Meeting

Meeting Date: April 17, 2009  
Meeting Time: 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm  
Location: HBC 201

Members present: S. Merz, R. Armenta, T. Bazan, N. Bell, D. Dydek, V. Fraire, R. Griffiths, S. Gunn, G. Hampton, M. Harris, E. Klein, L. Kluck, M. McCarthy, M. Midgley, S. Ortiz, C. Quinn, G. Reyes, R. Robinson-Francis, G. Lynn Scott, S. Thomason, R. Wallace, K. Walton, K. White, V. Wright

### Item 1: Welcome and introduction

Presenter: Co-Chair S. Merz

IPC Co-Chair S. Merz introduced guest Sandra Shannon. She commented on the CCSSE and the Sense survey. She said we have a team going to the New Mexico conference to develop a plan based on the results of the surveys that were conducted last September.

### Item 2: Approval of Minutes

Presenter: Soon Merz

Soon Merz requested the council review the minutes from the last meeting. There were corrections to the Streamline Enrollment Processes. Coordinators were noted to do a lot more than coordinate visits. They are also responsible for the development of an electronic transfer plan. The next meeting will be in July and will be the only meeting in the summer. She said approval of minutes can be done through e-mail.

### Item 3: Status of Master Plan 2009-2011 Initiatives

Presenter: Mike Midgley

Mike provided an extensive update of the Master Plan from the cluster group leaders by initiative number. The updates are as follows:

Initiative # 1226	Complete
Initiative # 1219	Complete
Initiative # 1223	Complete
Initiative # 1229	In Progress
Initiative # 1231	Complete
Initiative # 1265	Complete
Initiative # 1224	In Progress
Initiative # 1271	Complete

Initiative # 1273	Not Started
Initiative # 1274	In Progress
Initiative # 1252	In Progress
Initiative # 1277	Complete

Soon Merz, regarding updates, will send out a written request for updates to the initiatives. Kirk White noted that one of the initiatives was tied to Game Development and was finishing all paperwork for Continuing Education and credit courses. Kirk White also noted that upgrades to Continuing Education classrooms at HBC were done.

#### **Item 4: Prioritization Results for Master Plan 2010-2012**

Presenter: Soon Merz

Soon was hoping to give results regarding the 5 initiatives but is waiting for Dr. Kinslow to draw the line. Roslyn Wallace stated that the top 4 were very close with 24 votes and the bottom one, student services initiative, had 8 votes. Soon said that Dr. Kinslow may select all of the initiatives. Roslyn stated that there should have been 150 votes but participation in the process and attendance was low.

Soon requested feedback regarding the Master Plan process to review what has been done and look at what worked well and what didn't. She didn't have the participation as in past years. Part of that is intentional. We have started plotting limits to prioritize the most important things into the Master Plan. Intentional limits and changes to the economy may have decreased the number of initiatives, and also that the process may have been too confusing.

Soon reintroduced a cost factor Master Plan with a 3 year plan that would be updated annually. When first instituted the process, she disassociated the dollar amounts from planning so she could increase concentration on planning. It has always been her plan to reintroduce money back into the Master Plan. The costs are being reintroduced so Dr. Kinslow could see costs.

#### **Item 5: Master Plan Review**

Presenter: Soon Merz

Soon referred to the list of units within each cluster and wanted cluster leaders to work with leaders within units to identify Master Plan initiatives. Prioritization votes will go to Steve. The approved initiative will go to the budget. A big change this year included costs projections and estimates.

Virginia Fraire asked about adding costs and the 3 year plan. Soon replied, stating that because we have a one year budget we cannot approve costs for 3 years. The first year has to get approved and the second and third years will still have to go through prioritization. Charles Quinn asked that in the prioritization process will it identify initiatives approved previously. Soon replied, stating that we had to institute limits on initiatives. The limit is 5 total any given year.

Mike Midgley stated that he does not like the timeline. He believes that the Master Plan and budget should be aligned after initiatives are inputted as in the past while inputted in the budget. His concern is

that it will have departments throw up their hands. He also thinks that the limit of 5 initiatives needs to be revisited. The Master Plan initiative process is difficult for credit instruction. He also mentioned that he cannot get the entire credit instruction cluster group in the same room. He needs easier access at the objective level. Mike stated using non-credit as an example that for credit instruction to get everyone together it would take longer because of the size. Roslyn Wallace suggested that if the size of the cluster group is workable, should it be split up. Mike responded by saying no because it still has to go through multiple levels.

Gary Hampton stated that he is just receiving program needs and he is now putting stuff into the budget.

Mike Midgley stated that the timeline is unreasonable from the end of the process until we see something. Soon Merz stated that we will always have an annual process and always have outliers. Mike Midgley needs a better alignment of different pieces.

Soon Merz stated to Gary Hampton that we should be able to get pretty close the first year. Mike stated that it has budget implications. Soon responded by saying a plan has to have a budget component. Roslyn Wallace agrees with Gary. She asked if we need to revisit program reviews again. Would it help to have completed reviews in hands by January? Charles Quinn said that the program review schedule this year is unusual.

Terry Bazan brought up the issue of adjusting the number of initiatives allowed based on the size of the cluster group. Soon Merz likes the idea of variable limits and thinks we can make this modification but that we didn't have the technology capability and would have to check on that.

Richard Armenta speaking to Mike Midgley said that planning and budget have to go hand in hand and that the bad economy impacts propensity to submit initiatives. Mike Midgley pointed out that there are two components to the Master Plan. The first component would be a narrative with an emphasis on planning. The other being that costs are clearly budget oriented.

Richard Armenta stated that things are put into the budget that should be in the Master Plan. Mike commented further stating that at the department level it is very confusing and sees two budget timelines that do not match. Soon said that there needs to be a three year perspective not tied to the budget. Gary talked about alternative levels or hybrids. Soon proposed the idea of a hybrid system, but Mike said this year is just too complicated.

Charles Quinn emphasized that in order to make informed decisions we do need cost estimates. We need a multi-year perspective and still think that the Master Plan needs to be aligned with the budget. Soon said, however, that there is always going to be a misalignment and proposed a solution to move the Master Plan back to January and have it completed. Prioritization to be done on a 3 year broader level then when those are approved move over to the budget and make specific requests go through the budget.

Dan Dydek commented on the misalignment stating that the faculty is apathetic and bureaucracy is collapsing under its own weight. Virginia Murillo stated that finances shouldn't be driving what we are doing. Dan agreed. Mike didn't totally disagree with Dan. He said that it was too difficult to pick up what is happening at the budget and we need to have better access. Linda Kluck commenting on Dan's point said she does have creativity in her department from the bottom up and that Dan's point is important. Soon, also commenting on Dan's point, said there is creativity in bureaucracy. Gary agrees with Dan saying there is apathy among the faculty.

Soon asked questions to the council regarding possible changes. She asked would it be easier to have more cluster groups or how about a Dean area. Charles Reyes, in response to Soon, said he doesn't see the

possibility of more cluster groups as beneficial and sees it as expanding bureaucracy. Gaye Lynn does not think we need a dean area cluster but we do need to be more intentional about getting feedback from the bottom up. We need to build in some timelines within a dean area to brainstorm. Mike agrees to have discussions earlier coupled with easier access at the department level.

Mike Midgley's specific suggestions are that we need the department levels to enter objectives. He believes the current system is still too complex. There is too much detail and complexity to make it accessible. Gaye Lynn and Gary Hampton both agree that the Master Plan timeline has to have department head discussions.

Soon talks about going back to the hybrid process, and then going back to the department and entering budget requests.

Virginia feels a great disconnect and needs to have more interaction strive. Believes both have a lot to contribute to making students successful.

Roslyn Wallace proposed a subgroup. The IPC agreed to create a subgroup to improve the Master Plan process.

#### **Item 6: For the Good of the Order/Wazzup?**

Presenter: All Memebers

Dan Dydek commented on the faculty senate creating an ad hoc committee to come up with some ideas to make the Dean more accountable to faculty. Charles Quinn said the management department got approved for a sustainable business practice course. David Borden said national adults scored well on the GED. Kirk White commented on the continuing education graduation ceremony and customer training grants being funded. Soon responded saying grants were submitted. Linda Kluck stated that the early registration will have an impact. Gaye Lynn stated that P. Salazar is moving to Richard's area. Gary Hampton talked about breaking ground for the Austin Fire Training program. Mike spoke about meetings on a regional green economy. Virginia discussed transfer advising.

Adjourn: 3:30 pm