MT. SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE

JOINT MEETING
PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL, BUDGET COMMITTEE AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTES – April 15, 2009

Attendance:

Representing President's Advisory Council:

√ John S. Nixon, Chair	√ Kristina Allende	√ Diana Casteel	☐ Bill Eastham
☐ Michelle Grimes-Hillman	√ Sue Long	√ Jay Martinez	√ David McLaughlin
√ Bill Rawlings	☐ Ralph Spaulding	☐ Christian Vargas	√ Dale Vickers
√ Brandie White			

Representing Budget Committee:

√ Mike Gregoryk, Chair	√ Linda Baldwin	√ Ginny Burley	√ David Chang
√ Jennifer Galbraith	☐ Don Hurdle	√ Eric Kaljumagi	√ Denise Lindholm
√ Bill Rawlings	√ Audrey Yamagata-Noji	√ Kerry Martinez	

Representing Institutional Effectiveness Committee:

√ Debbie Boroch, Chair	√ Priya Chaplot	☐ Jason Chevalier	☐ Gary Enke
☐ Michelle Grimes-Hillman	☐ Grace Hanson	√ Sheryl Hullings	√ Paul Kittle
√ Barbara McNeice-Stallard	☐ Joan Sholars	√ Kate Scott	√ Kristina Allende

Guests: Art Morales (for Don Hurdle)
Vic Belinski
Dave Palais (IT Consultant)
Gary Nellesen

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

President Nixon welcomed everyone to this joint meeting of President's Advisory Council (PAC), Budget Committee, and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). He thanked committee members for their good work on PIE (Planning for Institutional Effectiveness) and the resource allocation model.

Self introductions were given by those present.

1. *Purpose and Outcomes*

Dr. Nixon explained that the purpose of the joint meeting is to develop common understanding of institutional planning and hear about the committees' work. He hopes we will develop a common understanding of the relationship of institutional planning to accreditation and receive input from committee members on how well the College is doing on planning and integration of planning.

2.   ***Summary and Discussion of Master Planning Documents***

Educational Master Plan
>   Vice President Burley said the Educational Master Plan is a relatively new document and
>   the College is still deciding how to distribute it. The plan is a very thick document;
>   however, it is on CD, which the College plans to make available to anyone interested.
>
>   Dr. Burley explained that an Educational Master Plan is part of a complete planning
>   process and can be used as the foundation for much of the institution's other planning
>   activities. The Educational Master Plan was developed for the purpose of projecting the
>   College's program and service needs from the present to the year 2020. The plan
>   projects enrollment, weekly student contact hours, and service needs, and makes
>   recommendations regarding programs and services for the District. While it is
>   recognized that the content of the Plan represents a snapshot in time, it is important that
>   projections anticipate the needs of future students and residents of the District.
>
>   Chapter 3 of the Educational Master Plan presents information about each department in
>   the College in summary narratives that describe the current program or service and its
>   current and future needs and plans. Dr. Burley shared sample information on the Biology
>   Department.
>
>   Dr. Nixon added that the Educational Master Plan would inform work at the academic or
>   program department level as well as for both Facilities and Technology master plans.

Facilities Master Plan
>   Vice President Gregoryk said that the College is planning to update its Facilities Master
>   Plan by the end of the year; it was last updated in 2005. Mr. Gregoryk shared the
>   process that will be followed in updating this document.
>
>   Mr. Gregoryk said the College has developed a Project Planning Guide for the Measure
>   RR Building Program. Because of the size of the guide, copies are available through
>   Gary Nellesen's office on CD.

Technology Master Plan
>   Chief Technology Officer Vic Belinski said a Technology Master Plan is being drafted and
>   will be put on the web for everyone to see as it evolves. He introduced Dave Palais, a
>   consultant who is helping with integration of the Technology Master Plan with the
>   Educational Master Plan. The goal of IT is to update the Technology Master Plan to
>   embrace the other master plans.

Bill Rawlings asked if the College's master plans will be integrated with the Chancellor's
Office master plan. Dr. Nixon explained that the Chancellor's Office Strategic Plan may
inform college level planning, but other than that, there is not a strong connection.

According to Dr. Nixon, the Educational Master Plan is a document that may remain static for
up to five years whereas the other master plans are more dynamic.

3. ***Overview/Discussion of Institutional Planning***

Barbara McNeice-Stallard presented an overview and led a discussion on institutional planning, which includes department-level input (PIE) as well as participatory governance input. Based on the College's mission statement and goals, planning involves deciding the College's focus/priorities, setting institutional goals, developing institutional/departmental strategies, outlining tasks, and creating schedules to measure if the goals are reached, evaluating the outcome, and doing it all again (i.e., think, plan, do, and evaluate cycle).

Ms. McNeice-Stallard reviewed the various plans at the College and discussed how they need to be interrelated. Dr. Nixon reiterated that integration of plans is an important theme and also stressed the need to evaluate our evaluation processes.

4. ***Roles and Responsibility of Budget Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and President's Advisory Council***

Dr. Nixon asked each committee to provide a short report addressing their planning models with some emphasis on how plans or processes are evaluated.

Institutional Effectiveness Committee
Dean Boroch, Chair, discussed the current planning model – PIE. This model is used to capture and document the planning and program review done at the unit and team levels, and to relate this planning to current and future institutional goals and objectives. This process is conducted annually by each unit of the college, and all unit participation is documented in ePIE. Dr. Boroch explained the PIE process beginning at the unit level and working its way through team summaries.

According to Dr. Boroch, evaluation of the PIE process is continuous. Each year, IEC requests and receives feedback via the manager and team summaries on process clarity, utility, ease of use, effectiveness of documents and training, etc. This feedback is incorporated into adjustments for the following year's PIE process. IEC also considers the ACCJC rubric and standards for planning and evaluation in identifying process components to be strengthened.

Budget Committee
Vice President Gregoryk, Chair, said the history of the Budget Committee is that the budget drives planning – today's process is reversed. Mr. Gregoryk said that, because of work going into planning (including identification of potential resources), the Budget Committee is reviewing its role. The Committee is also reviewing its current resource allocation process and wants to make it more easily understood. Mr. Gregoryk distributed a draft proposed budget review and development process prepared by Professor Kaljumagi. The Committee is trying to ensure that the planning process drives the budget process.

President's Advisory Council
Dr. Nixon reinforced PAC's role in monitoring and coordinating overall institutional planning. In its role as the College's main planning body, PAC has reviewed the College's Mission Statement and recommended changes to the Board of Trustees. It also developed College Goals and Strategic Objectives. Not only does PAC need to

function as the primary institutional planning council, but PAC has the responsibility of evaluating institutional planning. Today's meeting is an example of how we can do that.

5. ***Discussion of Models, Processes, and Evaluation Related to Institutional Planning***

Barbara McNeice-Stallard led a discussion of the many ways unit planning is occurring across campus, including: PIE, SLOs, VTEA, administrative systems planning, Banner, reviewing new processes, class schedules and enrollment, hiring, etc. Because it is important that we not work in a vacuum, there was discussion on how we can better integrate our planning. Unit level planning was seen as "the first step of the ladder."

Committee members were asked to review the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part II: Planning and determine where they felt the College was in its level of implementation. Nearly everyone agreed that the College was well into the Proficiency category and in Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement in some areas. This led to a lively discussion on what Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement would "look" like. Mr. Belinski commented that he believes the College does a great job of planning but noted that Mt. SAC looks at itself with a very critical eye.

Dr. Nixon thanked everyone for attending and for the great work they do across campus. He said he felt significant progress was made today on re-defining institutional planning and that we all have a better and more common understanding of the College's institutional planning and integration of its components.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

JSN:dc