Integrated Planning Taskforce

Meeting October 18th, 2013 2 pm

In attendance: Linda Cooley, Eileen Apperson, Sandra Fuentes, John Fitzer, Jan Dekker, Michael White, Pam Gilmore, Dave Borofka, and Stephanie Curry (Absent: Donna Berry, Michelle Johnson, Gary Sakaguchi, Michelle Highfill)

We began the meeting by reviewing the previous meeting and the purpose for this taskforce. Again the focus is on Program Review and how it connects to the processes that exist.

Discussion surrounding what information is needed from the Program Review process to connect to the existing processes on campus.

Eileen Apperson brought the program review handbook (a simplified version so we could focus on the content requested) and a possible idea for action planning in specific areas with columns that included page number, priority, cost and timeline.

Distance Education and Curriculum should be in the same category. Current form seems to be a good idea but it was just incorporated so the connection is not known. A suggestion of a possible DE check box in the program review was made for informational purposes.

Is this course current taught in a Distance Educational format? Yes or No

Could this course be taught in a distance educational format in the future? Yes or No

This would provide information to the DE committee of possible courses for the future.

To close the feedback loop it was suggested that the Curriculum Committee then provide a form to the department chair with the status of curriculum heard by the committee. In other words was it approved by the committee, by ECPC, by the board and does it have State approval or is that pending.

This could be then used in the annual report by the program.

As we discussed the next areas it became apparent that we are talking about two different processes, an action plan for the future year and a report of the past year. This is something we need to consider for the Program Review annual reports – maybe they need action plans and reports for the individual areas as needed.

Budget (Stephanie was there, but Donna and Melanie were not)

Budget requests need to come in August but they should be reported out in May.

We will continue the discussion on Budget at the next meeting to allow Stephanie, Donna and Melanie to contribute to the conversation.

Staffing

This was a lengthy discussion about changing the action plan into the actual request form. For example the faculty prioritization form still has to be filled out why not make it the action plan – may need a slight modification but the same data needs to be use. Only programs who are submitting prioritization forms would fill this out.

Discussion about whether the faculty prioritization is substantiated in the program review or not was also discussed. What if the need arises after the five years can it be put into the annual program review? Eileen suggested that all programs mention maintaining staff as a way to help facilitate this issue.

Again the issue of an action plan and a report.

Staffing plan is going to be another driver the PAC has agreed needs to be completed this year. Our hope is that the staffing plan task force will consider the integration of their process to the existing processes.

Finally it was mentioned that a memo should be crafted with the list of all requests and their ranking. This could then be used in the report section so that the program can keep track of their requests/goals.

Facilities

This section in the program review seems flawed, when asked what the purpose of the narrative Stephanie Curry gave us the history and that the section was for informational purposes. As the discussion continued we realized that there is a two part section to facilities that many people may confuse. First of all there are the actual facilities and Michael White suggested program design elements in a list format for example: wireless, sinks, lab space, large group instruction etc… This section could be passed onto the facilities committee so that they are aware of the needs for the college. This would be excellent information for them in the drafting of the five year facilities plans. Stephanie Curry stated that there were no instructional faculty on the facilities committee and that they seemed quite unaware that we were lacking in instructional space. If they could gather a report from all of the programs each year it might give them a broad perspective of the needs for our campus. Finally it was suggested that the facilities committee do a full site analysis to figure out what our space is being used for and how we can maximize our current facilities.

The second section should be more related to scheduling. The suggestion was that these be separated to make the information clearly defined. Scheduling has nothing to do with the facilities committees it is more for the deans and vice president of instruction. This would include timing of course offerings, course offerings, capacity and room utilized.

Again the suggestion would be to ask the facilities committee what information they would want so that the program review could be formatted to gather that information.

Deans should also consider what information they would need and the suggestion from John Fitzer was to do some sort of data analysis so that the programs could discuss their facility usage in their program review.

Our next meeting will focus on the following areas: Technology, Budget, Assessment/Data and we will revisit Facilities

The following people need to be included in the next meeting: Melanie Highfill, Michelle Johnson, Stephanie Curry and Donna Berry.