

**Institutional Planning Committee
Approved Minutes
August 31, 2011
BFL 210
2:30 pm - 4:30pm**

In attendance: Nadia Fonny, Michael Gong, Despina Prapavessi, Emily Stone, Ted Wieden, Tish Young
Guest: Peter Garcia
Note-taker: Shemila Johnson

Item #	Topic / Activity	Notes
1	Agenda Review	No changes.
2	Minutes review from 8/24/11 meeting	Motion to approve minutes with addition of 'In Attendance' (Prapavessi). Motion seconded (Wieden). Group consensus to approve minutes with noted change.
3	Review of draft charge to merge IEC and IPC  IPC Committee Charge 8-26-11 JC1.1	<p>Young and Cherry met to discuss IPC/IEC charge. Young explained the compiled draft (see attachment).</p> <p>The group had a clarifying discussion around its charge with relation to accreditation. Group concluded that IPC is not an accreditation body, not responsible for accreditation report, we support matters related to accreditation.</p> <p>Suggestions to make the first bulleted charge as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop college-wide skills and expertise on the process of writing good quality, effective plans. <p>Group consensus to go approve first bullet as written above.</p> <p>Motion to remove constituent group specifications for co-chairs (Young). Motion seconded (Prapavessi). Group did not respond to motion.</p> <p>Garcia suggests College Council needs to specify committee chair duties outlining skill set needed for the position. A job description of the committee chair position will be helpful. Wieden agrees.</p> <p>Remove constituent group rotation and allow SRC to appoint whomever fits the bill for the appointment.</p> <p>Young argues that three (3) students are not needed for IPC appointment. Stone feels three (3) students make it easier for at least one (1) student to attend meetings (if</p>

		<p>the others have conflicts) and presents great leadership opportunity for students. Young persists three (3) seems excessive, explaining that everyone should have a strong desire to participate and having three (3) for the sake of equal numbers is unnecessary. Fonny supports Young's stance to have two (2) student representatives. Group agrees to support student recommendation for two (2) student reps.</p> <p>Young asks for clarification on group decision making, is it voting or consensus? Stone explains the committee strives to reach consensus, Prapavessi feels this is a "common sense" matter and the group agrees to leave it unchanged for now; however if it becomes a problem IPC will address it at that point. Stone concurs.</p> <p>Garcia suggests leaving Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) charge as default in the event of an accreditation emergency. Wieden explains if ACCJC needs to know who oversees accreditation matter, there needs to be a body in place for such issue. Garcia agrees to eliminate ASC from IPC charge and he and Wieden will meet with Faculty Senate to compile a new ASC group.</p>
4	<p>Constituency presentation updates regarding IPC proposal to work with SEC on the Student Equity Plan</p>	<p>Gong informed Classified Senate of IPC's proposal to work with SEC. One suggestion that came from the classified group was that IPC research and pull from other college plans and best practices.</p> <p>Prapavessi shared vision of having the 'bottom- up' effort of producing SEC plan that will contain action items and benchmarks with Faculty Senate group. Prapavessi asked for group buy-in and support. Data provided by Mark Akiyama (SEC co-chair), group would like more data and source information. Proposal was received well by the group, showed much enthusiasm around the effort.</p> <p>Stone shared proposal information with Management Council. Stone explained that IPC has SEC endorsement on proposal. SEC would like flexibility on the deadline of February 2012 for the plan. SEC will meet Friday, Sept. 2nd. Co-chairs of both committees will meet prior to Friday's meeting; both groups are focused on relationship building between the two groups.</p> <p>Gong suggests looking at format and establishing uniformity with the plans and format to be utilized.</p>

5	Review of Workforce Development Plan	
6	Recommendations on next steps for IPC proposal to work with SEC	<p>Prapavessi would like group to focus on process rather than format. Possibly hiring a consultant due to the college's lack of experience with creating "bottom-up" plan. Gong shares experiences with utilizing a consultant and feels it could be wasteful. Prapavessi feels consultant would be helpful to bring departments that do not necessarily coincide on a regular basis together.</p> <p>Wieden shared his experiences with using a consultant. He feels the WFD plan is a glowing example of using a consultant to develop a plan, in addition to Tech plan is a glowing example of a plan developed internally. Wieden adamant that we've got to be able to achieve something through our plans. It must be linked to other plans.</p> <p>Young asks clarification on hiring consultant. Are we hiring someone to tell us what content goes into the plan or buying professional expertise that could be effective in bringing cross-constituents together to create processes to better our success? Young suggests we look internally and if we have the in-house expertise on student equity utilize them. If we are to go outside for a consultant, we have to be clear that the consultant is not here to write the plan, more so to facilitate the process.</p> <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let SEC know we are ready to support them as collaborative partners in the process. • Ask SEC if a consultant would be a useful tool in helping them develop the SEC plan? • Research and review existing plans from various colleges. • Prapavessi will compile recommendation and share with the group. Stone and Prapavessi will present to co-chairs of SEC. <p>Prapavessi reiterates SEC is responsible for the content of the plan, IPC is responsible for the process and helping develop the key achievable goals for the college. Stone suggests reaching out to sister colleges and the resources they've used for their equity plan process.</p>

7	Other	Wieden announces that the 'Focused mid-term report' has been accepted and moving forward it will be going to the Governing Board on Sept. 12th. ACCJC will not visit DVC this fall. We will submit the report to them and that will conclude accreditation work for the fall.
8	Adjourn	4:28pm

NEXT MEETING DATE
September 21, 2011
2:30-4:30pm
L-151

Upcoming Fall Term Meeting Dates 2011
October 5 (IPC)
October 19 (ASC)
November 2 (IPC)
November 16 (ASC)
November 30 (IPC)
December 7 (ASC)