

**Institutional Planning Committee**  
**November 16, 2011**  
**L-151**  
**2:30 pm - 4:30pm**

**In attendance:** Terry Armstrong, Jason Cherry, Peter Garcia, Hailie Kim, Mauricio Najarro, Despina Prapavessi, Emily Stone, Ted Wieden.

**Note-taker:** Despina Prapavessi

Item #	Topic / Activity	Outcome
1	Agenda Review	Group agreed to approve the agenda with no changes.
2	Minutes review/approval from 11/2/2011	Motion to approve minutes with no changes. Motion seconded. Group agreed to approve minutes.
3	Report on the planning requirements for the college	<p>Jason shared with the group that there are two main sources of planning requirements for the college: ACCJC and Title V. Title V specifically outlines which plans are required and explicit guidelines for what must be included in them. The required plans are the Strategic Plan, the Educational Master Plan, the Facilities Plan, the Student Equity Plan and the Matriculation Plan. ACCJC provides very broad guidelines from the planning cycle in the college. Jason and Ted have been working to distill the information down to bullet type requirements for each of the five required plans so IPC can have a reference sheet to ensure we meet current planning guidelines. Often these requirements are revised, so we must ensure we have a process to incorporate these revisions within our list, as soon as they come up. It is a shared responsibility with the district to report to the state in regards to these plans. Some plans e.g. the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan, are done exclusively at the district level. Others are delegated to the three colleges. There are also exist district policies about our planning at the college level. This is a work in progress and we will learn more about these in subsequent meetings. Jason expects by January we will have a complete bulleted list of requirements for the Matriculation Plan.</p> <p>Jason will send an electronic copy of his summary documents to the group along two links through which we can search the Ed code on planning issues. The group was very appreciative of the work Jason has done to date and affirmed the importance of continuing to explore these requirements.</p>

<p>4</p>	<p>Recommendations to the Student Equity Committee on the development of the Student Equity Plan</p>	<p>SEC has indicated to IPC that a bulleted list of suggested concrete approaches for their planning process would be very helpful. They intend to debate such suggestions and decide what steps to go through and what is the best venue for the development of their plan.</p> <p>Ted offered to bring references he has from the development of SE Plans at other community colleges. He reaffirmed that we have very important SE work that needs to be done and it is essential to not be bogged down with the process.</p> <p>Questions on the validity of the data continue to come up. For example a large number of students refrain from giving their ethnicity- how does that affect our equity report?</p> <p>Mauricio suggested the SE planning process starts by identifying the stakeholders. Then in turn ask: What are the goals? The objectives? How do we develop these goals and objectives?" Once we know these each unit can form their own action plans. The units will need to decide what measurements they will they use and set deadlines for action items, and of course decide by whom will these action plans be carried out.</p> <p>Despina asked for an example of a concrete goal. Ted suggested "By 3 years we will see a decrease the achievement gap by 10% " Group discussed how different parts of this goal will affect various units differently; some areas may not have large African American populations. In general some goals are better adaptable to specific units.</p> <p>Jason suggested SEC asks the question: Whom do we build the goal with? Who is involved in the conversation?</p> <p>Ted suggested using the January FLEX as an opportunity to invite people to such a conversation and get ideas and feedback on suggested goals. SEC could have a FLEX activity where they put the goals on board and ask participants how to achieve these.</p> <p>Using the Section II of the IUPR where data is giving success by ethnicity could be another place to have the conversation started at.</p> <p>Ted suggests a new idea: using the twelve DVC leaders representatives of units and areas across campus that are helping IPC with the consultant proposal to engage within their areas in a SE discussions</p> <p>Peter suggest a cumulative approach for the conversation: have divisions, the governance committees, the three senates, ASDVC, e-mail blast, IC, discuss the goals- it takes about 45 days to have a message like that go all around, and in 90 days we could have each committee discuss it twice.</p> <p>Terry suggested to start with an equity focused faculty convocation August that then trickles down to each division</p> <p>Peter notices that conceptual support is different from active support. It is important to engage in a</p>
----------	--	--

		<p>conversation and get people wanting to address the achievement gap.</p> <p>Emily observes that we are still in infancy in regards to planning and asks how do we infuse such conversation it in the fabric of the institution? It is an institution wide issue. Ted suggests focusing on something we can deal with so we don't get paralyzed by looking at the boulder. Emily notices there is great stuff happening on campus - it's already happening e.g. CSI, Puente etc. – but how do we communicate that. Jason advises that this is uncharted territory, so we should expect the planning outcome is not going to come up perfect.</p> <p>Emily says that Juan could be helpful to facilitate discussions that will percolate these ideas in lots of different places. We don't yet have this expertise and we are aspiring to have it. Peter reminds the group that the SE Plan was intended to be the model plan for the college.</p> <p>Terry poses the question: Is the campus understanding Student Equity issue?</p> <p>Group observes that people may be put on the defensive by the SEC presentation. Jason suggests brainstorming ways of presenting information to bring people together to discuss it and not have them on the defensive. We should list these along with advantages/disadvantages of each approach.</p> <p>Despina suggests identifying a leader in each of the units to begin the conversation about SE data within the unit, and brainstorm ideas on improving SE. Then pull these leaders together to gather data about the directions the college wants to move towards.</p> <p>Peter suggests we are not good at reviewing data. One of our problems with planning is data review is problematic. How do we lead the campus through that? We need to feel comfortable with the data- reflect on it-ask what our hunches are. Talk about causality, implications first but not offer solutions. Make sure people don't think we show them a problem to impose a solution.</p> <p>Terry suggests we lead discussions by instructing folks : look at the data, lead your own discussion, request more data if you have questions. And then in terms of the goals, ask what would that look like?</p> <p>Emily adds that In terms of reviewing the data as Tish proposed last time, maybe the immediate goal would be to teach the units tools to implement equity initiatives similar to how we are proposing to do plan to plan work before doing our strategic plan.</p>
5	Update on proposal to reinvent the college's planning practices and contract with Juan Lopez	Despina reminded everyone that the DVC leaders group IPC had invited to meet with Juan Lopez in an initial screening meeting had tasked a subgroup to work with

		<p>Juan and put together a proposal for IPC to consider. The proposal is for the college to learn to plan: in order to become adaptive to change, responsive to external factors, and increase employee involvement in planning and collaboration for the common good.</p> <p>This work is well under way and it is expected that IPC will have the draft proposal for review in our next meeting on 11/30. Despina and Emily will send to the group a few days in advance of the meeting for their review, so we can be able to make a recommendation to the College Council as soon as possible.</p>
6	Adjourn	4:37pm

**NEXT MEETING DATE**  
**November 30, 2011**  
**2:30-4:30pm**  
**L-151**