



Institutional Planning Committee Meeting
March 14, 2011
BFL Community Conference Room
3:00pm- 5:00pm

In Attendance: Ben Seaberry, Judy Foster, Michael Gong, Emily Stone, Despina Prapavessi, Colleen Lento

Note-taker: Shemila Johnson

Item #	Topic / Activity
1	Agenda Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postpone item three to after item four.
2	Announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gong announces that IT is experiencing delays with distance learning software (WebCT/Dashboard). It will most likely affect distance learning and campus courses. • Stone will follow up with Wieden as to when the next scheduled ASC meeting will be. She will also inquire on an update from the Feb. 28th meeting outcome. Foster suggests Wieden color coding the list of 94 items to disintegrate.
3	Minutes discussion from Fall 2010 meeting(s) (Despina) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prapavessi amended minutes regarding Mission Statement revisions. Handout provided. • Prapavessi included a comment on the Nov. 22nd minutes stating, "The committee reached consensus on approving the revised mission statement and having it be forwarded to College Council. Stone will request to be put on the agenda for the December 6, 2010 College Council Meeting. • Foster shares her concern with the group not following through on the agreed action to print the first paragraph and questions 1-5 in handout she provided at the Oct. 25th meeting. She suggests inserting in brackets a statement as to why we did not move forward with the groups agreed upon decision to provide handout for constituency feedback. • The constituencies did not feel further discussion was needed for full revision and thought the pocket mission statement was sufficient at this time. Gong motioned to approve, Lento seconded. IPC approved. • Stone motions to approve entire amendment, Myers seconds motion, IPC approved. • Per Stone presented to College Council at Dec. 6th, to take under advisement. First meeting in Spring 2011 they approved the statement.
4	College Wide Planning Process (Despina and Emily)- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review grid prepared by Mohamed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eisa devised the Status of College-Wide Plans document to facilitate a process of compiling the information of the college-wide plans into one central location. • Stone and Prapavessi have summoned a group of leads and co-leads for each plan to come up with a consolidated calendar for annual progress updates for each college wide plan. • Stone suggests talking to the lead of each plan for input. She also suggests

presenting to each group where IPC is and making recommendations based on their input. Leads and governance co-chairs can be the group to convene and bring it back to IPC.

- Myers suggests dividing it up and asking the leads how they feel about the plan, obtaining information on what happens with the plans data. She would like IPC to give the co-leads questions up front in preparation for the meeting discussion.
- Gong suggests having actions items for program reviews and college wide plans stating funding sources and allocation information is needed.
- Potential questions to ask are:
 - What state agencies?
 - What action plans do they have?
 - How is the progress tracked?
 - What's the purpose of the plan?
 - Do you feel the current process of creating/ updating your plan is a useful endeavor to you or your group? If so, why/how?
 - Do you feel the plan is a useful document to you and the group?
 - If you can design a plan or process for your area whose function is to consider
 - How is your plan being used?
 - What is your plan connected to?
- Stone will extend leads/co-leads meeting invite to IPC and send the members the meeting dates for their availability.
- Seaberry suggests looking at operational goals, instructional goal and providing a few big ideas that will help drive other decisions. As we are guiding people, we are maturing and the purpose of the plans and how we use them.
- Stone feels there is a conflict as we need the global discussion there is also time constraints, whereas we have plans that are due for revision and approval.
- Seaberry suggests we make sure to not set up false expectations. Myers suggests having someone with expertise in planning, Stone concurs and wishes we had someone with expertise in looking for external resources.
- Myers will send questions to Stone and Prapavessi.

b. Potential combination of college-wide plans?

- Does the plan connect, rather than how does the plan connect?
- Whatever rubric we develop, we want folks to have this available to them to see what IPC is looking at.
- Does the plan have some cognizance that this is planning?
- Stone wants an agenda item for the next IPC meeting to include
 - Use of the Technology plan and Workforce Development plan to be read in advance by group members, in an attempt to flush out the rubric questions/process. One hour agenda item.
 - Prapavessi suggests the Educational Master plan to be read, Stone and group feels the Ed Plan is not for use of this purpose, however agrees to include reviewing it on a future meeting agenda.
 - Stone would like group to flush out agenda for co-leads meeting on college wide plans as an agenda item.

c) College-Wide Plan Development

i. Approval Process (next mtg)

ii. Implementation and Evaluation Process (postponed)

5	Next steps
6	Adjourned at 4:50pm

NEXT MEETING DATE
March 28, 2011
3:00-5:00pm
Trophy Room

DRAFT