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The meeting of the Planning Process Task Force, a subgroup of the Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee (PIEAC), was originally scheduled to meet in the 4th Floor Conference Room of the College Center at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 8, 2013. Due to the Budget Committee (BC) concluding their regularly scheduled meeting earlier in the afternoon, the Planning Process Task Force began a pre-meeting at 3:10 p.m. to allow more time for discussion.

Members of the Planning Task Force in attendance included: Darian Aistrich, Cristina Arellano, Maribeth Daniel, Pedro Gutierrez, Ann Holliday, Nancy Jones, Linda Kuntzman, Rick Lockwood (via phone), Vinicio Lopez, Christine Nguyen, Vince Rodriguez, Jorge Sanchez, Cheryl Stewart, and Helen Ward.

A general brain storming discussion occurred about the positives/pros and negative/cons of Wing Plans, the Planning Process, etc., which resulted in the following comments:

**POSITIVES/PROS:**

* Annual Reports.
* Planning Councils for Student Services/Instruction and Administrative Services Wing Plans.
* Separation of Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation Committee and the Budget Committee. This split helped to keep the focus on planning and allowed for more focused discussions.

**NEGATIVES/CONS:**

* Need to summarize Wing Plans and present consistently to PIEAC.
* Wing identified priorities are not clearly stated and are non-inclusive.
* Wing Plans process needs to be started earlier in the year to allow more time for discussion and planning.
* Feedback on Wing Plans needs to be provided to unit members.
* The Prioritization Allocation Rubric (PAR) needs improvement.
* Wing Plan goals are not listed.
* No advisory/Planning Council meetings under the President’s Wing.
* Create stronger linkages between Program Review and other plans.
* Confusion between SLO, SAO, Annual Review, DSR, DSO, etc…
* Separate forms needed for Program Review (one for instructional department, one for non-instructional/service departments).
* Comprehensive Program Review.
* Lack of Faculty/discipline input into Wing Plans.
* Planning Allocation Rubric should be embedded into the scoring document.
* More open forums needed.
* Planning Guides for PIEAC need to be reviewed (i.e. meeting deadlines).
* Explore the possibility of having three versions of each line-item request to allow greater flexibility of the committee to fully fund, partially fund, or not fund at all, depending on the availability of funds.
* Do not combine multiple line-item requests into one large request. Line-item requests should be broken out so the committee can determine everything to be funded.
* Standardize all data elements in the Annual Plans which could be used in that year.
* Program Review needs to reference the goals stated in Education Master Plan (EMP).
* A process is needed to verify whether stated linkages to other plans are actually true. Currently there are no checks and balances to verify this.
* Draft minutes from the previous committee meeting need to be prepared in time for the next meeting.
* Agendas need to be prepared in advance.
* The online scoring survey for line-item requests did not seem to be fair.

A focused discussion occurred on the evaluation of the planning process. The following list highlights the comments made during discussions of sections a, b, c, and d.

**EVALUATION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS:**

**Section (a)**

* Survey needs to be deployed.

**Section (b)**

* Reports need to be made to PIEAC on tracking completion of one-time funding requests.
* At September PIEAC meeting provide status report on previous year one-time funding requests.
* At a spring PIEAC meeting provide a 6-month update on one-time funding requests from previous year.
* At October PIEAC meeting provide status report on current year one-time funding requests.

**Section (c)**

* Need to evaluate and set goals and objectives, in addition to reviewing the mandates for all committees.
* Create linkages to the Education Master Plan.

**Section (d)**

* College wide survey needed on the planning process. Clarification needed as to whether or not we wait three years to do this.
* At the fall All-College Meeting conduct a survey of the entire planning process while we have the captive audience.

The following are general comments made about other facets of the college planning process.

**OTHER COMMENTS MADE:**

* Evaluate PIEAC.
* Evaluate the planning process.
* Update the Planning Guide.
* Review the forms used in planning, which are used by Program Review to inform PIEAC to determine the most pertinent questions to ask and most relevant information to gather.
* Possibly add previous year funding explanation on Annual Report.
* Survey on the entire planning process needs to be developed and rolled out college wide.
* Post agendas online in a highly visible location ahead of the actual meeting dates to allow non-members the opportunity to attend.
* Need to develop a process for emergency/opportunity items to be brought to PIEAC.
* Review of the college wide planning calendar and timelines (page #22) to determine if the timeline is reasonable and in line with our process.
* Information on informing constituencies.
* Review of College Scorecard metrics.
* Review “Standards” and “Benchmarks” of the College Scorecard. Need to determine “Standards” we’ll not fall below.
* Possibly use an A, B, and C method for prioritization for Wing Plan requests.
* Review and clarification of planning cycles.
* The new planning process should be ready to go in fall 2013.

**MEMBER ASSIGNMENTS:**

* Discuss and prepare a college wide survey covering the entire planning process for rollout at the fall All-College Meeting. **(Ann Holliday, Helen Ward, Vinicio Lopez, and Jorge Sanchez)**.
* Review and clarification of planning cycles. **(Nancy Jones)**.
* Determine what other institutions are doing with “Standards” and “Benchmarks” on the College Scorecard and obtain copies for review, if possible. **(Vince Rodriguez)**.
* Review and update the Planning Guide. **(Pedro Gutierrez and Cheryl Stewart)**.

The meeting of the Planning Process Task Force adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Darian Aistrich