The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

Guests: Barbara McNeice-Stallard
Gary Nellesen
Mike Gregoryk
Paul Kittle
Sandy Samples
Virgilio Doniza
Virginia Burley

1. **Review of October 5, 2011, Meeting Notes**

   Approved, as presented.

2. **Review the Meeting Notes from the November 2, 2011, Expanded PAC Meeting**

   Barbara McNeice-Stallard presented a comment for Liesel Reinhart (detained) regarding items on page 4 of the *Integrated Planning: Pulling the Plans Together* document. She clarified the meetings/suggestions ideas (diamond bullets), which are:

   The following are next meeting suggestions/ideas based on both today’s meeting outcomes and proposals from members of the group as well as previous Integrated Planning Summit recommendations:

   - Use a 3-hour time block
   - Continue to provide the agenda ahead of time
   - Provide a primer on planning and integrated planning as a short introduction
   - Provide an opportunity for 1-2 plans to be reviewed and discussed & demonstrate how they are used for decision making
   - Ask the group to review a list of the master plans and who is responsible for each
   - Start the discussions about how the plans overlap with a goal toward the college finding the gaps and determining how they should be addressed
   - Provide an update on and evaluation of the suggested activities for formulating a new Strategic Plan
Bill Scroggins indicated that he thought this was a good use of the time.

Richard McGowan would like clarification on where everything fits and what are the issues; perhaps part of the primer.

IEC is working on ways to make planning flow more efficiently; what the new and improved planning looks like.

There were no modifications of the minutes of the expanded PAC meeting.

3. **Budget Committee Update**

Mike Gregoryk, Chair of the Budget Committee, reported that, at the last meeting Budget Committee meeting, Budget 101 training was presented for new members, which was the same training as was given to the President’s Advisory Task Force on Fiscal Planning. He offered to make the presentation to any other groups who might want to hear it.

At the next Budget Committee meeting, they will review the Budget Process to prepare for any future reduction in the budget.

Regarding the trigger cuts – we expect to hear something by December 15, and it is expected that K-14 will receive a $2B cut. If anyone would like a copy of the Community College Update, please contact Mike’s office. Mt. SAC budgeted $2M for cuts that may come in the current year, but we don’t know if they will be ongoing.

Richard McGowan asked what percentage Mt. SAC is being cut, and Mike said that 1½% would be the cut. Mt. SAC is about 2.5% of the State’s total FTES.

4. **IEC Annual PIE Summary and Recommendations**

Ginny Burley, as chair of the IEC, presented the formal PIE summary and recommendations for approval of the process by PAC. An enormous amount of work has been put into developing this summary. IEC has met several times to finalize the summary and to respond to feedback on ways to improve the process. The first part of the committee's report is to present the summary for formal acceptance by PAC, and the second part is to review recommendations for improvement. IEC is waiting for a decision by PAC before the new format can be rolled out for 2011-12.

Ginny referred to page 3 of the Executive Summary, and specifically to the bulleted recommendations and the themes in the next column, 1.-5.

Bullet 2 [Involve committees responsible for institutional planning efforts (e.g., Facilities Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, Educational Master Planning, Student Equity, EEO, etc.) in the PIE planning and reporting process.]: The planning committees for focused plans will be involved in PIE planning; this concept was discussed at the expanded PAC meeting. Jennifer Galbraith asked if the planning committees would send their plan to IEC. Ginny said they would be responsive to college planning efforts reported in PIE. Currently there is a disconnect between focused plans and the central college planning process. Bill Scroggins said this change would involve having
committees that have a subject-matter plan address the College goals and objectives and connect their own planning efforts to the college goals.

Bullet 3 [Offer Option 1 (Word document forms) and Option 2 (TracDat) for completing PIE process.]: Two options for filling out PIE will be made available: continue TracDat, but also allow people to fill in the forms themselves in Word documents. TracDat feedback has been consistently that it’s very difficult and cumbersome. Doing it only once a year makes it very difficult to learn every year. Liesel Reinhart suggested a hybrid form. Ginny reported that assistance will be offered to make sure the pertinent data gets input in TracDat.

Bullet 4 (Modify the current PIE form to specify the relationship of unit-based goals, the unit’s strategic objectives, and resource requests.): The problem at the unit level is that PIE doesn’t come across as a planning document. IEC recommends that the process be modified to ask the departments to identify their own goals and develop plans for implementation, instead of just listing accomplishments in alignment with the College goals. Bill said it would be important to establish a means of documenting resources needed to accomplish goals.

Bullet 5 (Require that each team prioritize its resource requests by category to be forwarded to appropriate planning committee or service department.): Instead of submitting a list of the most important resource requests, each team would prioritize resource requests. When there are needs, the College requires that the resources are connected to plans, be prioritized, and then be considered by the College for follow-up, which has been missing from PIE. We still haven’t figured out how to tie our needs to the budget allocation process formally. Liesel indicated that requests come in very different formats, and she suggested that the format be standardized for consistency. Jennifer suggested that the mechanism is there; but, it isn’t acted upon. Bill indicated that an analogy would be the FT faculty hiring process. The program would establish a need and rationale and would be prioritized by the group that would tie it to PIE. Group representatives, with the expertise, should be involved when rationale is established. The Budget Committee isn’t necessarily capable or qualified to determine priorities because the expertise isn’t there. Luisa Howell suggested that short- and long-term goals are set and followed.

Bullet 6 (Give priority consideration for funding resource requests that are supported by planning and outcomes data.): Areas and departments that have well thought-out plans should be considered for this. Liesel indicated that people are confused about how outcomes fit in this process, and they should be trained. Bill said that we need to be careful in how the word “outcomes” is used in this context. The student learning is viewed and measured. The word data doesn’t just mean objective data; it also includes affective information and should be considered actionable data used to measure outcomes. Jennifer suggested that it’s important to get that information out.

Section 7: Recommendations for Modifications to College Goals (page 48). The following planning themes emerged from the VP PIE Summaries as important ones to guide their efforts in the “Planning for the Future” section of PIE.
1. Maintenance of Effort: Utilize resources to maintain necessary services.
2. Staffing: Address appropriate staffing for critical functions.
3. Utilize outcomes assessment data to guide planning, curriculum design, pedagogy, and/or decision-making at the department/unit and institutional levels.
4. Efficiency: Improve business processes to maximize use of existing resources.
5. Meet Federal Mandates and State Regulations.

No. 5. requires considerable effort. There was talk about eliminating some of the college goals, but it didn't go over very well. The suggestion was to add another five. Pages 33 and 34 have the expanded explanation of the points. 1) Bill suggested that these be measured, i.e., OS1 has measurable standards, and there's a need to establish standards in other areas of the College regarding service. 2) Staffing – need to establish how to measure, i.e., how the service is being delivered, etc. IEC needs to establish how these goals are being addressed. Standards need to be established before accomplishments can be measured. Eric Kaljumagi asked why these five aren't goals. Jennifer suggested that some of them overlap already and maybe the current goals could be modified to incorporate these suggestions. Ginny indicated that college goals have evolved to allow departments, other than Instruction, to have the opportunity to participate fully. They are able to report what they're doing and how can they continue the level of service they're providing with diminishing resources.

Liesel suggested that modifications to the goals need to be made before she would recommend approval. Goals should be goals and not be processes, i.e., service vs. staffing. Bullet 1 needs a little more work on "how" we're going to do it. Bill and Ginny will work with IEC to make modifications discussed in today's meeting.

Regarding the rest of the recommendations (bullets), they should be supported by data. Liesel isn't comfortable with all planning committees making decisions about resource allocations because not everyone is qualified to determine relative importance of needs. Bill said a planning group should be created in any area where none now exists (e.g., a group to help determine which research needs should be supported).

PAC accepts the recommendations 2-6, as amended through the planning group, and asks that the first bullet be referred back to the IEC for modification.

Richard McGowan commended IEC for the tremendous amount of work that went into this process.

5. **ITAC Update**

Paul Kittle reported that ITAC was fairly short; they reviewed their 2011-12 goals. They've been finalized and will be sent to Denise Lindholm. A survey indicated that students prefer to get their College information through the portal first and then by e-mail. The final version will be brought to the March 2012 meeting and then forwarded to PAC. It was suggested that Blackboard be removed, and it was decided to use Moodlerooms. Training is set for the first week of January 2012 and, because the demand is so great, they have doubled their training efforts.
AP 3720 will come back to PAC one more time to be sure it's complete.

6. **Facilities Advisory Committee**

Gary Nellesen reviewed the committee’s charge and that they've met only four times in the last eight months. The committee has reviewed the Master Plan and will be looking at specific project lists to prioritize them. Also, standards are being reviewed and set where needed. A history of the facilities was presented to the committee, how State money is leveraged for projects, both Measures, and various options for the parking which will be recommended to CMPCT. The Facilities Master Plan is going to be reviewed by the committee for any changes that may be needed. At that time, specific plans will be reviewed.

7. **Report from Smoking Task Force**

Sandy Samples reported that several of the PAC members were on the team that reviewed the smoking policy implementation plan. They reviewed the proposed BP 3565 and AP 3565. They also reviewed possible areas on campus to be designated for smoking. Offenders would be cited, $35 being the fine for the first citation; double for subsequent citations, up to $100. An appeals committee would be established using shared governance, including student representation. Monies collected would be deposited in a special fund for the purpose of providing smoking cessation education and referrals, maintaining designated smoking areas, and funding implementation and ongoing costs. The implementation plan was presented. Several methods of announcing the policy are available, i.e., student and employee portals; electronic announcement boards; College website; publications; posters in high traffic areas; campus-wide e-announcement; hard copies in all mailboxes, counters, bulletin boards, etc.; and leaflets can be distributed with all new parking permits. Jennifer commended Sandy on her organization and commitment to the plan. Gary Nellesen indicated that LEED Certification requires 25 feet from doors and windows, and all new buildings will have that requirement; so, it was suggested that it be consistent all over campus. Jennifer suggested that, if it passes through all constituencies, it be started in summer 2012. Staff and students will have the same rules. Eric Kaljumagi asked why the last sentence of the BP is there since it’s in the AP. With the removal of the last sentence of the BP (regarding the issuance of a citation and fines), PAC accepts the first reading, and it will come back at a later date for final adoption.

8. **Plan to Add Cameras on Campus**

Jennifer Galbraith reported that it had come to the attention of the Faculty Association that cameras are being installed at entryways to buildings, and they have taken a position. Gary Nellesen explained the difference between surveillance (continuous monitoring) and the access control card-swipe system. The camera would capture the image when a card is swiped, for positive identification purposes only, and is for a short period of time. He used the cadaver lab as an example, which came about as the result of a security audit. The images are maintained on a hard drive in the Facilities Planning & Management (FP&M) department that can be accessed by Public Safety and two FP&M managers. The next example of implementation is at one location in Building 9B in order to secure one floor of the building while another floor is open for business. All
future new buildings will have the keycard and camera system. On existing buildings, it will be provided upon request and level of need. The cost of the system is quite expensive, but they pay for themselves over time due to not having to re-key when keys are lost or when employees leave. The cost of the cameras is about $1,200 each.

9. **Proposed Revisions to Assessment & Matriculation Committee Function Statements**

Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the January 2012 meeting.

10. **Proposed Revisions to BP and AP Approval Process, including AP 2410 – Process for Revision of Administrative Procedures or Board Policies**

Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the January 2012 meeting.

11. **Proposed Revisions to AP 7120 – Recruitment and Hiring – Proposed AP 7121 – Recruitment and Hiring, Classified Employees, and AP 7122 – Recruitment and Hiring, Management Employees were pulled from the original AP 7120, which is now Recruitment and Hiring, Faculty**

Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the January 2012 meeting.

12. **Proposed Revisions to AP 4300 – Field Trips and Excursions**

Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the January 2012 meeting.

13. **Proposed Revisions to AP 4350 – Student Travel Guidelines**

Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the January 2012 meeting.

14. **Proposed Revisions to AP 3500 – Campus Security**

Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the January 2012 meeting.

15. **Proposed AP 4051 – Course Equivalencies and Variances**

Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back to the January 2012 meeting.

16. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held on January 4, 2012, 3:00-4:30 p.m., in the Administration Building, Room 2440.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
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