Napa Valley College
PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES
September 23, 2005

PRESENT: Kirk Berger, Stephanie Burns, Dianna Chiabotti, Matt Christensen,
Sally Fitzgerald, Loi Nguyen,
Ron Rhyno, Ed Shenk, Jerry Somerville, Judie Walter-Burke

ABSENT: Benita Briones, Rebecca Scott, Olga Travis

1.0 Introductions
Planning Committee members introduced themselves, stated where they worked and how long they have served on the Planning Committee. The three new members are Stephanie Burns, Loi Nguyen, and Rebecca Scott. Kirk Berger is filling in for Robyn Wornall, who will be on maternity leave beginning Oct. 17.

2.0 Announcements
None

3.0 Public Comment
None

4.0 Approval of Minutes
The May 17, 2005, minutes were not ready. This item was tabled until the next meeting.

5.0 Adoption of Agenda
M/S/C to adopt the agenda with the following changes:
Item 6.4 is tabled until the next PC meeting
Add to 7.0 Other Business
7.1 Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
   Advisory Board – Jerry Somerville
7.2 Faculty openings – Dianna Chiabotti

6.0 Information/Action
6.1 Planning Committee Overview
6.1.1 Planning and Budget Policy
Judie reviewed the development of the Planning and Budget Process and read the Charge and Functions of the Planning Committee. The structure of the committee is as follows:
There shall be twelve voting members:
1 – VP of Instruction – Sally Fitzgerald
1 – VP of Student Services – Ed Shank
1 – Director of Facilities Planning & Services – Matt Christensen
1 – Administrative Senate – Kirk Berger
1 – Classified Representative – Benita Briones
1 – Student Representative - vacant
6 – Academic Senate Representatives
   Stephanie Bruns, Loi Nguyen, Ron Rhyno,
   Rebecca Scott, Jerry Somerville, Olga Travis
6.1.2 Mission, Vision, Values, Strategic Plan

There are two co-chairs.
1 – Academic Senate Co-chair – Dianna Chiabotti, Interim appointed by the Academic Senate, will vote only to break a tie.
1 – District Co-Chair – Judie Walter-Burke Dean, Research, Planning & Development, does not have a vote

Judie reviewed the Mission, Vision, and Values Statements and the 2005-2011 Strategic Institutional Plan (sent out with the agenda). A handout was distributed identifying the planning priorities for 2005-2006.

6.2 2005-2006 Activities

6.2.1 Program Evaluation and Planning, Verification Teams

Napa Valley College’s Program Evaluation and Planning process addresses the recommendations from the 1997 and 2003 Accreditation Teams. Those recommendations were:

- Build upon initial efforts to evaluate current programs, giving teeth to the Program Review process, and incorporating plans to develop future programs that meet emerging needs and changing demographics. (1997)
- The team recommends that the college develop an effective, evidence-based program review process for implementation as early as possible. (2003)

The new Program Evaluation and Planning Process is being implemented this fall. All Program Evaluation and Planning Reports (PEPR) will be confirmed by a Verification Team to assess for accuracy and completeness and assure that the process has been followed. Each verification team will be comprised of 3-6 members (some members may represent two of the following groups) and should include individuals from both student services and instruction.

- Planning Committee member – Team Chair
- Budget Committee representative
- Academic Senate representative
- Classified Senate representative
- Administrative Senate representative
- Associated Student Body Representative
There will be four Verification Teams. Each Verification Team will be assigned approximately four reports to evaluate each year.

- Instruction Team I
- Instruction Team II
- Student Services Team
- Administrative Services Team

Duties of the Verification Teams

1. Review the PEPR.
2. Verify the accuracy and completeness of the report and plan.
   a. Meet with those who developed the report and other faculty/staff/students in the program/service.
   b. Examine facilities, materials, supplies, and equipment presently being used for the program.
3. Verify that effective opportunities were available to faculty, staff, and students to express their views. Such opportunities could include: a) open meetings, b) visitations, c) surveys, and d) informal discussions.
4. Prepare a written summary/checklist for the PEP team based on 1 – 3 above.
5. Forward PEPR and Verification Team Summary (VTR) to V.P./President
6. The team chair presents the PEPR and Verification Team summary to the Planning and Budget Committees

Jerry Somerville asked if there was an evaluation section on the Program Evaluation and Planning Process. This would enable us to see what worked and what didn’t. Judie said that that was a good idea and would incorporate it into the process.

The new Program Evaluation and Planning (PEP) process combines self-study, evaluation, planning and budgeting for all instructional programs, student services, and administrative services at Napa Valley College. Each program will complete the evaluation and planning process every six years or more often if necessary.

Each year about 1/5 of the programs/units will be evaluated. The new process calls for four verification teams
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2</td>
<td>Review 2004-2005 Progress Report</td>
<td>The 2004-2005 Progress Report on the 2001-2005 Strategic Institutional Plan is scheduled to be reviewed by the Planning Committee in October. It will then go to the BOT in November. There may be highlights/accomplishments/challenges that don’t fit under any of the goals. If that is the case, create an “Other” page and list them there. There will be a section at the beginning of the report listing all of the “Highlights”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3</td>
<td>Review District Plans</td>
<td>There is a list of the Mandated Plans in the Planning Committee binders. Plans will be reviewed as they become due. This year we may be looking at VTEA and NVC’s Accreditation Mid-term report for 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.4</td>
<td>Establish Planning priorities for 06-07</td>
<td>The Planning Committee will need to identify Planning Priorities for 2006-2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.5</td>
<td>Meet with Budget Committee</td>
<td>A training for verification teams may be scheduled for November. Verification teams will present VTR and Program Evaluation Summary to a joint meeting of Planning and Budget Committees in February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.6</td>
<td>Hold college-wide forums</td>
<td>We may decide to hold forums relating to the Program Evaluation and/or other topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Planning Committee Meeting schedule for Fall 2005</td>
<td>The Planning Committee generally meets twice a month. We will schedule our meetings for the 2nd and 4th Friday of the month. If we don’t need one it will be cancelled. Our meetings will be from 8:15 a.m. to 9:45 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2005-2006 Budget Update</td>
<td>This item was tabled until a future meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Other Business</td>
<td>Jerry Somerville asked the Planning Committee to serve in an advisory capacity during the implementation of student learning outcomes and assessment processes. If the PC took this on, even temporarily, it would save the necessity of forming a new committee to serve as an Advisory Board. Jerry distributed a handout outlining the role and benefits of an Advisory Board (see attached). Sally had concerns with the PC dealing with curriculum issues. The PC would only deal with planning issues. Curriculum co-chairs would be invited to PC meeting when any items dealing with curriculum were going to be discussed. The Planning Committee could also be the mechanism to disseminate information to the college community relating to SLO’s and Assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There was consensus from the Planning Committee to accept the Advisory role for Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment.

7.2 Faculty openings – Dianna Chiabotti  
Dianna Chiabotti had a question regarding faculty vacancies and how the decision was made to fill them. Sally stated that this is a matter for Instruction Council and does not belong at the Planning Committee. Sally offered to share the process that Instruction Council uses. Judie pointed out that the NVC planning process calls for area priorities to be established at the area level, i.e. by instruction council. Area priorities are merged by the President’s Cabinet to establish college-wide priorities.

Adjourned:  9:35 a.m.

Carolyn Sanchez  
Recording Secretary