PRESENT: Stephanie Burns, Matt Christensen, Michael Dow, Sue Nelson, Mary Shea, Jerry Somerville, Loi Vo-Nguyen, Judie Walter-Burke, Robyn Wornall

ABSENT: Christopher Adams, Oscar De Haro, Chris McCarthy, Rebecca Scott, Terry Woodward

1.0 Introductions

2.0 Announcements

Judie announced that we are beginning the next round of Program Evaluations

3.0 Public Comment

None

4.0 Approval of Minutes

M/S/C to adopt the minutes of
November 3, 2006
November 17, 2006
December 1, 2007
February 9, 2007 – Planning & Budget Joint PEP meeting

5.0 Adoption of Agenda

M/S/C to adopt the agenda

6.0 Information/Action

6.1 2006-2011 Strategic Plan

The revised plan was approved by the Board of Trustees at their meeting on February 8, 2007. One additional change was made at the meeting. Goal 1. Objective 3 was changed to read, “Increase the number of transfers to four year colleges and universities.”

6.2 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC)

ARCC is a new program for evaluating the performance of California’s community colleges. ARCC includes statewide/system measures as well as college level measures of student progress and achievement, pre-collegiate skills improvement, and participation. The first year of ARCC implementation is 2006-2007. The committee will discuss the ARCC process, the measures and review NVC’s report and self assessment

AARC replaces Partnership For Excellence (PFE). This year (2006-2007) is the pilot year for AARC. PFE focused on volume/numbers and AARC focuses on rates at campus level. Robyn went over the handouts: College Core Indicators and System Indicators. She mentioned that there aren’t any participation measures at the college level due to difficulties in identifying service areas. These may be phased in later when the service areas are identified.

The Basic Skills improvement rates are not reported for NVC. This is due to issues surrounding basic skills course coding rather than the absence of such courses. We are addressing the coding issues as part of the Curriculum Reporting for Community Colleges project. The college would like to conduct 1 hour sessions with data entry staff to stress the significance of accurate data entry.

Robyn went on to say that each campus is required to provide a one page self assessment for ARCC to the Chancellor’s Office. A draft of the self assessment for NVC was distributed. The draft covers: drop in FTES (flood, bond projects, slow growth area, changes in demography of service area), Title III, Strategic Plan focus on persistence, retention, and successful course completion.
6.3 Discussion - Joint meeting with Budget Committee

The committee will evaluate the verification process and suggest ideas for improvement.

After hearing the reports at the joint meeting, the committee will discuss institutional needs.

Matt Christensen asked if we could address the traffic problems like Jamison Canyon. Robyn said that she would add a sentence regarding traffic.

Robyn will submit the Self-Assessment online.

Judie asked the PC if they had any recommendations on improving the PEP process.

- The number of Verification teams will be increased so that each team will only have 1 or 2 programs to review. This should address the workload issue.
- Verification teams could consist of writers that just completed the PEP process. Also, we could assign an experienced PEP verifier with an inexperienced one.
- Need to have broader representation on verification teams. Only one verification team had representation from classified and ASB.
- Verification team members need to be identified as to what group they are representing.
- We need to allow more time between the due date of the reports and the joint Planning and Budget meeting. There was not enough time to make copies of the reports and distribute them.
- The program’s Mission Statement should be included in the packet that is sent to the Planning & Budget meeting.
- Encourage the programs to “use” the data that is provided.
- Provide more training and guidance to the verification teams, focusing on the content of the verification summary.

When hearing some of the verification team reports, Robyn felt that the joint meeting may not have been the right audience.

Mary Shea said that she volunteered to serve on a verification team after hearing the comments made by Stephanie and Loi, who had volunteered for the first PEP cycle. Mary said that it was a great way to learn about other programs.

PC members were asked to forward any additional recommendations to either Mary or Judie.
6.4 Discussion – Update the Planning and Budget Process policy
The policy was written in 1994. There are several areas that need to be updated to reflect title changes and other changes in terminology. The committee will discuss whether additional changes may be recommended. A sub-group may be assigned to review the document and bring suggestions to the full committee at a later date.

7.0 Other Business

Judie made some minor technical changes to the policy.

Another item to consider is classified staff representation. At the time of the last Accreditation visit the Classified staff felt that they did not have a strong enough voice on college committees. This was discussed at President’s Council several years ago. Although there is one Classified representative on Planning and Budget Committees, there is more representation on other college committees.

The Planning Committee will not meet on March 2, 2007. Next meeting will be March 16, 2007. Agenda items will include PEP recommendations and the Planning and Budget Policy revisions.

Adjourned: 9:45 a.m.

Carolyn Sanchez
Recording Secretary