Napa Valley College  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
March 7, 2008

PRESENT: Christopher Adams, Stephanie Burns, Matt Christensen, Edward Beanes, Oscar De Haro, Fain Hancock, Dustin Harnois, Chris McCarthy, Sue Nelson, Mary Shea, Jerry Somerville, Judie Walter-Burke

ABSENT: Michael Dow, Martin Murphy, Robyn Wornall

1.0 Introductions
Dustin Harnois, the substitute ASB rep, introduced himself.

2.0 Announcements
Dustin announced that he was doing massages to raise funds for Tour de Cure.

3.0 Public Comment
None

4.0 Approval of Minutes
M/S/C to approve the minutes of November 9, 2007, (with corrections from Jerry Somerville) and the minutes of February 8, 2008.

5.0 Adoption of Agenda
M/S/C to adopt the agenda.

6.0 Information/Action

6.1 Accreditation Update - Mary Shea
NVC will begin work on the accreditation self study report this spring. The college’s accreditation visit is tentatively scheduled for October 2009.

Mary gave an overview of the accreditation process. A file folder was distributed to PC members containing a description of Standard 1, a chart, and two examples of Standard 1 from other colleges. The Planning Committee will write the self study for Standard 1.

A subgroup was formed to begin work on Standard 1. The subgroup consists of Mary Shea, Chris McCarthy, Stephanie Burns, Jerry Somerville, and Judie Walter-Burke. They will meet and give a report at the April 4, 2008, Planning Committee meeting.

The PEP process has an Accreditation section, which asks programs/departments to describe how they are addressing accreditation standards. This information can be used to complete our Accreditation Self Study.

Sue Nelson said that she plans to talk to division chairs and to work with Instructional PEP teams that have gone through program review to get an update since their review. She will report back at a future PC meeting.

A suggestion was made to expand Schedule A in the PEP process to include an “update” column.

Chris stated that we have to address the recommendations from the last team visit.
There were two surveys in the agenda packet; Survey of Napa Valley College Progress with Program Review and Survey of Napa Valley College Progress with Planning. Committee members were asked to complete the surveys and then a discussion ensued.

The surveys listed Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Planning and Program Review. There were three sections under Levels of Implementation: Development, Proficiency, and Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement. You were to mark “Yes”, “No”, or “Do Not Know” for each of the characteristics within these sections.

Survey on Program Review:
The one area that was a definite “No” was: Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.

There were several “Do Not Know”:
Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.

Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.

Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.

The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.

Survey on Planning:
“Do Not Knows”
Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.
The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its education mission).

There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.

These surveys are a rubric developed by the ACCJC. They are given to the Accreditation visiting teams. We are expected to be at the 3rd level. Mary and Judie felt it would be a good idea to test Planning Committee so that we could see what areas needed work.

One of the major areas that we need to concentrate on is Assessment. Most college are way behind on assessment.

It was recommended that the theme for the next Flex day be Accreditation with a focus on Assessment. Sue Nelson said that she would talk to Academic Senate about the next Flex day.

Agenda items for future meetings will include:
- A report from Sue Nelson on the updates from completed program reviews.
- Future Bond Projects - BOT Priorities
- Assessment Task Force
- Review/revise Mission Statement
- Review NVC Technology Plan

7.0 Other Business

Adjourned: 10:30 a.m.

None

Carolyn Sanchez
Reporting Secretary