**Napa Valley College**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES**

**October 20, 2009**

**PRESENT:**  Stephanie Arguello, Stephanie Burns, Oscar De Haro, Donna Geiger, Sue Nelson, Armond Phillips, Mary Shea, Joann Stubitsch, Judie Walter-Burke, Robyn Wornall

**ABSENT:**  Rhue Bruggeman, Matt Christensen, Tom Dana, Bill Fried, Regina Orozco, Erik Shearer

**GUEST:**  Robert Boyd, Falk Cammin, Douglas Garrison, Kathy Hart, Marilyn Meyer-Behringer, Santanu Bandyopadhyay - Accreditation Visiting Team

1.0 Introductions

Planning Committee and Accreditation Visiting Team members introduced themselves.

2.0 Announcements

None

3.0 Public Comment

Accreditation Visiting Team members thanked us for welcoming them.

4.0 Approval of Minutes

The minutes of October 9, 2009, were held over to the next meeting.

5.0 Adoption of Agenda

M/S/C to approve the agenda.

6.0 Information/Action

6.1 Review and approve revised 2010-2011 Planning Guidelines

The 2010-2011 Planning Guidelines were approved at the October 9, 2009, Planning Committee meeting. Sue Nelson and Erik Shearer asked that two star bullets be added under “1. Each budget center manager should meet with his/her staff to review the following:”

* Schedules A-I from recent Program Evaluation and Planning Process
* Results of SLO assessments

It was the consensus of the Planning Committee to accept the above additions.

6.2 Review and approve 2010-2011 Planning Priorities

The Planning Committee reviewed the most recent draft of the 2010-2011 Planning Priorities. Following are the recommended changes:

Remove from #2 and make a separate priority: “Continue to serve disabled students to the extent possible.”

Add:  *Effectively serve disabled students.*

Under #3 replace BSI with ARCC
Under #4 replace ESL with ARCC

Since we don’t have a quorum a lunch time meeting will be scheduled for next week to approve the 2010-2011 Planning Priorities.
6.3 Review 2008-2009 Strategic Plan Progress Report

Judie reported that the 08-09 Progress Report was compiled with input from VP’s and area managers. In the past, we waited until the ARCC measures were available (January) but that delayed the report too much. The report will go to the BOT in November with the previous year’s data.

Consensus of the Planning Committee was that the report looks good and should be presented to the BOT.

6.4 Discussion with Accreditation Team Members

Six members of the Accreditation Visiting Team attended the Planning Committee meeting. They were Robert Boyd, Falk Cammin, Douglas Garrison, Kathy Hart, Marilyn Meyer-Behringer, and Santanu Bandyopadhyay.

Douglas Garrison asked how the Planning Committee arrived at the 12 Planning Priorities.

The Planning Committee developed a draft list of priorities. The co-chairs then met with the VPs of Instruction and Student Services for their input on the priorities. They then presented the draft priorities to President’s Cabinet and President’s Council.

Falk Cammin asked if in that process any priorities were excluded.

No, in fact more were added.

Stephanie Burns stated that she would present the draft of planning priorities to the Academic Senate. Judie said that since we have representation from each constituent group on the Planning Committee, we don’t normally send them out.
After the Planning Priorities are approved by the BOT they are included in the Planning & Budget Development Guidelines and Forms packet for the meeting with the Budget Center managers.

Each budget center manager will identify objectives to reach planning priorities and identify resources. The schedules used in this packet are identical to the schedules used for the Program Evaluation and Planning Process.

These are submitted to the pertinent areas - Instruction, Student Services and Administrative. The VPs and President meet with their staff to identify their priorities which are then forwarded to President’s Cabinet.

Mary Shea mentioned that there was a shift in the PEP process. The college no longer has a roll over budget. Each budget center gets 90% of previous year’s budget and increases need to be justified.

Falk Cammin asked what happens with the Strategic Plan Progress Report. Do we discuss it and does it play a role in making decisions. One example is the huge drop in the transfer numbers. Sue Nelson replied that any drop is discussed. Otherwise the progress report really isn’t studied.

7.0 Other Business

None

Adjourned: 10 a.m.

Carolyn Sanchez
Recording Secretary