

Committee/Council/Senate Report



Committee - Institutional Planning and Effectiveness

Purpose Statement: Monitor and assess the ongoing effectiveness of the integrated institutional planning processes through the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Membership:

- Administrative co-chair appointed by the Superintendent/President or his/her designee, Co-chair
- Vice President of Academic Senate, Co-Chair
- Three faculty appointed by the Academic Senate.
- One classified employee appointed by classified employees
- One confidential employee appointed by the superintendent/president or his/her designee
- One Dean or Director from each of these areas: Academic Services, Administrative Services, Student Services
- One student appointed by students
- One representative from Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness

<i>Initiatives</i>	<i>Evaluations</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Review the Annual Report Timeline-- - Review the Annual Report Timeline Initiative Status: Active Academic Year: 2016 - 2017, 2017 - 2018</p>	<p>Directly related to Outcome</p>	<p>Report Type: End-of-Year Result: Carried Forward The committee has reviewed the timeline, but not in a way that we anticipated. The committee drafted a completely new time line specifically for this year, and for any future years that are the last year for a strategic plan. While the committee did not have this as an initiative specifically, the committee decided to not complete the usual "Annual Report on the Master Plan" and instead complete the Annual Report along with a comprehensive evaluation of the entire strategic plan cycle. The committee gave reporting parties additional time this Spring semester to give them time to further complete actions before the current strategic plan ends at the end of this academic year. The committee will use its final two meetings to go over the updates; however, in the fall of 2018, the committee will combine all three years reports to create an end of cycle assessment to gauge how well the District moved toward completing its objectives and Goals. In this sense, the committee did change the timeline for the annual report. The committee should keep this as an initiative next year, however, to see how well the new time line works as well as</p>	

Initiatives	Evaluations	Results	Actions
	Directly related to Outcome	looking at possible changes in the timeline for the years that are not at the end of a strategic plan cycle. (05/03/2018)	
<p>Strategic Plan - Develop the Sequoias District Strategic Plan Initiative Status: Inactive Academic Year: 2014 - 2015, 2017 - 2018, 2020 - 2021, 2023 - 2024, 2026 - 2027, 2029 - 2030 Start Date: 08/28/2014</p>	Directly related to Outcome	<p>Report Type: End-of-Year Result: Satisfactory The committee completed The Strategic Plan, 2018 - 2021 during this Academic year, using the process and timeline that we had developed the year before. By all accounts, the process, while messy, was very successful in developing our new strategic plan in a manner that provided significantly more participation early in the process from across the District. A future initiative should study how well this process worked so that possible changes can be made. (05/03/2018)</p>	
<p>The Annual Report on the Master Plan - Complete the Annual Report on the Master Plan. Initiative Status: Active Academic Year: 2015 - 2016, 2016 - 2017, 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, 2019 - 2020, 2020 - 2021, 2021 - 2022, 2022 - 2023, 2023 - 2024, 2024 - 2025, 2025 - 2026, 2026 - 2027, 2027 - 2028, 2028 - 2029, 2029 - 2030 Start Date: 09/10/2015</p>	Directly related to Outcome	<p>Report Type: End-of-Year Result: Carried Forward The Annual Report on the Master Plan will not be completed this academic year, as the committee has developed a new plan with a new timeline for the final year of the Strategic Plan. Since we wanted to have a more complete picture of the progress on Actions, the committee decided to give responsible parties until later in the term to submit their progress updates. The committee will begin looking at those progress updates in the last two meetings of this semester; however, this final Annual Report will be completed alongside a comprehensive report/evaluation on the entire Strategic Plan, 2015-2018, in the Fall of 2018. This way, the District (IPEC) will be assessing how well the entire Strategic Plan moved the district toward, not only meeting the Objectives of the Strategic Plan, but also the Goals of the Master Plan. (05/03/2018)</p>	
<p>Assess year-end survey - Analyze the results of the year-end governance survey. Initiative Status: Inactive Academic Year: 2014 - 2015, 2015 - 2016, 2016 - 2017, 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, 2019 - 2020, 2020 - 2021, 2021 - 2022, 2022 - 2023, 2023 -</p>	Directly related to Outcome	<p>Report Type: End-of-Year Result: Satisfactory There were 11 respondents to the survey provided to committee members by the district. This is a pretty good showing, as this represents 11 of 13 members (85%). Question 1: "The senate/committee/council met its roles and responsibilities." 4 indicated "Agree" and 7 "Strongly Agree".</p>	

Initiatives	Evaluations	Results	Actions
2024, 2024 - 2025, 2025 - 2026, 2026 - 2027, 2027 - 2028, 2028 - 2029, 2029 - 2030 Start Date: 05/06/2015	Directly related to Outcome	<p>Question 2: "Adequate and appropriate resources are available to support my work on this senate/committee/council." 1 indicated "Disagree"; 6 "Agree"; and 4 "Strongly Agree"</p> <p>Question 3: "The workload of this senate/committee/council is appropriate." 2 indicated "Disagree"; 6 "Agree" and 3 "Strongly Agree"</p> <p>Question 4: "The senate/committee/council was effective in completing its initiatives." 1 indicated "Disagree"; 4 "Agree"; and 6 "Strongly Agree"</p> <p>Question 5: "The senate/committee/council stayed on task." 1 indicated "Disagree"; 4 "Agree" and 6 "Strongly Agree"</p> <p>Question 6: "The senate/committee/council adhered to Robert's Rules of Order." 1 indicated "Strongly Disagree"; 3 "Disagree"; 5 "Agree"; 18 "Strongly Agree"</p> <p>The survey results reveal that a vast majority of the committee agreed or strongly agreed with all questions except for the one about following Robert Rules of Order. The committee does make an effort to follow Roberts Rules; however, the committee may need training to be fully in compliance.</p> <p>There were quite few responses to the questions asking for a written response.</p> <p>Question 1: "How could the IPEC improve its effectiveness in regard to meeting its roles and responsibilities?" Several responses indicated that there was nothing more to do in this regard. One comment suggested that there be more joint meetings with other groups, such as IPRC and Budget Committee. In addition, this comment also suggested more faculty involvement in the committee. In the past, IPEC has had</p>	

<i>Initiatives</i>	<i>Evaluations</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>Directly related to Outcome</p>	<p>joint meetings with IPRC and the Budget Committee, but IPRC was initiating these meetings and decided that they did not need to meet with IPEC this year, but that they would next year. During discussions in IPEC about the meetings, there was a consensus that the meetings were not that productive for IPEC. This isn't to say that IPEC should not meet with other groups as needed. As far as more faculty involvement is concerned, the committee has four faculty members, including the faculty co-chair. That represents about 31%. Not included is the one classified member who is also an adjunct faculty member. The committee should consider adding additional faculty, though getting faculty to join a committee with a significant workload at specific times of the year can be difficult. Another response to this question stated that we needed to "Include all members in discussions and decision making process." The committee's perspective is that this is a fairly small committee of individuals who respects each other's opinions. It isn't clear what the response is referring to specifically. Perhaps a more conscious effort should be made to ensure that everyone gets to be heard.</p> <p>Question 2: "How might the IPEC improve its effectiveness in regard to accomplishing its initiatives?"</p> <p>There were a few comments here worthy of mentioning. One was to develop more effective timelines for tasks. As can be seen in our initiative on reviewing timelines, this has been a concern for a few years. This semester did result in a time-line change, but only one that impacts the end of strategic plan cycles. The committee will have to continue to look at the timeline, particularly for the Annual Report for the remaining years of the cycle, as it suggested under that initiative.</p> <p>Another comment suggested longer meetings. IPEC meets for two hours, and on occasion, has had to extend those meetings to complete tasks. While it would be a good idea to consider scheduling longer meetings all of the time, it seemed effective to do so as needed. This is something that should be discussed in IPEC.</p> <p>Question 3: " What resources are needed to assist the IPEC</p>	

<i>Initiatives</i>	<i>Evaluations</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------	----------------	----------------

Directly related to Outcome

in performing its operations?"
 One comment is that the committee needs laptops for writing the Annual Report. We have done small group work using laptops provided by the District in the past, so it would seem that enough laptops are available.

Question 4: "What topics should be addressed by the IPEC next year?"

As the committee is aware that the newly created comprehensive report on the strategic plan is looming, a few mentioned that it should be a focus for next year. There is no doubt that the committee will not only have to complete this new task, but also assess how well it works, so we anticipate that it will at least take up most of the Fall semester. Of course, in the Spring the committee will be engaged in writing the first Annual Report for the new Strategic Plan. Another response suggest that IPEC review the integrated plan and even "It may be that the Integrated Plan be placed under IPEC's discretion." While it may be a good idea to review the plan, it is likely that the committee would not have time to take on the plan itself. The answers to the next question illustrate this.

Question 5: "Are there any additional roles or responsibilities the IPEC should be fulfilling?"
 As in the past, almost all responses indicate that members of IPEC think the committee has enough work and often not enough time. There was only one suggestion for an additional task, and that mirrored the question about IPEC leading the Integrated Plan. Again, it is clear that most of the committee does not want to see additional tasks, especially considering that IPEC just charged itself with creating the new comprehensive report at the end of the strategic plan cycle.

(05/03/2018)

General Expectations - Agendas
 Posted
 Minutes Recorded
 Quorum Attained
 Attendance at meetings recorded in minutes

Directly related to Outcome

Report Type: End-of-Year
Result: Satisfactory
 Agendas and minutes are posted in a timely manner, as well as reports to District Governance Senate. We have had a Quorum at every meeting except for one, and attendance has been recorded in the minutes, including for two

<i>Initiatives</i>	<i>Evaluations</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Initiative Status: Active</p> <p>Academic Year: 2013 - 2014, 2014 - 2015, 2015 - 2016, 2016 - 2017, 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, 2019 - 2020, 2020 - 2021, 2021 - 2022, 2022 - 2023, 2023 - 2024, 2024 - 2025, 2025 - 2026, 2026 - 2027, 2027 - 2028, 2028 - 2029, 2029 - 2030</p> <p>Start Date: 11/06/2013</p>	<p>Directly related to Outcome</p>	<p>additional meetings needed for the Strategic Plan. (05/03/2018)</p>	
<p>Collecting Annual Report updates-- - Investigate more efficient methods of collecting data for the Annual Report</p> <p>Initiative Status: Inactive</p> <p>Academic Year: 2016 - 2017</p>	<p>Directly related to Outcome</p>	<p>Report Type: End-of-Year</p> <p>Result: Carried Forward</p> <p>The TracDat work group came up with a solid template that would allow responsible parties to enter their updates. We did not put it to use during this academic year, however. (05/03/2018)</p>	