



September 18, 2003
H-118
Open Forum

Dr. E. Brackett called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

In attendance:

Administration- C. Antonich, R. Burson, J. Lattyak, B. Scism, M. Stabile, S. Sullivan, K. Kennedy

Full-time Faculty- V. Brackett, M. McGuire, L. Dodt, M. Hahn Wade, S. Hughes

Mid-Management- J. Smith, L. Roe, J. Davidson, T. Moore

Classified- K. Johl, E. Johnson, K. Frey

E. Brackett, chairperson for IP3, welcomed everyone. He commended Dr. 'D' DeGrado and the Executive Committee on their accomplishments last year. The Executive Committee introduced themselves and announced their respective positions.

Materials were distributed entitled, "Executive Committee to the President for Institutional Planning"; "Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2005"; "Institutional Priorities and Objectives" and "Three Year Institutional Planning (IP3) Time Line for Fiscal Years 2004 & 2005".

"Executive Committee to the President for Institutional Planning"

E. Brackett reviewed the list of Executive Committee members, which includes phone extensions for contact purposes. J. Smith inquired as to the lack of Mid-Management representation on the Executive Committee. M. Pendola responded that is a member of the Executive Committee and represents Mid-Managers.

The two IP3 websites on the Intranet and Internet have been re-designed. The Internet contains pertinent informative material, such as IP3 minutes, whereas the Intranet would be used as the interactive tool. E. Brackett hopes to make IP3 more inclusive and responsive to everyone's interests and needs by streamlining the process. The recommendations developed last year by the Executive Committee were based on

assessments, which were submitted to the President for adoption and implementation. In response to a recommendation, the institutional planning process needs to be streamlined and made more inclusive.

“Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2005”

An Action Plan is a detailed outline that addresses a major campus problem. The Action Plan template will be available for submissions on the website on October 1st. The process has been streamlined to be more effective. Submitters should be cognizant of all priorities and take a holistic view when developing ideas. All Action Plans are electronically submitted to the Priority Committees (simultaneously to the Executive Committee) and will be posted to the website as they are received for viewing by others that may have similar interests. The campus will be notified via e-mail when available for viewing. Action Plans will be assessed by the Priority Committees returned to the submitter for elaboration, if necessary. Action Plans must be submitted by November 3rd. The Priority Committees’ recommendations may be reviewed with appropriate deans or managers in an attempt to foster collaboration with departments that may have similar ideas. Dr. E. Brackett referred to Recommendation #8. This completes the first phase.

The Priority Committees then electronically forward their recommendations to the Executive Committee for further assessment and ranking. The Executive Committee makes its recommendation, which includes proposed budget funding, to the President by January 12th. This process will hopefully be more time-efficient than last year, and will allow ample time for ideas to be incorporated into the institutional budget.

“Institutional Priorities and Objectives”

E. Brackett reviewed the priorities and objectives noting that they are basically the same as last year. E. Brackett suggested making the Action Plans as comprehensible as possible. L. Dodt questioned whether more than one priority could be identified. Brackett asked that one priority be identified, but added that other priorities may be addressed in the narrative, if appropriate. The primary function, this cycle, is to respond to the submitters of the Action Plans, after the Priority Committee chairpersons meet with their sub-committees for review. T. Moore referred to #9 and asked which criteria are used for prioritization of ideas. The document pertaining to prioritization, currently in draft form, will be posted on the website after its approval by the President and adoption by the Executive Committee. S. Yoelin referred to last year’s process as a “wish list” and asked if this year’s recommendations should include only what is effective. E. Brackett replied by suggesting when developing plans, to think institutionally in terms of a three-year process.

The President is currently interviewing persons for the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment position, who would assist in the assessment portion of this process.

The main objective of the Action Plan is to identify a problem that impacts Triton College, then develop a long-term solution taking into consideration how the College

would be impacted. The more an Action Plan reflects these criteria, the higher it will be ranked. P. Carl stated that ideas differ from recommendations on the Action Plan. S. Yoelin requested a copy of his last year's Action Plans, as he would like to re-submit his this year. Action Plans from last year will be made available. If there are similarities in the proposals, the deans and managers should work collaboratively with the submitter, Priority Committee, and among themselves, so that the different areas may work collaboratively to develop a truly institutional initiative. The deans would make recommendations to the Priority Committees who recommend to the Executive Committee. The Priority Committee determines whether an Action Plan shows merit alone and is not assessed by priority listing. The Executive Committee can be contacted by e-mail at: exemail. E. Brackett envisions a 2-month assessment process. K. Kennedy noted that there is a area on the website accessible year-round, for "suggestions," which are sent directly to the Executive Committee. E. Brackett added that institutional planning is a year-round process that will consistently be improved by input from the campus. Events sometimes occur beyond our control, such as the budget cuts, but we can envision dreams to build on, grow and move forward into the future. This process is an effort to enhance shared governance.

Dr. E. Brackett adjourned the meeting at 2:56 p.m.