

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

MINUTES

March 28, 2011 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121

Present: Trudi Abram, Saodat Aziskhanova, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo, Ed Karpp, Jill Lewis, Alice Mecom, Mary Mirch, Ron Nakasone, Vicki Nicholson, John Queen, Mike Scott, Alfred Ramirez, Monette Tiernan, Jose Diaz, Juliana Kim

Absent: Karen Holden-Ferkich, Margaret Mansour, Rick Perez, Hoover Zariani,

CALL TO ORDER

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 12:20 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **MSC (Scott/Abram)** to accept the minutes of the March 21, 2011 meeting.

2. OLD BUSINESS

Upcoming Meetings

The accreditation visiting team would like to meet with the IPCC from 1:00 to 1:30 on the day of the visit, April 4. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Dining Room and members should come at the regular time of 12:15 p.m.

After next week the committee will move to meeting twice on month on the 2nd and 4th Mondays at the same time starting April 25.

Improvements for Sustaining Integrated Planning, Program Review and Resource Allocation

Categoricals will be removed from Basic Skills funding and Team B will be discussing revisions to the EMP.

Items for Accreditation Visit Update Sheet

Rec. 1: All bullet items will be cross referenced to the original eight points (a. through h.) of the ACCJC Action Letter. Changes included: the Budget Reallocation Task Force should be changed to a Subcommittee, dates will be added to each bullet item,

Rec. 4: HR software was approved on Mar. 21

Rec. 5: The internship program is scheduled for approval at the April board meeting.

The Update (bullet list) and Process Improvements for Integrated Planning matrix will be given to the visiting team on Monday.

Standard Template for Plans

A new column will be added for “Responsible Person/Committee”, the term “Strategy” will be replaced with “Action Item”. Ed also needs suggestions for an approval process.

Approval Process

Approval should include the appropriate standing committee and all official plans should be approved by Campus Exec. Ed explained that all official plans are on the Master Plan website. Mary suggested that the process be institutionalized with a new administrative regulation regarding campus plans. Ed will come up with a draft for consideration. Mike suggested that the process be put into XXX and this will be stated in the Planning Handbook.

3. NEW BUSINESS

Evaluation measures for integrated planning should be quantitative and not just qualitative improvements as done previously. Ed developed an Annual Evaluation of Planning Form because the previous visiting team had suggested that more quantitative measures should be in place. Mary suggested that a column be added for when the plan was completed or if it is “in process” a completion date should be noted. In reference to the multitude of plans from the 2010 accreditation report and the list given to each of the V.P.s: replicated information should be merged. Mike stated that Team B should be asked to look at and merge the list of plans. Alice said we need new ideas for evaluation. Additionally, we should have a list of what has been completed so that we can evaluate if we are making appropriate progress. (There are 429 plans on the original list)

Alice suggested that in addition to a completion number we should consider what direction to go in relation to evaluation of the plans (measurable effectiveness & improved progress). Mary was concerned regarding if the processes we are using are creating the outcomes that we want. The committee should ask that question and then create a cycle for the process and progress. Ed added that we must define what we want plans to do and what measure of involvement or participation with other constituency groups should occur. We must also stay focused on our mission and be student centered. We should say that the planning process is “X, Y and Z” and use a rubric with a number scale. Ed also felt that the team would be looking for surveys that are opinion based. The IPCC could have a discussion and become a “focus group”. Ed reminded the group that analysis needs to include numbers. John stated that this direction is corrupt and that using numbers is opinionated. Mary also expressed concern over attaching numbers. John felt that the core competencies accomplish this. Program Review used SLOs, but in a minor way. John thought we should add another measure to the plan template for “outcomes” and that the core competencies are really the “missing link”. The matter of WAC and RAC was brought up—are they plans? Mike added that some plans may no longer exist if not funded.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 p.m.
The next meeting will be on April 25.

Submitted by Jill Lewis