Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee

MINUTES
September 27, 2010 - 12:15 pm in AD121

Present: Ed Karpp, Jill Lewis, Mike Scott, Mary Mirch, Alice Mecom, Margaret Mansour,
                 Ron Nakasone, Arnel Pascua, Monette Tiernan, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo, Vicki Nicholson,
                Hoover Zariani, Armond Aivazyan

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Ana Boghazian, Karen Holden-Ferkich, Rick Perez,
                Alfred Ramirez

Guests: Dawn Lindsay, John Queen

CALL TO ORDER
        The meeting was called to order at 12:20 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   • MSC (Mansour, Mirch) to accept the minutes of the September 13, 2010 meeting with
     no changes

2. OLD BUSINESS
     John inquired about the faculty planning coordinator position. It was reported that no applicants
     had been applied and that the one potential had just declined. Mary and Jill will follow through
     with advertising the RT position again.

3. INTEGRATED PLANNING
      IHAC & Program Review Timelines
     The process actually starts in March of the previous academic year. Meetings then start in the
     fall to determine the number of faculty positions needed. Five positions are needed for the 2010-
     2011 year, with four to five more positions for the 2011-2012 year. Mary outlined the process as
     follows: After the preliminaries are completed, information regarding the number of positions
     needed is provided in October. This year has fallen behind and so advertising for the open
     positions will take place in January. Mike asked if new and replacement positions would be
     prioritized. Mary stated that there are now between 40 and 49 replacement positions from the
     past three years. In the fall the student achievement data from the previous year is used to justify
     positions. Currently, the college is challenged to meet the full-time obligation of 4-5 positions in
     2010-2011 and between 8 -11 for 2011-2012. IHAC conducts all prioritizing.

     Ed explained that this year all personnel requests would be submitted by the division through the
     program review "Resource Request" form. Additional questions from the original IHAC form are
     required by the IHAC Committee. Mary estimated that over 60 requests for new and replacement
     positions could be submitted this year.Mary is responsible for the IHAC process and Rick
     oversees the faculty SSHAC process. Hoover expressed concerns over the CSHAC process in
     use. This group has a history of difficulty obtaining any funding. Some areas have different
     funding such as: "03", categorical or restricted money. Each hiring group committee can prioritize
     their own positions. Ramona mentioned that many SS programs are "01" positions and had
     questions regarding the SHAC process. Hoover inquired regarding the status of CHAC. Vicki
     stated that cabinet is reviewing the process. Alice reminded the group about the Telecon with the

ACCJC concerning recommendation 1.c and Jack Pond's response that addressed reallocating existing resources (harder decisions must be forthcoming).

Mary will get more information to us. John explained that in future years (when we are not in a time crunch to get a process in place) that we will have program review information from previous years to prioritize the next fall. All of the hiring committees must be on the same track even though instruction is more time driven than the other groups.

Roles in the Process: The IPCC oversees all of the integrated planning components. Team A and B will be responsible for the annual rework of the EMP and the revision of the mission statement. John explained that Team A makes decisions regarding the mission, EMP, and annual goals to Campus Exec.

The IPCC will create a year-end report to be reviewed by Teams A & B, which will in turn make recommendations for improvements to the integration process. We have no specific annual goals for this year. Team A & B met last spring to work with K.H. on the EMP. Team A will meet on Oct. 22 to develop recommendations for Campus Exec. regarding annual goals. What does Campus Exec. need from Teams A & B to prioritize annual goals?

The Program Review Committee will evaluate the program review documents and receive input from all users.

Ed asked what we could use to validate plans such as the EMP and lots of other plans without any real approval process (ex. The Matriculation Plan was prepared to meet state requirements, but not approved by any campus group). Mike stated that all other plans have an administrator in charge of creating them and all go through some part of the governance system, but who would evaluate these plans is not defined. The previously developed "Checklist for Plans" could be part of a new "Plan Review" along with a document similar to the validation process for resource requests done by program review. The IPCC could give feedback to provide to Campus Exec. An annual program review report was also discussed which could identify trends that can influence plans.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Submitted by Jill Lewis