

**Glendale Community College  
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

**May 13, 2013 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121**

Present: Ed Karpp, Deborah Kinley, Jill Lewis, Margaret Mansour, Mary Mirch, Rick Perez, Alfred Ramirez, Isabelle Saber, Ron Nakasone, Donna Voogt, David Yamamoto, Hoover Zariani, Vahe Sargysyan

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Sarah McLemore, Mike Scott, Yvette Ybarra, Solene Manoukian

Resource: Michael Ritterbrown, Monette Tiernan

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 12:22 p.m.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- **MSC (Perez/Sargysyan)** to accept the minutes of the April 8, 2013 meeting with corrections.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**2. Standard Processes for Prioritizing Resource Requests: Memo to Standing Committee Chairs Outlining Suggested practices**

Possible criteria for prioritization was discussed which include program review criteria used for validation of resource requests by the Program Review Committee. Standing committees could evaluate how well the request meets with selected required criteria such as the strength of the relationship of the request to plans such as the EMP or an existing internal plan or other campus plan could also be used. It was also decided that other factors used by program review such as "health and safety" or "legal or accreditation mandates" could be used. Program review also considers how well the program addresses SLOs, PLOs and ILOs in the validation process for all resource requests. Hoover stated that this seemed like too much criteria. It was agreed that we need consistency of terms for requestors and standing committees and that annual goals could be used in prioritization. Some committees may need to come up with their own specific criteria similar to the way hiring committees use their own criteria.

Members agreed that there is sometimes confusion regarding what constitutes mandates such as health and safety. Jill reported that some requestors site "accreditation as a factor, when the requested item really has nothing to do with accreditation. Direct relationship toward meeting an accreditation standard or specific recommendation should be considered. Additionally, some programs such as Nursing have their own accreditation requirements. It was agreed that a standard scale of 1 to 10 with 10 being the highest score should be used by all of the prioritization committees for each request. Each standing committee will provide a ranking and a total score for each request to be forward to the Budget Committee.

- **MSC (Saber/Yamamoto)** to use and forward the above prioritization parameters to the standing committees.

Discussion continued regarding whether 01 or 03 funding should be used as criteria. The Budget Committee will look at the lists from all of the standing committees and make a final decision.

Jill reported that the requests were forwarded to the standing committees in March and April. Ron stated that all ranked/rated requests should be forwarded to the Budget Committee in June.

**3. Accreditation Process: Process and Timeline for 2016 Accreditation**

The 80% RT Coordinator position closes on May 17 and as of today no applications have been received. Possible chairs for the various standards were discussed. Ed suggested that a chair or member of the primary committees could be a good choice as writers for the Self-Evaluation document. The Accreditation Steering Committee will also need a chair person. The committees should be filled by fall 2013 as the report needs to receive final approval from the Board by Nov.-Dec. 2015. Additionally, each standard needs a faculty, classified and administrative co-chair. Three to 5 additional members with knowledge in the area and 1-2 students should be added to each standard committee. Ron expressed concern over spreading the writing over 2 years. His fiscal data needs to be most current to the due date.

Isabelle suggested that a clerical support person be established for the team. Managing the paperwork, changes, updates and references becomes a monumental task.

The "New Business" (items 4 through 8) on the agenda will need to be pushed to the next meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

*Submitted by Jill Lewis*