

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

MINUTES

April 25, 2011 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121

Present: Trudi Abram, Saodat Aziskhanova, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo, Ed Karpp, Jill Lewis, Alice Mecom, Margaret Mansour, Rick Perez, John Queen, Mike Scott, Alfred Ramirez, Monette Tiernan, Hoover Zariani, Jose Diaz, Juliana Kim

Absent: Karen Holden-Ferkich, Mary Mirch, Ron Nakasone, Vicki Nicholson

Guests: Dawn Lindsay

CALL TO ORDER

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 12:19 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **MSC (Aziskhonova/Scott)** to accept the minutes of the March 28 and April 4, 2011 meetings.

2. OLD BUSINESS

Update on Follow-Up Visit

Ed commented on the visiting team's response to Rec. 1 as very positive concerning our progress; however, the cycle has not been fully completed. It is possible that the timeline to present a sustainable cycle could take 1 to 2 years. Ed explained that Dawn will visit the commission meeting on either June 9 or 10 to provide additional information on our progress. Rick asked if the commission would make their decision at that time. Ed explained that the commission meets for three days to review all of the college cases and makes their decisions at the end of the meeting. Response letters to each institution are then completed and sent out.

Ed asked the group for input regarding what proof of progress Dawn could present to the commission. Ed's list included:

1. Annual Evaluation of Program Review (form), the Program Review Committee's Self-Evaluation, and the IPCC's evaluation of Program Review
2. Annual Evaluation of Planning (form) to be completed by Team B and the IPCC
3. Annual Evaluation of Resource Allocation
4. Program Review Annual Report
5. Planning Annual Report – Annual EMP report
6. Planning Annual Report – Institutional Effectiveness Report (Measures transfer rate, ARC, Perkins, Institutional xxx)

These documents will show that the college is seriously evaluating our processes and making improvements.

Mike commented that visiting team member Darla Cooper expressed concern that our SLO progress was lagging behind. John felt that our progress was presented negatively. Alice said that the SLO meeting she had with Darla which also included Tina Anderson-Wahlberg, Sarah McLemore and Roger Bowerman went well and they presented improved numbers.

We need to show how program review is used for program improvement even though the cycle has not been completed. Jill stated that improvements to the program review document and process will be outlined in the year-end report. It has not been determined whether or not SLO assessments have been used to help improve programs. All resource requests need to be returned from the standing committees back to the Budget Committee for prioritization in order to complete a cycle. The team did not see proof or a demonstration of evidence to show completion of a cycle and be able to determine the sustainability of the process. Ed stated that our updated ARC numbers will be up from last year.

John wanted to know when we will see the visiting team's report. Jill will check with the ACCJC. Mike stated that the IPCC will have to continue to meet in the summer to continue our progress with the Budget Committee. Mike wants to see a timeline for the summer. A draft timeline with deadlines for plans will be presented at the next meeting. Dawn asked for direction on what to do about the faculty accreditation coordinator position now that John's term is ending. Mike agreed to take on the responsibilities of the position.

Standard Template for Plans

Ed revised the College Plan form to include core competencies and action items and also an approval process. Hoover asked if the number of "passing votes" for plans could be included as an accountability measure. Ed stated that the form could essentially "be a plan". Margaret added that this should also match up with the plan review form, but it also looks like a duplicate of the plan review form. Alfred commented that there should be more details to the plan sheet. Ed suggested that the form could let people know what is expected from a plan and could also be used as the format for a plan. Mike added that the form could be used for new plans and revisions to existing plans.

Plan Review Phase One: Plan Identification (form)

Ed presented the template for new plans or plans under review to provide expectations for what a plan should include. Monette added that we must make it very clear—this is what we expect and not give the writer a choice to use it or not. Ed also explained that "Plan Review" is what we started with. Alice asked what the purpose of the Plan Review form is. Ed stated that it was developed to identify what plans exist. Rick added that plans such as Non-Matriculation are given a format from the Chancellor's office. Alfred added that we could use the form to outline where information in the plan could be found, such as page numbers. Alice suggested that a rubric for plans could be an internal form to point out a weak versus strong plan, or essentially be the validation of the plan and help us to take an accounting of how plans are "stacking up". Hoover did not think that the IPCC should have to input this information and that the author of the plan could fill out the form faster. Perhaps this new process could be started in September.

3. NEW BUSINESS

SLOAC Timeline (Rec. 2)

Ed explained that in 2010 we focused on Integrated Planning and that this year the college should focus on SLOs for the march 2012 Follow-Up Report. Alice explained that we must get program SLOs moving (we are currently at 67%). SLOs should be in the catalogue and in evaluations. The problem is in our culture as people don't want to be required to do more. Alice suggested that Institute Day could include an SLO theme discussion regarding quality assurance. WAC and RAC can provide meaningful examples regarding the core competencies. It was not clear who would "screen" SLOs for quality. The fall 2012 SLO "Proficiency Level" deadline is not far off. GCC needs to come up with our own list of what constitutes "quality assessment". Alice reminded the group that proficiency is not the highest level outlined by the ACCJC rubric (Continuous Quality Improvement is

the highest level). C&I was discussed as a possible clearing house for SLOs. During our April site visit, Darla Cooper reminded us of the importance of providing quality assurance. Alice was not sure of how eLumen might work into Program Review. Alice discussed a "Criteria for Proficiency" chart developed by the SLO Committee and Sarah McLemore's involvement in the WASC Assessment Academy, the SLO Committees Mission (handout) and a possible focus for program review regarding what students need versus the continuous cycle of improvement. She admitted that a SLO cycle for every course SLO is impossible, but that we must provide a "culture of evidence". Ed stated the compliance will involve showing milestones by division and that motivation and accountability were no longer a matter of choice. Reporting issues with different divisions were discussed. All SLO progress must be reported to either Alice or Ed or through eLumen.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:31 p.m.
The next meeting will be on May 9.

Submitted by Jill Lewis