

**Glendale Community College  
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

**MINUTES**

**July 17, 2011 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121**

Present: Trudi Abram, Val Dantzler, Ed Karpp, Jill Lewis, Alice Mecom, Mary Mirch, Ron Nakasone, Rick Perez, Alfred Ramirez, Isabelle Saber, Mike Scott Hoover Zariani,

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Margaret Mansour, Monette Tiernan, Student Representatives

Guests: Sarah McLemore

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m.

Mary Mirch brought a cake for the committee to celebrate the college receiving the ACCJC Action Letter dated June 30, 2011 which stated that GCC has been removed from "Warning" status and that our 2012 Follow-Up Report would not require a visit as previous stated.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- **MSC (Abrams/Zariani)** to accept the minutes of the June 6, 2011 meeting.
- **MSC (Scott/Abrams)** to accept the minutes of the June 27, 2011 meeting.

**2. OLD BUSINESS**

**Revised Plan Review Process**

Ed suggested that plan review parallel that of program review to be done in the fall. All requests generated through plans will go through a resource request process similar to program review and will be submitted to the IPCC in the fall. Jill mentioned that several areas that submit program review reports also have college plans (HR, IT, Facilities, etc.) For last year, some submitted resource requests through program review and others to the IPCC. Staff Development and Non-Matriculation did not report last year, but do have plans. Ed stated that some resource requests might be outlined or detailed in plans, while others might be more clearly linked to the department and the program review report. Jill did not think that all programs were on the reporting list. To clarify the issue of duplication of resource requests, Ed will prepare a detailed evaluation of resource requests through both pathways for the next meeting.

Mary stated that the IT plans relationship to the EMP should be emphasized with the 13 goals for 2011-2012 and that all plans should have stated outcomes. Jill felt that the EMP connection in the program review report is often problematic in trying to connect small department items and specific instructional needs that are not mentioned in the current EMP.

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

**Revising the Budgeting Process**

A discussion of the "3-M" proposal from Michael Ritterbrown at the last meeting was continued. The proposal involves the dedication of a % of budget to specific projects, such as 2% for IT, and also allow changes in spending focus through the years. Ed suggested that the point should be the bigger

picture of all requests which could include linking “like” requests for “economies of scale” and better inventory and budget control. Discussion of accessing needs in order to prioritize budgeting was brought up by Sarah. Mary pointed out that prioritization/ranking happens due to consensus at some point and that this has still not been agreed upon. Changes can often result in “sacrifices” elsewhere. We don’t currently have a long-range plan to pay for our IT issues. Ed asked what the next step should be. Mike Scott suggested that the three “Mikes” should make a proposal to the budget committee. Hoover added that any written proposal should include a flow chart and perhaps come to the IPCC first. Isabelle stated that such a plan has ramifications and implications to all bargaining groups. Any plan should outline how all the pieces will fit together to prevent previous practice of everyone spending to avoid losing their budgets.

Mary reiterated Academic Affairs frustrations of competitive resource requests. The current system supports divisions vying for budget and additionally, programs change. We should consider starting discussions with the bargaining units. We could possibly start with a plan and then tweak it like we usually do. It was agreed that the IPCC would not make a decision, but that a proposal should come forward.

**Commission Action Letter of June 30, 2011**

The college was removed from “Warning” status. We will not have another visit in spring 2012 and only have to submit the second Follow-Up Report in March addressing the completed first cycle of integrated planning for Rec. 1 in addition to the Rec. 2 (SLOs), Rec. 8 (safety of the IT servers) and Rec. 9 (funding plan for GASB45). The commission also gave us credit for addressing Rec. 3 & 7 early and they are considered as completed.

Ron’s plan to meet Rec. 8: The pony chillers are awaiting DSA (Dept. of State Architect) approval and need to be combined with other units and generators; the cost is approx. \$300K. There is an estimated cost saving for the new Lab Services Building and Ron will also propose taking some funds from the Measure G Balance allocated to the Lab Sciences building. It is possible that new software could resolve the generator use issue with automatic power up and power down.

Mary reminded the committee that a small group went to LACC last year and they shared some valuable information with us regarding our reporting to the ACCJC. She suggested we should prepare a thank you letter to them advising of our status. Ron will forward the Action Letter to the Board. Ed is going to set up a “Google Document” format for our March 15, 2012 report to eliminate some of the format problems associated with emailing document revisions back and forth for the documents in 2010 and 2011.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:26 p.m.  
The next meeting will be on July 25  
Future meeting dates for the summer include August 8 and 22.

*Submitted by Jill Lewis*