Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee

MINUTES
August 8, 2011 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121

Present: Trudi Abram, Ed Karpp, Wayne Keller, Jill Lewis, Alice Mecom, Mary Mirch, Rick Perez, Alfred Ramirez, Isabelle Saber, Mike Scott, Monette Tiernan, Hoover Zariani

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Val Dantzler, Margaret Mansour, Ron Nakasone, Student Representatives

Guests: Dawn Lindsay

CALL TO ORDER

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **MSC (Abram/Tiernan)** to accept the minutes of the July 25, 2011 meeting with corrections.

2. OLD BUSINESS

IPCC Final Evaluation of Planning, Program Review and Resource Allocation for 2010-2011 Cycle
Ed presented the Annual Evaluation of Planning Report as completed by Team B. The committee reviewed the document which primarily focused on the EMP. Suggested changes included the Recommendations for 2011-2012 and specifically the three bullets on the bottom of page 16.
Ed mentioned that Team B had okayed the top 13 goals and revisions of the "plans" document. The IPCC can agree or not agree with Team B's evaluation. It was agreed that the Team B self-evaluation at the top of page 16 should result in all three "x" marks in the #1 column to progress to the #2 column.

Mary suggested that the committee read through the evaluation report so that we can vote on acceptance at the next meeting.

- **MSC (Mirch/Ramirez)** to put voting on the approval of the Team B Evaluation of Planning and Program Review on the agenda for the next meeting on August 22. Members should submit comments/suggestions with specific details in writing to Ed by the end of next week.

Ed will reschedule the Team B meeting previously scheduled for Aug. 22.

Draft Follow-Up Report due March 15, 2012 (Recommendation 1)
Ed shared the last "Google Doc" draft of the report and pointed out the new table following the flow chart, the "Resolution of Recommendation 1" . The chart addresses items which the visiting team mentioned in their report which they did not think we had completed. We may have additional information to add following the Aug. 24 Division Chair Retreat and possibly for the Institute Day breakout sessions.

Isabelle questioned the GASB 45 funding response and asked for this to be placed as an agenda item for further discussion at the next meeting. Mary mentioned that the last visiting team changed the previous wording of this recommendation. Furthermore, the commission added wording in our

Action Letter of June, 2011 that we should not just plan for GASB45, but also "implement" a funding plan. We have made a financial accounting of this obligation in our own books. Ron has developed a funding plan for all new employees.

3. NEW BUSINESS

Emergency Procedure for Resource Requests Outside of Regular Timeline
Ed presented a new document developed with Mary and Jill for a "Proposed Urgent Resource Requests Process" to address requests that occur outside the program/plan review cycle. The most recent issue was for a "replacement" position in the Math Discovery Center this summer. The proposal outlines a mini process for requests outside the regular fall cycle. These requests would be documented on the regular resource request forms, validated by the Program Review Committee and then forwarded to the appropriate hiring committees. This plan would require the hiring committees to be available throughout the year. A running list of personnel requests would be prepared and who should maintain the list was discussed. Isabelle suggested that specific information about when these requests go to the budget committee should be developed. It was suggested that the requests should go to budget twice; the first time to determine what funds are available and then again for the final choice. Mary would like to see cooperation between the hiring committees and avoid having the processes being political.

Issues surrounding the Faculty Obligation Number (FON) were discussed. Mary pointed out that short term contracts can be problematic and that legal mandates (such as those for nursing) must be factored in. Additionally, the administrative executive committee has final veto power over all campus recommendations. Anything that goes through the governance process is forwarded on to administrative exec. This needs to be a transparent process. Mike stated that he wants to take the issue to the Senate and mentioned issues when recommendations are ignored due to a lack of funding.

Isabelle asked for a revision to include the hiring committees sending their list to budget for approval of funds in 1-c and to add another step (2-e) for replacements to go to budget at the end. Mike added that this step could be "messy" and that replacements should go back to the HAC's for reprioritization and cited summer being problematic. He felt that classified positions are more difficult than IHAC and that perhaps the three hiring groups should be bifurcated (separate IHAC & SSHAC from CHAC). It was agreed to revisit this topic at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.
The next meeting will be on August 8

Submitted by Jill Lewis