# Glendale Community College Institutional Planning Coordination Committee

## March 12, 2012 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121

Present: Trudi Abram, Saodat Aziskhanova, Ed Karpp, Wayne Keller, Isabelle Saber, Deborah Kinley,

Jill Lewis, Sarah McLemore, Alfred Ramirez, Mike Scott, Monette Tiernan

Absent: Margaret Mansour, Mary Mirch, Ron Nakasone, Rick Perez, Donna Voogt, Hoover Zariani

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m.

### 1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSC (ScottAbram) to accept the minutes of the February 13, 2011 meeting.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

## 2. Update on Follow-Up Report Due March 15, 2012

Ed discussed the latest SLO and PLO numbers reflecting great progress from Institute Day showing 87% of SLOs defined and 60% assessed/timelines and 89% of PLOs defined and 62% assessed/timelines. Sarah discussed combining the results of all the timelines and putting them together as a campuswide project to provide evidence of "accelerating" our assessment efforts.

## 3. Administrative Regulation 3250, Institutional Planning

Small changes need to be taken to the standing committees and then to Campus Exec. for approval. Donna will bring CHAC language back to the committee.

## 4. Procedure for Urgent Resource Requests Outside of Regular Timeline

We will wait for CHAC to come back to the group with new language.

## 5. ACCJC Review of Accreditation Standards: Opportunities for Input

Interested parties may submit suggestions for changes to the standards at a hearing in Huntington Beach (in writing or in person) on Mar. 14, 2011. Ed asked if any of the people who had taken a lead on the different standards had suggestions. None were made during the meeting. Any replies can be sent to Jill or Ed.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

## 6. Validation of Resource Requests from Plan Review

Two requests from the Non-Credit Matriculation Plan were discussed by the committee: Marketing Materials for \$7500

Bus Transportation for students if fall and spring.

Using a rubric similar to what Program Review uses to validate, the requests were rated in five different areas in relationship to 1) goals and plans, 2) the EMP, 3) Core Competencies, 4) student and 5) achievement and "other" if applicable on a scale of 0 to 3 points for each area. The committee gave both requests scores of: 3, 2, NA, and 2 which was a supporting validation.

It was decided that the second request had already coordinated with Outreach, the ASGCC and the Senate for funding. It was also suggested that the Foundation may be able to support projects like this one. It was recommended that we change the validation questions to match up with the request form next year. The committee decided to and forward both requests to the Budget Committee.

Similarities of the validation process with program review was discussed. It was agreed that Program Review would be adding "NA" to their resource request validation form for the coming year also as this situation had been realized after the process and forms had already been put to use for 2011-2012..

At the next meeting we will be discussing eLumen and the \$13K renewal fee.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.
The next meeting dates will be March 26 and April 9.

Submitted by Jill Lewis