

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

August 12, 2013 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121

Present: Ed Karpp, Richard Kamei, Jill Lewis, Rick Perez, Isabelle Saber, Mike Scott, Donna Voogt, Yvette Ybarra, Christina Yeghnazarian, Davit Avagyan

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Alfred Ramirez, David Yamamoto, Hoover Zariani

Resource/ Kathy Bakhit, Michael Ritterbrown

Guests:

CALL TO ORDER

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 12:20 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **MSC (Saber/Kamei)** to accept the minutes of the July 8, 2013 meeting.

Ed announced that starting in February we will change our meeting schedule to one meeting per month on the second Monday of the month.

NEW BUSINESS

2. Accreditation Follow-Up Report Due March 15, 2014

We need to address three issues: IPCC will coordinate the writing of the report. For the past two Follow-Up reports the IPCC assigned people to complete the writing and then forwarded the different sections to the appropriate constituency group for review and revisions. Isabelle will do the follow-up on all items in our report that we promised to accomplish by specific dates, etc. Michael added that all assessments must be at 100%. We will also need some final "editors". Yvette is working with divisions that have un-reported assessments and any database entry issues. Yvette will also provide help at the Division Chair Retreat on August 28th for anyone who needs assistance. Ed will start on Recommendation 1 and Yvette, Sarah and David will be working on Recommendation 2 with a step-by-step SLO/PLO resolution plan. We need to address redundancy and keep some people who worked on the previous reports as reviewers. Isabelle and Richard will take over Recommendation 4 in regards to faculty evaluations including assessment as part of their responsibility. The first deadline for these drafts will be Oct. 1, 2013. Ed will forward the committee a new Google Document which can be updated and added to.

3. Possible Limitations on New Programs from Divisions Not in Good Standing on SLOs, PLOs or Program Review

Ed suggested that the program review process of not allowing resource requests to go forward for prioritization in the budget process be carried through to divisions. In program review, programs that do not fully complete the program review document or SLO/PLO assessment cycles will not have their resource requests validated. This means that the request does not go forward for prioritization or to the budget committee for consideration. Similarly, this proposal would affect divisions/programs that either does not complete program review or which have not completed SLO/PLO assessments from adding new programs or curriculum. Ed presented Administrative Regulation 6200 outlining the organization of the college's budget process

including resource requests and new curriculum. It was suggested that “programs should be in “good standing” before program expansion takes place. Program Review controls resource requests through a validation process and policy and C&I (a subcommittee of the Senate) regulates the addition of new curriculum. The necessary completion of all assessments will be communicated by Mary at the Division Chair Retreat. Ed, Isabelle and Jill will draft some language and share it with the committee.

4. Program Review Committee as Governance Committee

Ed suggested that since Program Review is a sub-committee of the IPCC that it could become a governance committee similar to C&I which is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. The work of the committee is similar to other governance committees and the minutes would become part of the college records.

- **MSC (Saber/Avagyan)** to recommend that the Governance Review Committee appoint the Program Review Committee as a governance committee reporting to IPCC. The motion was carried.

5. Resource Requests: Alternative Funding Sources

Jill explained that several requests were received following last year’s program review process asking how the resource requests were prioritized by the standing committees and if a rubric or other instrument had been developed and if the results of the prioritization could be more transparent. The Program Review Committee uses a rubric for validation of non-personnel requests. Ron stated that the 4C’s and Academic Affairs had used Survey Monkey. Yvette reported that IHAC is setting 4-5 criteria, the rest of the committees kept the same process as last year. It was agreed that this should be made public.

6. Resource Planning for Technology Acquisition & Implementation

This idea originated from discussions at Budget Committee meetings. A potential bond to support technology acquisitions was discussed. Isabelle recalled previous budget discussions regarding any monies left at year end, above 6%, could go into GASB funding and then for technology. It was agreed that although we have done planning—we have yet to carry it out and therefore the “chance” for technology upgrades are still a low priority.

Kathy asked if we wanted to request a “set aside”. Mike stated that he was working with the president to develop a complete 3 Year budget to include maintenance, technology and equipment. He recommended that we wait as he wants to work with Dr. Viar and Ron to address “all issues”. Isabelle responded that this matter is really part of planning and that the EMP does not address this issue and budget and planning are not working collaboratively working. She suggested that a new budget start with a plan consistent with multi-year budgeting be adopted by the Budget Committee, which has unfortunately been reactive, but not thinking toward the long term solution. Rick stated that there was plenty of time to discuss this matter with the Budget Committee. Donna added that state funding is volatile and that shortfalls by the state often surprise us.

- **MSC (Saber/Perez)** to recommend that the Budget Committee develop a 3 year budget in its next Budget cycle for 2014-2017. The motion was carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:29 p.m.

Submitted by Jill Lewis