

**Glendale Community College  
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

**December 8, 2014 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121**

Present: Saodat Aziskhanova, Marc Drescher, Ed Karpp, Richard Kamei, Jill Lewis, Mary Mirch, Ron Nakasone, Rick Perez, Alfred Ramirez, Sarah McLemore, Teyanna Williams, David Yamamoto, Andrew Young, Hoover Zariani

Absent: Deborah Kinley, Sarah McLemore, Deborah Robiglio, Isabelle Saber, Yvette Ybarra

Guests/Resources: Arin Edwards, Michael Ritterbrown

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. **MSC (Kamei/Yamamoto)** to accept the minutes of the November 3, 2014 meeting.

**OLD BUSINESS**

2. **Accreditation Gap Analysis: Progress Reports**

Ed reviewed the latest version of the report on SharePoint. Changes were noted at the bottom in black. Today's agenda showed up at the bottom in blue and included the following three bulleted items:

- Create a system for analyzing SLOs/PLOs and forward results/ concerns to appropriate groups.
  - Assess ILOs, report on results, direct concerns to appropriate groups.
  - Communicate shared understanding of college strengths and weaknesses to all constituencies.
- Additionally, information needs to be disseminated to the right group at the right time. Students belong to the group of stakeholders.

Ed suggested that we should do a SWOT to fully understand our strengths and weaknesses. We currently access using a survey regarding a "shared understanding" of assessments to groups. A new diagram was added showing Information at the top and Stakeholders (community, college, students and employees) at the bottom. Distribution would include presentations, electronic dissemination, information of the Web and also paper copies.

3. **Strengthening the Link**

We were asked to think about the last SLO and PLO results and where they go next. Sarah suggested that assessment information go to governance committees. Ed will draft a plan. Program Review reports include summaries of SLO/PLO assessments, however, we could survey students regarding their understanding of ILOs. The information is summarized into program review and the learning outcomes committee could also be involved with this. It was agreed that a summary of assessments would go to the governance committees as appropriate. A proposed new Annual Report could go to Team A, Team B, the Learning Outcomes Committee and also to any affected divisions. We need to develop a mechanism regarding assessment changes and improvements resulting from program review. Validation teams might be able to provide feedback to divisions. Faculty need to have control over changes at the program and curriculum level. The issues of one division may be similar to those of another. We need a mechanism to take on changes/improvements resulting from program review. It was agreed that we need a process for strengthening the linkage between assessment of learning

outcomes, planning and setting goals and priorities. The results of SLOs, PLOs and ILOs could become an annual presentation to Team A. Changes based on assessments and improvements could become a yearly report. Sarah stated that some colleges identify and publicize trends and gaps.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **4. Approval Process for Plans**

Team B proposes plans and identifies any conflicts, overlap or needed changes. Team A approves plans. IPCC review the plans and forwards them to the appropriate standing committee and then to Campus Executive for final approval.

**MSC (Yamamoto/Zariani)** that IPCC supports the Pathway for Plan Approval that Ed presented.

### **5. Communicating Planning Processes**

Ed suggested that we don't describe planning processes. Current program review and resource allocation processes are working. We can use a previous diagram from the "Flowchart" to demonstrate this and the information could be disseminated campus wide. The SLOAC Committee is not connected to ILOs, however, this could be discussed at faculty meetings or included as part of a newsletter. It was suggested that we develop a video or "Ted Talks" version of "Everything you always wanted to know about planning, program review and resource allocation but were afraid to ask. It is important to explain how prioritization is determined. We must communicate and show how this happens.

### **6. Integrated Planning Handbook 2014-2015 Draft**

The handbook is updated annually. It has been reorganized and includes the new Mission Statement and an explanation of the process. It includes the goals from the "KH" plan, the Board of Trustees Goals, a process for revising the EMP, component Plans within GCC's Comprehensive Plan. Changes include terminology, an emphasis on the hierarchy of goal and also the program review document and an explanation of the process. Our plan review process was applauded by our last site visit team. A summary of prioritizing committees has been added as well as an approved emergency resource request process. "Closing the Loop" will be added along with our Integrated Planning Process.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

The next meeting will be held on January 12, 2015

*Submitted by Jill Lewis*