

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

April 20, 2015 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121

Present: Ed Karpp, Zohara Kaye (as proxy for Richard Kamei), Deborah Kinley, Jill Lewis, Mary Mirch, Ron Nakasone, Rick Perez, Alfred Ramirez, Sarah McLemore, Deborah Robiglio, Isabelle Saber, David Yamamoto, Andrew Young, Student Representative: Arin Sadeghi

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Marc Drescher, Gayane Iskandaryan, Teyanna Williams, Yvette Ybarra, Hoover Zariani

Guests/Resources: Michael Ritterbrown

CALL TO ORDER

Announcements:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **MSC (Kinley/Yamamoto)** to accept the minutes of the March 9, 2015 meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

2. Accreditation Gap Analysis: Progress Reports

Ed Karpp met with the President, V.P's and Teyanna and then resorted the Gap Analysis document with updates and added "status" and "prioritized" columns. Additionally, the IPCC webpage now links to the GAP Analysis document via Share Point. Any remaining items that are not completed could be put into an "Addendum" after the submittal of the report. Isabelle explained that the document is on Share Point

Mary added that she had been to a conference recently and was informed that Napa Valley College is reporting in October. They have a document similar to our Gap Analysis. They are including these items in their Quality Focused Essay and plan to ID elements that still need to be improved. We may want to add a column to our GAP document for "continuous improvement". Ed sent evaluation documents out to Planning, Program Review and Resource Allocation managers.

3. Strengthening the Link Between SLO/PLO/ILO Assessment and Planning

Ed noted that there is still a gap between the assessment of learning and planning. Assessments are an element in program review. The Planning office aggregates assessment results and the learning outcome committees should provide that evidence. A summary to IPCC identifies gaps. IPCC refers the gaps to the appropriate committee to "close the loop". Results are reviewed and distributed to the relevant areas for improvements. Sarah suggested that when planning aggregates assessment results, we could identify issues and take a broad look and develop some generalized suggestions. In student surveys we could come up with questions regarding student competency and how students respond to questions or graduation. We could pick one or two to focus on, involve any applicable areas and avoid picking on specific divisions. ILOs are being revised by the "Learning Outcomes Committee" which is asking departments to link ILOs and PLOs and target improvements. Areas will be asked to connect and revisit their

SLOs. We are still building ways to aggregate data. Math is assessing and evaluating assessments. It would be beneficial if we could drop data into the PR document to show SLO's becoming PLOs, which become ILOs. IIA focuses on granting degrees based on Los. We can use campus wide data and discussions within the Senate. The discussion could be continued by committees such as Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. If an ILO develops issues we could start by identifying all programs that use that ILO. Some assessments are "weak" we could pilot one item linked to the "critical thinking" ILO.

MSC (McLemore/Yamamoto) to explore and put together a group to review assessment reports linked to the ILO: Critical Thinking, and based on findings move it.

Sarah will take the lead on this with Arin, one of our student reps. Zohara will see if a member of the Guild would like to join in ad also ask Andy Young for a Senate member will participate.

NEW BUSINESS

4. Administrative Regulation 3250 (Institutional Planning)

The current AR 3250 and also BP3250 reference the Matriculation Plan. This should be changed to the Student Services and Support Program, also known as SSSP. A question arose regarding if continuance of the Cooperative Work Experience (units for working) is still required. This program was discontinued several years ago and will be investigated along with the Transfer Center and the Veteran's Center in accordance with State and Federal Programmatic Guidelines.

5. Institutional Effectiveness Goals

The Chancellor's Office is requiring colleges to set institutional effectiveness goals. A memo from the CCCC office outlines a framework for "Institutional Effectiveness Goals" with aspirational goals and as well as actual goals. The Effectiveness Framework includes first year course completion rates, Accreditation Status, Fiscal Viability and Fund Balance and programmatic compliance. Legislators are working on a framework and indicators. The first goals are due to the Chancellor's Office by June 15, 2015.

6. Shared Understanding of College Strengths and Weaknesses

The IPCC and Campus Executive will work together to propose and summarize a set of strengths and weaknesses. The project could start with the combined managers group forwarding a list of strengths and weaknesses which IPCC could start with to come up with a short list to be shared with the Academic Senate and the standing committees.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:09 p.m.

Submitted by Jill Lewis