

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

March 14, 2016

AD 121

Present: Edward Karpp (Chair), Saodat Aziskhanova (CSEA), Maritza Arrendondo (ASGCC), Daphne Dionisio (Resource) Zohara Kaye (Guild), Jill Lewis (Manager/Confidential), Sarah McLemore (Other Faculty), Arash Motamedrasa (ASGCC), Ron Nakasone (Administration), Rick Perez (Administration), Alfred Ramirez (Administration), Michael Ritterbrown (Administration), David Yamamoto (Joint Faculty), Teyanna Williams (Administration)

Absent: Seboo Aghanjani (CSEA), Marc Drescher (Administration), Deborah Kinley (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Other Faculty), Deborah Robiglio (Joint Faculty), Andy Young (Senate), Yvette Ybarra (Other Faculty)

Quorum: 12/16

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Ed Karpp at approximately 12:30 p.m.

- I. Approval of Minutes
 - a. The Minutes from December 14, 2015 need to be reconstructed.
 - b. At the December meeting the revision to the Mission Statement was approved.
 - i. The committee was asked if anyone remembered who made the motion and who seconded.
 1. The revision to the Mission Statement was MSC (McLemore/Young) for approval at the December 14, 2015 meeting.
- II. Review of Subcommittee Minutes
 - a. Master Planning – Team A
 - i. The last meeting was a working meeting and there are no Minutes to review.
 - ii. The groups got through all the EMPs.
 - iii. At the next meeting (scheduled for the end of April) there will be an update to the EMP
 - b. Program Review
 - i. Has not met since December.
- III. Accreditation Gap Analysis
 - a. Ed Karpp presented the list of gaps that have been identified which need to be closed before the Accreditation visit in October.
 - i. The final date for the Accreditation document is May.
 - ii. In June the Board will approve the final version of the Self-Evaluation report which will go to the Accrediting Commission in July.
 - b. The following are items that are still open:
 - i. *Develop a routine for ensuring that all published instances of institutional policies, procedures, and publications match each other and are the most recent versions.*
 - ii. *Code of Ethics Policies do not include consequences.*

1. *CSEA has approved a Code of Ethics policy for classified employees. It is unknown if it includes a Code of Ethics.*
 2. *We will need to speak to the Accreditation team when they are here to clarify how far we need to go on this issue. Would a Code of Ethics policy normally include specific punishments for violations?*
 - a. *A lot of campuses have Ethics Committees to recommend consequences.*
- iii. *Process for communicating, monitoring, and tracking evaluations.*
1. *We are now handing that off to the President's office and VPs.*
 2. *Information regarding which employees are up for evaluations are being sent to the President's and VP offices.*
 3. *There were concerns re: Evaluations being backdated, especially when they are negative.*
- iv. *Transfer of Credit Policies*
1. *Probably sufficiently covered in the Catalog.*
- v. *Communicate shared understanding of college's strengths and weaknesses.*
1. *This is only a small part of the standard and should be easily covered.*
- vi. *Evaluation of all personnel responsible for student learning.*
1. *Currently re-writing the Administrative Evaluation right now with language related to this.*
- vii. *Public Notification of the visit and third party comment.*
1. *In June there will be notification placed on the website that we will be undergoing an Accreditation visit in October and the public may comment.*
- viii. *Additional Items for Gap Analysis:*
1. *General Education Criteria and the Evaluation Mechanism.*
 - a. *Currently held up.*
 - b. *They have been submitted to the Senate to be on the Agenda.*
 - c. *Still needs to be reviewed by the Graduation Requirements Committee which might hold it up at Senate.*
 - d. *Might not get included in the catalog depending on when things get approved.*
 2. *CSU GE and IGETC*
 - a. *Technically certificates which we do not have specific learning outcomes for. Do we want to refer people somewhere else? Do we want to have a statement of how we are assessing them?*
 - i. *The understanding is that we would identify the courses in the catalog that are CSU and IGETC so the substance of the courses could be reviewed.*
 - ii. *Data is in PeopleSoft.*
 - b. *Language needs to be written for the GE and IGETC.*
 - c. *Learning Outcomes needs to make a recommendation.*
 - d. *Sarah McLemore will write a Draft.*

- IV. Annual Evaluation of Integrated Planning, Program Review, and Resource Allocation for 2014-2015 Process.
 - a. The Budget Committee just recently got through deciding funding for items submitted in 2014.
 - b. We need to evaluate the process.
 - c. Ed Karpp has reviewed the document for 2015-2016.
 - d. It was recommended that a section be added to the form: Achieving Key Knowledge.

- V. Disseminating SLO/PLO/ILO Results and Program Review Results
 - a. Standard I.B.8 says, "The institution broadly communicates the results of all its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.
 - b. How do we know that students are learning and how do we use this information?
 - i. The Learning Outcomes Committee will update the IPCC on this item.
 - c. How do the results get aggregated on the course level/program level rather than an individual section?
 - i. Requested feedback from Learning Outcomes Committee.
 - ii. The Core group will meet with David Yamamoto to figure things out.
 - d. The college needs to decide where we are at with this specific question and then clarify what the plan is to move forward.
 - i. The SLO committee should be given an opportunity to provide this information.
 - 1. The SLO Committee has been asked to make a recommendation about what we want to do and how to use the results of the assessments.
 - 2. The SLO Committee has not yet reported.
 - 3. It was suggested that this be revisited.
 - 4. The committee did not meet last month and it was suggested that a special meeting be called to discuss this as well as outcomes for CSU GE and IGETC.
 - 5. Ed Karpp will send a request for a meeting as we are waiting for suggestions.

- VI. Quality Focus Essay
 - a. The Accrediting Commission requires a Quality Focus Essay that identifies plans for future improvement as part of the self-evaluation report.
 - i. This has never been required before.
 - ii. A lot of other colleges spend most of the words on how they developed the essay rather than on what they are going to do.
 - b. Ed Karpp drafted a document that talks a little bit about how it was developed and identification of action projects.
 - i. QFE is supposed to identify things you know need to be improved for institutional effectiveness and what you're going to do to complete them. Ed's document includes the following:
 - 1. Improve the integration of plans.
 - 2. Improve the use of learning outcome assessments.
 - 3. Strengthen the process of evaluating personnel.
 - ii. The rest of the document is an outline that covers:
 - 1. Need for action project.
 - 2. Standards related to the Action Project
 - 3. Strategies
 - 4. Responsible Parties
 - 5. Timeline
 - 6. Measurable Outcomes
 - 7. Impact on Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness.

- c. We need to get to the content soon so we have time to adapt and edit.
 - i. Ed Karpp to come up with a draft for how to improve the integration of plans.
 - ii. Learning Outcome to do something for improving the use of learning outcome projects.
 - iii. Teyanna Williams asked to cover the process of evaluating personnel.
- d. It was suggested that the following be added:
 - i. Relationship to action plan in Standards.
 - ii. Table of Action Project Items.
 - iii. Bigger Instruction-related issues and EMP Planning.

VII. Process for Deciding When New Programs Require Substantive Change Proposals to the Accrediting Commission.

- a. New programs that represent a significant departure from existing programs, or can be completed at least 50% off-site or online, require substantive change proposals to the accrediting commission. The college should have a process to decide when such proposals are required.
 - i. The college currently does not have a policy about what triggers the requirement for a substantive change.
 - ii. It was suggested that Divisions should be made to include proposals for changes to programs in their Program Review.
 - 1. This would centralizes the process and triggers us to see that something might be coming up and if there are indicators that might make it be a substantive change.
 - 2. How do we make this a process? What are the steps for approval?
 - iii. Currently in Program Review it asks the following questions:
 - 1. What percentage of the courses can be completely taught online?
 - 2. Is this a significant departure from what the college already offers?

Are these questions enough to trigger the substantive change report? If not, we need to know the appropriate questions so they can be moved the Program Review Process.

- b. This will go to Program Review as an Agenda item.

VIII. Summary of Requirements for Institutional Effectiveness Indicator Goals.

- a. The Chancellor's Office requires each college to set goals for a defined set of Institutional effectiveness indicators.
- b. Ed Karpp showed a chart from ca.gov.
- c. This is currently being worked on.
 - i. There are a few fiscal ones that Budget Committee is working on.
 - ii. Academic Senate is starting to look at a couple of them.
 - iii. We don't have all the data we need yet but it is something we are working on.
 - iv. This is Year 2.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: April 11, 2016

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui