

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

April 18, 2016

AD 121

Present: Edward Karpp (Chair), Daphne Dionisio (Resource), Marc Drescher (Administration), Megan Ernst (Joint Faculty), Zohara Kaye (Guild), Deborah Kinley (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Other Faculty), Jill Lewis (Manager/Confidential), Sarah McLemore (Other Faculty), Arash Motamedrasa (ASGCC), Ron Nakasone (Administration), Rick Perez (Administration), Alfred Ramirez (Administration), Michael Ritterbrown (Administration), Andy Young (Senate),

Absent: Maritza Arrendondo (ASGCC), Saodat Aziskhanova (CSEA), Seboo Aghanjani (CSEA), Deborah Robiglio (Joint Faculty), David Yamamoto (Joint Faculty), Yvette Ybarra (Other Faculty), Teyanna Williams (Administration),

Quorum: 13/16

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Ed Karpp at approximately 12:35 p.m.

- I. Approval of Minutes
 - a. The minutes from December 14, 2015 were reviewed.
 - ***It was MSC (Ritterbrown/Lewis) that the Minutes from December 14, 2015 be approved without corrections.***
 - b. The minutes from March 14, 2016 were reviewed.
 - ***It was MSC (Ritterbrown/Perez) (One Abstention: Young) that the Minutes from March 14, 2016 be approved without corrections.***

- II. Review of Subcommittee Minutes
 - a. Master Planning – Team A
 - i. There were no minutes from Team A to review.
 - ii. Next meeting is scheduled for April 29, 2016 from 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
 - b. Program Review – Minutes of December 1, 2015
 - ***It was MSC (Perez/Kinley) to accept the Minutes from December 1, 2015.***

- III. Accreditation Gap Analysis: Progress Reports
 - a. The committee reviewed the list of gaps that have been identified which need to be completed before the Accreditation visit.
 - i. *Develop a routine for ensuring that all published instances of institutional policies, procedures, and publications match each other and are the most recent version develop policy (AR) for all campus publications.*
 1. Being done in the Catalog process.
 2. Still need a process for matching.
 - ii. *Our code of ethics policies don't include consequences.*
 1. The CSEA code of ethics policies have been revised and include consequences.
 - iii. *A written process for communicating, monitoring, tracking evaluations which should include a trigger mechanism to the evaluator(s)/automated performance tracking system.*
 1. A process has been put in place for tracking employee evaluations.
 - iv. *How do we make available to students our transfer of credit policies?*

1. Currently being revised.
 - v. *Communicate shared understanding of college strengths and weaknesses.*
 1. Will be discussed further down the Agenda as it relates to ILOs.
 2. Still needs to be solved.
 - vi. *Evaluation of all personnel responsible for student learning*
 1. The Administration evaluation is being changed but has not been finalized.
 - vii. *Public Notification of Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment*
 1. Has not been done yet but there is still time.
 2. These will both be posted on the website.
- IV. Annual Evaluation of Integrated Planning, Program Review, and Resource Allocation for 2014-2015 Process
- a. IPCC is responsible for the last step of the evaluation.
 - b. Budget Committee has looked at it.
 - c. Program Review Committee needs to look at the process and come up with strengths and weaknesses.
 - d. Team B looks at the planning part.
 - e. We are currently doing the prioritization of items for 2016-2017.
- V. Disseminating SLO/PLO/ILO Results and Program Review Results
- a. The Learning Outcomes committee will update the IPCC on this item.
- 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.
 - b. We need to make more progress on this.
 - c. There are three action projects. These define what the college sees as areas we need to address and improve on in the future:
 - i. Improve integration of plans.
 - ii. Improve use of learning outcomes Assessment
 1. This has moved forward.
 2. Learning Outcomes Committee met on March 24, 2016, and came up with a plan for the future. This needs to be turned into a narrative and tabled part with a timeline and who is responsible.
 - iii. Strengthen Process for Evaluating Personnel.
 1. Part of this will include a timeline for evaluations so that 100% of employees are evaluated.
 - d. The first draft of the whole self-evaluation goes to Board in May and the Final Second reading will be done in June.
- 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 proposals are required.
 - b. We have done a couple of the course of the years but we have never had a policy or Administrative Regulation saying when we have to file a substantive change report.
 - c. How is this triggered in the new Program Approval Process?
 - d. How do we identify what is considered a significant departure?
 - e. This only applies to Instructional programs.
 - f. ASJCC does not have specific guidelines.
 - g. The best way to create a policy may be to survey other Districts and see how they are doing this and which other colleges have a plan.

- VIII. Recommendations from Critical Thinking ILO Task Force
- a. The IPCC discussed the recommendations that came from the Critical Thinking ILO Task Force to determine what we do with the information.
 - b. We are required to disseminate information about our assessment and make decisions on what we've assessed.
 - c. Some of the recommendations were: Revise Assessment Forms, Meet with Division Chairs, Connect SLOs to PLOs and PLOs to ILOs, investigate ways to implement a campus focus on critical thinking and effective practices and ideas how the college can support Instruction.
 - d. This report exists but we have not followed up on it and come up with a procedure for looking at the next ILO.
 - e. What is the next step now that we have these recommendations? Do we more widely disseminate this information? Do we present it somewhere?
- ***It was MSC (Perez/Kaye) to recommend to the Learning Outcomes Committee that they look at the available information (based on the report) and develop a response/action plan on how to better disseminate and communicate the information.***

Meeting Adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: May 9, 2016

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui