INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES September 12, 2016 AD 121

Present: Edward Karpp (Chair), Seboo Aghanjani (CSEA), Saodat Aziskhanova (CSEA), Anthony

Culpepper (Administration), Daphne Dionisio (Joint Faculty), Marc Drescher

(Administration), Megan Ernst (Joint Faculty), Zohara Kaye (Guild), Beth Kronbeck (Other Faculty), Jill Lewis (Manager/Confidential), Sarah McLemore (Other Faculty), Rick Perez (Administration), Michael Ritterbrown (Administration), Yvette Ybarra (Other Faculty),

Andy Young (Senate), Teyanna Williams (Administration)

Absent: Billy Agudo (ASGCC), Martin Chino (ASGCC), Alfred Ramirez (Administration), Deborah

Kinley (Administration), David Yamamoto (Resource)

Guest: Piper Rooney

Quorum: 15/19

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Ed Karpp at approximately 12:15 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

- a. The minutes from May 9, 2016 were reviewed.
 - > It was MSC (McLemore/Perez) that the Minutes from May 9, 2016 be approved without corrections.
- II. Review of Subcommittee Minutes
 - a. Master Planning Team A
 - i. There were no Minutes to review.
 - b. Program Review
 - i. The Minutes from May 17, 2016 were reviewed.
 - ii. It was suggested that Program Managers be included in the Workshop for assisting in Program Reviews.
 - iii. It was recommended that the Learning Outcomes Officer be included on the Program Review Committee (even as a Resource).
 - iv. It was requested that Curriculum also be added to the Program Review Committee.
 - It was MSC (Young/Dionisio) that the Program Review Minutes from May 17, 2016 be accepted.
- II. Process for Deciding When New Programs Require Substantive Change Proposals to the Accrediting Commission
 - a. The college needs to get ahead of this because occasionally new programs are developed and we need to have this in place.
 - b. A process needs to be identified.
 - c. Some indicators include geographic areas as well as new Tops codes.
 - d. It was suggested that this information be housed in various areas but key changes should be mentioned in the Curriculum Handbook.
 - e. Sarah McLemore volunteered to develop the language for this.
 - f. The committee will continue to work on this.

- III. Guidelines for PLO Development
 - a. What guidelines did we give Division Chairs for giving their PLOs?
 - i. They haven't changed since they were developed years ago.
 - ii. Division Chairs were recently asked to revise by changing action verbs, remove, or completely develop a new PLO if they felt they needed to.
 - iii. There has been discussion about using C&I and the review process for SLOs for Program Learning Outcomes as well.
 - Original guidance stated that PLOs were to be developed based on their SLOs.
 - v. David Yamamoto is currently taking all the PLOs and building the connections to the SLOs so that we have a substantial mapping.
 - vi. Division Chairs were instructed that if their PLO was not working towards anything in relation to their courses they needed to delete it or change it so that it did.
 - vii. The hope is that the Database will be open next week.
 - viii. Tuning USA Identifies Learning Outcomes and says what's appropriate for those types of degrees in the disciplines. Division Chairs should be thinking about this.
 - ix. Yvette Ybarra will come up with a process and include Program Review and will make it within the Division to make the change unless it needs to go through C&I.
- IV. Preparation for Accreditation Site Visit Questions for IPCC
 - a. The Accreditation Site Visit is scheduled for October 3-6, 2016.
 - b. There is a possibility that the Accreditation Team might want to meet with as many members of the IPCC that are available.
 - c. There was discussion on how we can best prepare and what should the IPCC know and be thinking about so everyone is on the same page. Some of the important things are:
 - i. What is in the QFE.
 - ii. Planning and Learning Outcomes
 - 1. We should know about things that are missing.
 - a. Animation PLOs were left out of the Catalog.
 - b. A Google Doc will be created of things that were inadvertently left out.
 - d. It was suggested that a list of classes the Team can visit which do not have classes taking exams during their visit be made available.
 - e. Debriefing meetings will take place after each interview with the Accreditation Team.
 - i. Each VP will handle their own areas.
 - ii. A Google Doc will be created with information from each meeting.
 - f. Jill Lewis will contact ASGCC to see about getting Reps to act as Ambassadors to walk members of the Accreditation team around to rooms.
 - g. There are two open forums scheduled.
 - h. An e-mail update will go out prior to the visit.
- V. College Plans Tracking System
 - a. Daphne Dionisio gave an overview of the tracking system she has developed for tracking college plans.

VI. IPCC Mission Statement

- a. The committee reviewed the current IPCC Mission Statement.
 - It was MSC (Aziskhanova/Ernst) to approve the revised Mission Statement:

The IPCC models and monitors continuous quality improvement to ensure institutional effectiveness. The committee oversees college planning and program review; assesses the effectiveness of planning; makes recommendations for sustained quality improvement; develops strategies to promote college-wide dialogue and participation in the integrated planning process; and identifies trends that reveal institutional and student needs. These objectives are achieved by the strategic use of institutional data (including program review), accreditation standards, federal and state regulations, and community input as quiding principles for assessing institutional effectiveness.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:30 p.m. Next Meeting: TBD Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui