INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES
October 10, 2016
AD 121

Present: Edward Karpp (Chair), Seboo Aghanjani (CSEA), Billy Agudo (ASGCC), Saodat
            Aziskhanova (CSEA), Susan Courtey (Administration) (Proxy for Anthony Culpepper),
            Daphne Dionisio (Joint Faculty), Marc Drescher (Administration), Martin Chino (ASGCC),
            Megan Ernst (Joint Faculty), Zohara Kaye (Guild), Deborah Kinley (Administration), Beth
            Kronbeck (Other Faculty), Jill Lewis (Manager/Confidential), Sarah McLemore (Other
            Faculty), Rick Perez (Administration), Alfred Ramirez (Administration), Yvette Ybarra
            (Other Faculty), Andy Young (Senate),

Absent: Michael Ritterbrown (Administration), Teyanna Williams (Administration), David
            Yamamoto (Resource)

Guest: Piper Rooney

Quorum: 17/19

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 September 12, 2016 were reviewed.
            ➢ *It was MSC (Kinley/Dionisio) that the Minutes from September 12, 2016*
              be approved without corrections. (Courtey Abstained)

II.   Review of Subcommittee Minutes
        a. Master Planning – Team A
            i. There were no Minutes to review.
        b. Program Review
            i. The Unadopted Minutes from the September 20, 2016 meeting were
                reviewed.
            ➢ *It was MSC (Dionisio/Ramirez) that the Program Review Minutes from*
              September 20, 2016 be accepted.

II.   Process for Deciding When New Programs Require Substantive Change Proposals to the
        Accrediting Commission
        a. The committee reviewed Sarah McLemore's Draft Policy for the process of when new
            programs need to submit a substantive change proposal.
        b. The goal was to create a process that wasn't restrictive and works for us.
        c. Some triggers include:
            i.   A Tops Code associated with a program is substantially different would be a
                 factor.
            ii. Job categories that are different would also be a deciding factor.
            iii. If more than 50% is offered in a different geographic location.
            iv. If we start a program that has a clinical component that would be an
                 automatic substantive change.
        d. The idea is to put this in the Curriculum Handbook.
        e. This will also need to be added as a field in the new Curriculum database so that it is
            a question and a workflow can be created.
        f. There was a question as to how Job Categories is defined.

i.   We would refer to the Center for Excellence to get that information.
g.   The document will be going to C&I for a second read as well as to Academic Affairs.

> ➢ ***It was MSC (Young/Kronbeck) that the Policy for Deciding When New Programs Require Substantive Change Proposal be approved as written as it goes through the Governance Process.***

III.   Guidelines for PLO Development
a.   The committee needs to talk about guidelines/best practices for PLOs as they can be done in so many different ways.
b.   Support for this was formalized at the last Academic Affairs and this will now be an Instructional Goal.
c.   The Learning Outcomes Committee approved a revision policy for PLOs at the September 2016 meeting. It needs to go to Senate for future approval.
   i.   Every division just re-did their Program Learning Outcomes over summer minus one division.
   ii.   These revisions are now in the Database (glendale.edu/slo)
   iii.   The revisions will be sent so that Catalog can be updated.
d.   Trying to keep PLOs in the Division's hands.
e.   Yvette Ybarra is developing a Handbook that will include guidelines for content (how to write a PLO, what language is used to meet the needs of division, etc.). This is going to the Learning Outcomes Committee at the end of the month.
   i.   It was recommended that this also go in the C&I Handbook.

IV.   Debriefing on Accreditation Visit and Recommendations
a.   The Accreditation visit was last week.
b.   We do not have the official results of the visit but we received a lot of information and outlined what will show up in the report.
   i.   The self-evaluation report was organized and thorough and the evidence was substantially complete. When new evidence was requested it was immediately available.
      a.   Most claims were supported by evidence or interviews.
      b.   The self-identified planning agenda was appropriate and achievable.
      c.   The report was well written and organized according to the instructions.
   ii.   Commendations:
      1.   Impressed by the culture of inclusion and support for diverse student populations.
      2.   Facilities are student centered.
      3.   Garfield Campus is a service to the community.
      4.   Student participation and knowledge of Governance system.
      5.   Responses to Technology needs, including the Tech Plan and rapid response to student needs.
      6.   Regard and inclusiveness toward Adjunct faculty.
   iii.   Recommendations:
      1.   We received six (we normally receive nine or ten).
      2.   The college was told that the six recommendations would be given as recommendations for improvement.
      3.   Disaggregating Student Learning Outcomes Data for different subpopulations.
         a.   This is being worked on but it is a bit of a problem as our current systems don't handle this very well.
         b.   Most colleges are getting this recommendation.
      4.   More systematic use of Student Outcomes

<ol start="5" type="1">
Assess the effectiveness of the current decentralized approach to our labs and tutorial centers and make changes if necessary.
Increase online counseling access for students, especially Distance Education students. Also implement methods to reduce wait time for counseling appointments.
<ol type="i">
Implement a stronger method to identify, complete and track timely evaluations of Adjunct faculty.
Include in the evaluation process the extent to which Assessment of Learning Outcomes is used to improve teaching and learning.

    iv. Quality Focus Essay
<ol type="1">
The QFE was consistent with our self-evaluation and connected to our self-analysis and reasonable although some items might be a stretch.
There was a request to make the responsibilities for the QFE be put on the agenda for the next meeting.

V. Institutional Master Plan Revision: Process and Structure of Plan
- a. EMP has been changed to IMP because it doesn't just cover educational areas rather it sets goals for the entire college.
- b. Team B is taking about the process and structure of the plan.
- c. Ed Karpp will be doing a presentation at the next Board Meeting about the process and structure of the plan.
- d. Team B is coming up with a draft with the mission, vision, values and operating principles.
  - i. Team A is meeting in December and this will hopefully be approved at the meeting.
- e. The overarching goals will be developed over the next three semesters.
- f. Plan should be completed by 12/2017.

VI. Identification of College Plans
- a. The IPCC needs to identify the plans the college has and pull them together as an organized process and coordinate them.
- b. Some plans have been identified as we either don't currently have or that needs to be revised:
  - i. Need to be created:
    1. Safety Plan
    2. Distance Education Plan
    3. Human Resources Plan
    4. Instructional Plan
  - ii. Out of Date:
    1. Facilities Index/Master Plan
    2. Staff Development
    3. Garfield Plan
    4. Student Services Plan
- c. A proposal will be developed with what new plans the committee will recommend, which plans need updating, and which we do not need. This will be brought back to IPCC for discussion/approval.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:30 p.m.
Next Meeting: November 14, 2016
Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui