Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee
Agenda

March 13, 2016
12:15 pm
AD 121

Call to Order
Announcements
Approval of IPCC Minutes
      1.   December 12, 2016 IPCC Minutes

Review of Subcommittee Minutes
      2.   Master Planning - Team A – December 2, 2016 Minutes
      3.   Program Review

Old Business

      4.   Governance Survey
          The committee needs to approve the governance survey response, which was not approved in November due to lack of quorum.

      5.   Standing Progress Reports
         i. Progress on 2016 ACCJC Recommendations
        ii. Progress on Action Items from 2016 Self Evaluation Report
       iii. Progress on 2016 QFE

      6.   Update on Mission Statement Revision (BP 1200)
         Team A approved a revision to the college mission statement at its December 2, 2016 meeting. Feedback is currently being collected from constituent groups.

New Business

      7.   Update on Institutional Master Planning Process
         The new IMP is being developed between Fall 2016 and Spring 2017

      8.   Reviewing and Using Program Review Findings at Institutional Level
         The college should strengthen its use of program review results in institutional planning and decision-making.

Other
Adjournment

IPCC 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 guiding principles for assessing institutional effectiveness.

approved October 14, 2013
approved with no changes November 3, 2014
approved with no changes September 14, 2015
approved with changes September 12, 2016

Committee Blue List Information:

Institutional Planning Coordination
Time and Location: Second and Fourth Mondays, 12:15 – 1:30 pm, AD 121

Chair:	Edward Karpp, Dean, Research, Planning & Grants
	(votes only in the event of a tie)
Senate:	Andrew Young, Senate President
Guild:	Zohara Kaye, Guild President
Joint Faculty [2]:	Deborah Robiglio (16-17), Garfield faculty member
	Daphne Dionisio (19-20)
Other Faculty:	Yvette Ybarra, SLO Coordinator
Seats related to position	Beth Kronbeck, Faculty Accreditation Coordinator
	Sarah McLemore, Curriculum & Instruction Co-Chair
CSEA [2]:	Saodat Aziskhanova, CSEA President
	Seboo Aghajani
Administration [8]:	Anthony Culpepper, Executive Vice President, Administrative Services
	Rick Perez, Vice President, Student Services
	Michael Ritterbrown, Vice President, Instructional Services
	Teyanna Williams, Associate Vice President, Human Resources
	Alfred Ramirez, Administrative Dean, Continuing and Community Education
	Deborah Kinley, Associate Dean, Continuing and Community Education
	Marc Drescher, Chief Information Systems Officer
Manager/Confidential:	Jill Lewis, Program Review Manager
ASGCC [2]:	Sintia Danylian, Rachelle Gilbuena
Resource:	David Yamamoto, SLO Database Coordinator
(non-voting)	
Minutes Recorder:	Gordon Lui, Office of Research, Planning & Grants

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
December 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), Deborah Kinley (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Other Faculty), Sarah McLemore (Other Faculty), Alfred Ramirez (Administration), Michael Ritterbrown (Administration), Andy Young (Senate),Teyanna Williams (Administration)

Absent: Billy Agudo (ASGCC), Martin Chino (ASGCC), Rick Perez (Administration), David Yamamoto (Resource), Yvette Ybarra (Other Faculty)

Quorum: 13/18

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 October 10, 2016 were reviewed.
      ➢ *It was MSC (Aziskhanova/Kinley) that the Minutes from October 10, 2016 be approved without corrections.*
   b. Due to a lack of quorum there were no minutes from the November 14, 2016 meeting to approve.

II. Review of Subcommittee Minutes
   a. Master Planning – Team A
      i. The minutes from the May 16, 2016 meeting were reviewed.
      ➢ *It was MSC (Dionisio/Young) that the Program Review Minutes from May 16, 2016 be accepted.*
   b. Program Review
      i. The Minutes from the October 18, 2016 meeting were reviewed.
      ➢ *It was MSC (Dionisio/Kronbeck) that the Program Review Minutes from October 18, 2016 be accepted.*

Old Business:

III. Governance Survey
   a. The Governance Survey was reviewed previously however due to a lack of quorum the committee has not yet approved them.
   b. A correction needs to be made under Section A so that it reads, "Team A."
   c. We kept the same measures as last year.
   d. There was a question on #5 and the indicators.
      i. Last year was the first time we were asked for indicators so there was nothing to report.
      ii. As we specified indicators for last year it was questioned whether or not we could get some data to report?
         1. Ed Karpp will get the agreement rates.
         2. Ed Karpp and Daphne Dionisio will get the Program Review completion rate in February 2017.

      ➢ *It was MST (Young/Perez) that the Governance Survey be tabled until the Indicators can be included.*

IV. QFE Progress
   a. Progress on the QFE was reviewed.
   b. Tables of plans will be included.

c. The idea is that the IPCC should go through the QFE items and all the other plans that the college said it would be doing over the next cycle from the Accreditation document and get updates when possible.
d. Action Projects:
    i. The first action project is to improve the integration of plans.
        1. Centralize tracking of all plans.
        2. Integrate the plans better.
        3. Initiate a set of guidelines for plans and recommend how they should link goals and objectives.
        4. Communicating Guidelines
        5. Assess effectiveness of plan integration.
        6. Investigate a common resource request form.
        7. More efficiently tying plans to Resource Allocation.
        8. Communicating Planning More Widely
            a. More information on how the process works will be disseminated.
            b. Planning Handbook will be updated.

    ii. Action Project 2: Improving the use of Learning Outcomes Assessments.
        1. Goals include:
            a. Improving Data Quality
                i. We have been discussing moving to a different system of SLO Assessments and working those into Program Review in a more integrated way through a software system.
                    1. Team C will focus on the integration part.
                        a. The Group has come up with recommendations for software systems that might need our needs.
                            i. This has been taken to Academic Affairs for software approval.
                ii. Assessor Proficiency & Data Fluency
                    1. The Learning Outcomes committee is taking the lead on doing more professional development of faculty members and others who are assessing student learning outcomes.
                    2. Improve the use of SLO assessment data by doing more professional development and having a greater college wide understanding of how to do assessment best and how to use it for improvement.
                    3. Terrrence Yu from Research & Planning will be put on the SLO committee as a Resource.

                iii. Comprehensive and Regular Assessment
                    1. A lot of these new software systems will send out reminders of when a course and program needs to be assessed.
                        a. We need to make sure the reminders are set up at least two semesters prior to when the course/programs need to be assessed.
                iv. Communication, Dialog, & the Use of Data to Drive Institutional Processes
                v. Making sure awards are based on outcome assessments
                vi. Assure quality of Student Support Services

V. Planning Grant Funded Projects
    a. This has been brought up a few times and has not been solved.
    b. There are often situations where decisions are made regarding resource allocations where some equipment, software, or hardware needs to be purchased through a Grant or categorical funds and neither IT or Purchasing is involved in the process.

    c.   It was suggested that we need to create a better Grant Approval Process.

    d.   Decisions are often made internally within the Grant.

    e.   It seems like using Program Review is a logical way of feeding this into a process.

    f.   Grant deadlines often do not match up with the regular approval process of Program Review.

    g.   Having these go through Program Review would be more about the idea of capturing the information. It would not necessarily have to go through the Resource Allocation process, but it is a way of codifying it within a program's plans so that the plan could be disseminated to others.

    h.   If we expand our understanding of Resource Allocation to include all sources of funding (not just general funds) where we have other times to conduct the process for allocation (not just spring) we can conceivably get it to work better so the idea of deadlines and time frames aren't the big problem they seem to be now.

    i.   We will look at what other Districts are doing and how they have handled the problem, develop a plan to revise our process, and discuss them at IPCC.

New Business:

VI.   Mission Statement Revision (BP 1200)

    a.   At the December 2, 2016 Team A meeting, Dr. Vair proposed a new Mission Statement.

    b.   For future discussion and approval, Ed Karpp has put together a draft change to BP 1200 (Mission Statement).

    c.   The draft was reviewed by the IPCC.

    d.   Team B felt that this needed to be communicated more to get faculty and staff feedback.

    e.   This will be sent out to staff and the ASGCC in spring 2017 for feedback.

        i.   Ed Karpp will develop a draft for a survey.

VII.   Accreditation Recommendations

    a.   The Accreditation Recommendations are not public and are not to be made public.

    b.   We received the fact checking draft of the document last week.

    c.   We do not know what the final recommendations will be.

    d.   There were two recommendations that were not included in the exit report.

VIII.   Guidance/Template for Component Plans

    a.   In the QFE it talks about integrating planning.

    b.   IPCC came up with a template back in 2011 to help standardize plan formats.

    c.   IPCC could revise this template as part of our guidance to the college plans as we do more standardization of plans and plan tracking.

    d.   We will hopefully review this at a future IPCC meeting, update it and communicate it to those preparing plans.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:30 p.m.
Next Meeting: March 13, 2017
Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui