

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

May 8, 2017

AD 121

Present: Edward Karpp (Chair), Saodat Aziskhanova (CSEA), Anthony Culpepper (Administration), Daphne Dionisio (Manager/Confidential), Marc Drescher (Administration), Agnes Eisagalian (Proxy for Seboo Aghanjani) (CSEA), Zohara Kaye (Guild), Deborah Kinley (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Other Faculty), Sarah McLemore (Other Faculty), Rick Perez (Administration), Alfred Ramirez (Administration), Piper Rooney (Joint Faculty), David Yamamoto (Resource), Yvette Ybarra (Other Faculty), Teyanna Williams (Administration),

Absent: Sintia Danylian (ASGCC), Rachelle Gibuena (ASGCC), Michael Ritterbrown (Administration), David Yamamoto (Resource), Andy Young (Senate)

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 April 10, 2017 were reviewed.
 - ***It was MSC (Aziskhanova/Kinley) that the Minutes from April 10, 2017 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 Unadopted Minutes from the March 21, 2017 meeting were reviewed.
 - ii. There was discussion on the Cycle of Program Review.
 - a. The Integrated Planning Handbook states that Departments will do a full review every three years and an annual update.
 - b. An idea has been discussed in Program Review that the annual update would be optional and done when Departments feel it is necessary. Resource Request submissions could be annual if the Department's last full review was validated.
 - c. In exchange for the optional annual update, Departments would be responsible for reviewing their data once a year, review the data, place the data on an Agenda for Departmental discussion, and document the discussion.
- ***It was MSC (Ramirez/Perez) that the Program Review Minutes from March 21, 2017 be accepted.***

Old Business:

- III. Standing Progress Reports
 - a. The Sharepoint site was reviewed.
 - i. Establish a Multicultural Center – Completed
 - ii. Establish a Welcome Center – Completed
 - iii. Progress on QFE – Learning Outcomes has done a lot on this which hasn't been updated.
 - iv. If anyone has updates about things they should notify Ed Karpp and he will cross them off the list.
- IV. Master Planning Speaker Series
 - a. We have finalized the events happening this semester.
 - b. The last event will take place on Friday, May 12. Winfred Roberson, Superintendent of GUSD will be talking about the status of GUSD and hopefully tie it in to a discussion of strengthening the relationship between GUSD and GCC.
 - c. In the fall semester we will look into putting together an on-going series for things like Labor Market Data and Technology and Trends in Higher Education.

New Business:

- V. GCC Mission Statement Draft
 - a. This has not gone to the Senate or Team A.
 - b. Team A will review the draft at the May 12, 2017 meeting.
 - c. The draft was reviewed.
 - i. It is essentially the same.
 - ii. A change was made from “primarily serves adults,” to “serves a diverse population.”
 - iii. Bullet points were moved below to a Values statement making the Board Policy a Mission, Vision, and Values statement.
 - iv. It was suggested that the sentence, “but primarily serves,” be changed to, “primarily serving.”
 - v. This will go to Team A for approval and then back to IPCC. It will then be sent to the Senate and College Exec.
- VI. Senate Task Force on Accreditation Recommendations
 - a. The Senate formed a task force (chaired by Beth Kronbeck) and met for the first time last week.
 - b. Next meeting is May 30, 2017.
 - c. A timeline will be setup so that the Senate each year will know when they are going to look at the Institutional Set Standards and the Program Set Standards.
 - d. Additionally, they will also create guidelines for the programs on how they should be reviewing their data and what the Senate should do should those programs or the institution fall below those standards.
- VII. Recommendation 4: Documentations of Discussions and AR 2511
 - a. There is a proposal which has been taken to the Governance Review Committee to change some of the language in AR 2511.
 - b. There are three proposed changes to better define what is expected of committee minutes and agendas.
 - i. Agendas should be publicly posted three days prior to the meeting.

- ii. The Minutes of meetings should have a description or the rationale behind the motions that were passed.
- iii. An expectation that the minutes would be publicly posted four weeks after the meeting.
- c. No decision was made and it will be brought back to the next Governance Review Committee meeting.

VIII. Appropriate Type of Resource Requests for Program Review

IX. Recommendation 5: Learning Support

- a. The recommendation is to evaluate or decentralized labs and learning support services.
- b. This will mostly be done through Instruction as now the labs are under Instruction.
- c. Ed Karpp will be bringing this up at the May 9, 2017 Dean's meeting.
- d. Discussion will be on how we are going to evaluate this.
- e. Eric Hanson will most likely be taking the lead.

X. Recommendation 7: Adjunct Evaluations

- a. HR was asked if they had an update on the progress in improving the tracking of our Adjunct evaluations.
 - i. HR tracks Adjunct evaluations via an Excel Spreadsheet and is up to date.
- b. The recommendation is to develop the method for identifying, completing and tracking timely evaluations of Adjunct Faculty.
 - i. Is our current process sufficient or are we looking into new options, software, etc.?
 - 1. It needs to take into account everything in the contract including when Adjuncts are teaching or when they're off semesters.
 - 2. This can be done in NeoGov but it costs \$35,000/year.
- c. The Evaluation Team identified the gap being that we were not up to date on the Adjunct evaluations.
 - i. Tracking and ensuring that the evaluations are done are two different issues.
 - ii. The disconnect is not whether or not we are tracking who needs to be evaluated it is whether or not the Division is doing the evaluation.
 - iii. HR can track and notify which Adjuncts need to be evaluated, however if the Division Chair does not evaluate the Instructor there is nothing HR can do.
 - iv. Who is ultimately responsible for the Evaluations not being done?
 - 1. The Division Chair is ultimately responsible.
 - 2. The Dean and/or VP of the Division chair needs to have a discussion with the Division Chair.
 - 3. There is an additional issue: Even if a Division Chair can do the evaluation they cannot submit it if the Student Evaluation is not done by the Instruction Office.
 - 4. Division Chairs are often too busy to be able to do the evaluation.
 - v. Division Chairs are often too busy to be able to do the evaluation.
 - 1. Assistant Chairs and Tenured Faculty Members can perform the evaluation.
 - 2. If there were money to pay people to do evaluations we could get caught up.
- d. We need to pay attention to this recommendation not just because the ACJCC recommends it but because it is part of the Ed Code. If people aren't evaluated they automatically get rehire rights.
- e. We will move forward by trying to get a group together with representation from the Guild, HR, etc. to figure out how to get this done.

XI. Appropriate Type of Resource Requests from Program Review

- a. There are a lot of small items that go through Program Review that seem as though they can be dealt with elsewhere.

- b. Daphne Dionisio put together a categorized list of common requests that go through Program Review that may be able to go elsewhere.
 - i. Facilities Requests – Routine maintenance, repair, and cleaning.
 - 1. These requests should not be put through Program Review. These should be done through a Maintenance Request.
 - 2. This is a training issue. People need to be trained to submit these through a Maintenance Request and not through Program Review.
 - 3. Faculty and Staff have learned to put these through Program Review because they are trying to get a need met because Facilities is often non-responsive to work orders.
 - a. Dr, Culpepper has requested that if there are issues with Facilities responding to work orders that he be contacted and he will address them.
 - b. Receiving a response indicating whether or not a work order can be completed would help solve 75% of these issues.
 - c. Another reason that these items are being put through Program Review is because for years people were told if it involved money it had to go through Program Review.
 - d. Perhaps the sequence should be that a work order needs to be submitted first. If it can't be handled through facilities, etc., it then moves forward to Program Review.
 - e. Emergency, Safety, and Minor Maintenance should not go through Program Review.
 - f. What should be requested through Program Review?
 - i. Conference Travel
 - g. Ed Karpp will work on a proposal on how to break Resource Requests into categories and how they should be handled.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 1:35 p.m.

Next Meeting: June 12, 2017

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui