

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

May 9, 2016

AD 121

Present: Edward Karpp (Chair), Maritza Arrendondo (ASGCC), Saodat Aziskhanova (CSEA), Daphne Dionisio (Resource), Marc Drescher (Administration), Megan Ernst (Joint Faculty), 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), David Yamamoto (Joint Faculty), Yvette Ybarra (Other Faculty),

Absent: Seboo Aghanjani (CSEA), Zohara Kaye (Guild), Andy Young (Senate), Teyanna Williams (Administration)

Quorum: 15/19

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by Ed Karpp at approximately 12:20 p.m.

- I. Approval of Minutes
  - a. The minutes from April 18, 2016 were reviewed.
    - ***It was MSC (Kinley/Perez) that the Minutes from April 18, 2016 be approved without corrections.***
- II. Review of Subcommittee Minutes
  - a. Master Planning – Team A: Adopted Minutes from November 13, 2015.
    - ***It was MSC (Kronbeck/Arrendondo) to accept the Master Planning Minutes from November 13, 2015***
  - b. Program Review
    - i. There were no minutes to review.
    - ii. Next meeting is scheduled for May 17, 2016.
- 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. Almost everything has been completed.
    - ii. Policies and making sure that they show up the same no matter where we are printing.
      1. Rick Perez assigned the Catalog to Jolie Morris who matched policies with what is on the web.
      2. There are still issues with what goes into the Schedule of Classes, etc.
    - iii. Code of Ethics is still being worked on.
      1. Classified Code of Ethics was approved.
      2. A lot of our policies do not have consequences and this will probably be brought up at the Accreditation visit.
    - iv. Performance Tracking – Getting better but still an issue for Faculty and Staff evaluations.
    - v. Transfer of Credit Policy – Done.
    - vi. Shared Understanding of Strengths and Weaknesses – Basically Done.

- vii. Evaluation of Personnel for Student Learning – Pretty much done.
  - viii. Public Notification – Planned for June 1, 2016.
  - ix. Scheduling Courses – Done.
  - x. GASB45 – We have been putting funds into the post-employment benefits fund. We need to make sure that this is moved into an Irrevocable Trust.
  
- IV. Annual Evaluation of Integrated Planning, Program Review, and Resource Allocation for 2014-2015 Process
  - a. This is a placeholder.
  - b. We are not ready to complete the evaluation yet.
  - c. Team B has not finished the evaluation for Planning.
  - d. Program Review Committee needs to do an evaluation for Program Review.
  
- V. Quality Focus Essay
  - a. A lot of progress has been made.
  - b. We need to identify big areas that the college needs to improve in.
  - c. IPCC originally identified three action projects:
    - i. Better Integrated Planning
    - ii. Better use of Assessment Results
    - iii. The third was going to be Human Resources, especially evaluations and other issues.
      - 1. The HR issues seem to be a different level so it was decided that we would only have two action projects.
  - d. Action Project I is a little less developed than Action Project II but Ed Karpp has been working on it.
  - e. Action Project II is a little more developed.
    - i. One thing that has come up is that Dr. Viar felt we were too negative in this section.
    - ii. This section is more focused on all the issues and problems rather than the progress we've made. This can probably be toned down.
    - iii. There needs to be input from people who have been working on this and what has been done.
    - iv. Final version needs to go to Board by June 6, 2016.
    - v. Yvette Ybarra will try to get the Learning Outcomes Committee together and have something by next Monday, May 16, 2016.
  
- VI. Process for Deciding When New Programs Require Substantive Change Proposals to the Accrediting Commission
  - a. Part of this making people aware of what a substantive change proposal is with the Accreditation commission and what the triggers are.
  - b. We have talked about having an Administrative Regulation or something in the Curriculum Program.
  - c. This involves new programs not new courses.
  - d. In most cases this involves a huge change or a change in population that we are serving or a change in the way that something is offered so that 50% is offered online or in new location.
  - e. It seems like the Curriculum Handbook might be a better way to handle this than a Board Policy or Administrative Regulation.
  - f. Ed Karpp and Jill Lewis will come up with a paragraph to try to define it and it can perhaps make its way to the Curriculum Handbook.
  - g. Sarah McLemore will email the Curriculum Mailserv to see what others use as there thresholds.
  
- VII. Survey of Governance Committees

- a. For the past two years surveys have been sent to Governance Committees about their effectiveness, if there are obstacles and how they relate to the mission of the college.
- b. The first year that this was done we received a lot of responses.
- c. The second year we only received four or five responses.
- d. We may need a different approach in the handling of this survey.
- e. Ed Karpp suggested making this an electronic document.
- f. The advantage of doing this electronically (i.e. SurveyMonkey) allows the results to be much more accessible.
- g. The previous surveys were all narrative responses. Ed would like to change the survey so that it has rating scales in addition to the narrative questions.
- h. The Timeline will be kept the same. It will be distributed in the spring and results would be returned in fall.
- i. The Chair of each committee would fill out one survey on behalf of their respective Governance Committees.
- j. It was requested that this be set to Senate Committees as well.

VIII. Review of Accreditation Institutional Self-Evaluation Report

- a. A folder has been created in Sharepoint where there are now two drafts which will eventually go to the Board.
- b. The plan is that four standards, the QFE, and an Introductory section will be uploaded.
- c. Timeline to the Board says that this will go to Standard Governance Committee in May. Some Committees might not meet after this month.
- d. What is the best way to get this out there so that people can take a look and provide feedback?
  - i. Beth Kronbeck will mention it at the next Senate meeting and will also email Chairs and writers who have been involved.
  - ii. Rick Perez will mention it at Student Affairs.
  - iii. Presidents of Guild, CSEA, Senate and Chairs of Committees will be emailed.
- e. Any feedback can be emailed to Ed Karpp.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: TBD

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui