ADOPTED MINUTES

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES
September 11, 2017
AD 121

Present: Edward Karpp (Chair), Seboo Aghanjani (CSEA), Saodat Aziskhanova (CSEA), Maria Czech (Joint Faculty), Anthony Culpepper (Administration), Daphne Dionisio (Joint Faculty), Julie Gamberg (Joint Faculty), Zohara Kaye (Proxy for Roger Bowerman) (Guild), Beth Kronbeck (Other Faculty), Sarah McLemore (Other Faculty), Alfred Ramirez (Administration), Piper Rooney (Joint Faculty),Teyanna Williams (Administration), Yvette Ybarra (Other Faculty)

Absent: Seboo Aghanjani (CSEA), Rick Perez (Administration), Michael Ritterbrown (Administration), David Yamamoto (Resource)

Guest: Valicia Dantzler

Quorum: 12/15

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 May 8, 2017 were reviewed.
      - ***It was MSC (Kaye/Culpepper) that the Minutes from May 8, 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. There were no minutes to review.

Old Business:

III. Standing Progress Reports
   a. Progress on 2016 QFE
      i. The Learning Outcomes committee reviewed the QFE and established that we were completing items more frequently than thought.
      ii. Progress is being made.
      iii. There are issues with eLumen and information from PeopleSoft and the LOD. We are working through spreadsheets and trying to clean them up.
         1. Will be moving forward with looking over the test site with the LO's in there.
      iv. Will be reviewing the Mission Statement in fall.
      v. The Handbook is currently being worked on.
      vi. At the ACCJC Team Training it was mentioned that there are no consequences for the QFE (for the visiting team).
         1. The Teams are supposed to review the QFE to see if it is doable but there cannot be any sanctions if they feel like the QFE is too ambitious or not ambitious enough.

b. Integration of Planning
    i. Moving along but we're still working on tying things together.

IV. Master Planning Speaker Series
a. There was support for continuing this series.
b. We will work on developing a generic calendar to cover topics such as: Labor Market Data and Technology and Trends in Higher Education.

V. Senate Task Force on Accreditation Recommendations
a. Beth Kronbeck presented to the Senate our responses to Recommendations #1 and #2.
    i. Recommendation #1: The team recommended that when a college establishes institutional set standards for student achievement, including job placement rates, that we consistently publish the information and they recommended that when the college identifies gaps between performance in institutional set standards that we have strategies to fix those.
        1. For Recommendation #1: A series of questions was recommended for a program to answer as to why they fell below their own program set standards.
    ii. Recommendation #2: The recommendation was that we need to review our institutional set standards and our program set standards on a regular basis.
        1. For Recommendation #2: The Senate is going to start every fall to review program set standards and every spring they will review the institution set standards.

VI. Recommendation #5: Learning Support
a. There is no update.
b. Ed Karpp will speak with Eric Hanson to see where we move.

VII. Recommendation 7: Adjunct Evaluations
a. Val Dantzler from Human Resources gave information on what progress we have made in addressing this use.
b. Val met with Marc Drescher, NeoGov and Oracle.
    i. It was agreed that Oracle cannot provide what is needed for our Adjunct Evaluation process.
c. Nancy Traynor has been brought in on this.
d. NeoGov is aware of how our process works and they are working with their Developer to work on the process to integrate the needed information.
    i. Currently waiting for an update.
    ii. Demo has been requested and it will be brought back to a focus group to look at.
    iii. Process takes information from curriculum because our challenge is in finding out who is active. After figuring who is active it can then be determined who is due for an evaluation, however an issue occurs if the Adjunct is not teaching the semester they are due for an evaluation.
    iv. The cost has not yet been determined.
    v. With Marc Drescher gone we will need to review and see if this process is operationally effective.
    vi. Our current form will be uploaded into NeoGov which the evaluator would use to evaluate.
        1. This will need to be negotiated and there will need to be a side letter if this is what the college decides to do because the storage of evaluations is in the contract.

VIII. Appropriate Type of Resource Requests from Program Review
   a. The committee reviewed a chart outlining the guideline for requests developed by Daphne Dionisio.

New Business:

IX. Annual Goals for 2017 – 2018
   a. The committee reviewed the Annual Goals which were developed by Team A.
      i. *AG#1 Increase the number of students transitioning from noncredit to credit.*
      ii. *AG#2 Formalize process for the use of assessment results in program improvement.*
      iii. *AG#3 Develop clear strategies regarding the use of marketing and communication to increase enrollment and retention.*
      iv. *AG#4 The college will work to integrate projects from all available funding sources to design academic programs and support services to provide coherent program pathways that enhance the student experience from recruitment to completion.*

   - ***It was MSC (Aziskhanova/Kaye) to approve the Annual Goals for 2017-2018 and forward them to College Exec.***

X. Classified Positions
   a. There is still a lack of understanding about whether replacement of Classified Positions needs to go through Program Review or if it goes through a different process.
   b. Currently the Integrated Planning Handbook indicates that replacement positions go through Admin Exec and if approved there it goes through Budget as an informational item.
      i. The CHAC Handbook had not been updated to reflect what was already stated in the Integrated Handbook.
      ii. The CHAC manual needs to be changed to be reflective of the Integrated Planning Handbook and those changes have already been made.
   c. There was discussion on what constitutes a "replacement position."
      i. A replacement position refers to the same exact position.
         1. Minor revisions to the job descriptions are acceptable.
         2. CESA and HR are the arbitrators of what is a minor and major change to a job description.
         3. There are issues of areas trying to replace a position with a position that requires an overhaul of the job description. This is not a replacement position but instead a new position which needs to go through the Program Review Process.
      ii. Anything outside of replacing the same exact position could be a Reorg, New Classification, etc.

   - ***It was MSC (Dionisio/Kronbeck) to approve the revision of college documents to reflect the updated process where replacement of Classified positions are approved through Administrative Exec, the Budget Committee and then College Exec.***

XI. Program Review Annual Updates

a. A formal motion was made to recommend making Program Review Annual Updates optional, and instead require thorough full reviews every three years plus department review and discussion of performance data every year.

   - ***It was MSC (Dionisio/Kronbeck) that we approve moving towards a three year cycle with optional updates every year.***

XII. ACCJC Proposal on Employee Evaluations.

a. The ACCJC has proposed the removal of their standard that requires employee evaluations include use of learning outcomes assessments. This will be voted on the commission in January. This would consequently remove one of the recommendations for improvement that GCC needed to address by the time of the midterm report.

XIII. ACCJC Proposal to Modify Existing Standards

a. The ACCJC has proposed a policy change that will allow them to modify existing standards. (They have informally mentioned that they would like to roll back parts of Standard I.B.6 and this provides them the mechanism for doing so.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 1:30 p.m.
Next Meeting: October 9, 2017
Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui