

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

MINUTES

August 30, 2010 - 12:30 pm in SR 328

Present: Ed Karpp, Jill Lewis, Mike Scott, Mary Mirch, Alice Mecom, Karen Holden-Ferkich, Arnel Pascua, Rick Perez, Ron Nakasone, Vicki Nicholson, Alfred Ramirez, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo

Absent: Margaret Mansour, Saodat Aziskhanova, Hoover Zariani

Guests: Dawn Lindsay, John Queen

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:34 pm.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- MSC (Mirch,Scott) to accept the minutes of the August 23, 2010 meeting with no changes

2. MEETING TIME & LOCATION

The next Monday is a holiday, so our next meeting date will be Monday, September 13. The time is being changed to 12:15 to 1:30 p.m. and the location will change also to AD121, the President's Conference Room and continue every Monday.

3. CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON RECOMMENDATION 1

Ed distributed a handout on the lingering issues surrounding this recommendation.

Discussion

Questions remain regarding what process should be used to link the following funding sources to the budget cycle: Perkins, categorical, basic skills, PFE, staff development and RT positions. The group agreed that the processes must be transparent and that all items must be linked to a plan. Categorical and Basic Skills could be included into program review. Many programs have state reporting mandates, and PFE funds could be identified in the program review document or the Senate could relate PFE requests to specific EMP goals.

Dawn stated that we need a consistent process and need to show accountability. Mary added that the request for funds in the program review document could list the various sources of funding. Basic Skills could also be included with program review information outlining where monies are going and link it to budgetary decisions. Ed added that the website should contain a list of all requests.

Jill and Monette will discuss linking these issues to resource requests with the Program Review Committee. Mike will discuss PFE issues with the Senate and report back. It was agreed that we need to resolve these details this year. Mary mentioned that the timelines for the various hiring groups (IHAC, SSHAC etc.) do not merge well with program review's timeline.

Campus Development facilities requests are prioritized and put forward to administrative affairs. Mary brought up the matter of the new teaching and learning center and how it would fit into this structure. It was agreed that plans cannot just be “wish lists”. Legitimacy can be established by learning outcomes, transfer rates, etc. Additionally, “must dos” should be clearly defined (such as resource requests for copier maintenance fee increases). Using ITS as an example, we must determine how we can reallocate/reprioritize budget items.

BUDGETING ISSUES

Discussion

Ron stated that we looked at the \$10K accounts this past year. Discussions on an annual reallocation process (vs. zero-based budgeting) have taken place. Mike stated that we must do a better job of preparing for future costs such as Oracle upgrades and “must dos” such as PeopleSoft support. Karen asked what happened to the task force that was reviewing the cost of salaries and benefits with other colleges. (Was there an answer?) Mary said the focus should be on hiring requirements.

Actions to be Taken

- IHAC positions should be prioritized according to the master plan. (EMP?)
- The Budget Committee task force that looks at the \$10K accounts should consider reducing this to possibly \$5K or \$7500. Ron will report back on this.
- More difficult decisions such as the affordability of programs will also need to be built into the process. Annual program review reporting should make this more visible and involve the Enhancement/Sunset process which usually comes from information provided by the deans.
- Effective parameters for certificates need to be defined (such as AA, transfer, IGETC, etc.)

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Submitted by Jill Lewis.