

**Glendale Community College  
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

**MINUTES**

**September 13, 2010 - 12:15 pm in AD121**

Present: Ed Karpp, Jill Lewis, Mike Scott, Mary Mirch, Alice Mecom, Karen Holden-Ferkich, Margaret Mansour, Arnel Pascua, Rick Perez, Ron Nakasone, Vicki Nicholson, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo, Monette Tiernan, Hoover Zariani

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Alfred Ramirez, student representatives  
Guests: Dawn Lindsay, John Queen

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 12:15 p.m.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- MSC (Scott/Barrio-Sotillo) to accept the minutes of the August 30, 2010 meeting with no changes

**3. FORMAT FOR FOLLOW-UP REPORT**

Ed shared two draft Recommendation samples with the group. It was decided that we will use the standard headings: Resolution, Analysis, Evidence and Future Plans as our section headings for each Recommendation.

**Discussion**

John Queen suggested that we have a team look at the drafts. Putting “hot links” into the document similar to the Self Study report was also recommended.

Mary suggested that we use the “Recommendation language” previously shared with the group in a handout and that we also add the phrase “We have met this Recommendation” to mirror the Self Study report.

Using Arnel’s draft for Rec. 6 as an example, Ed brought up the issue of using specifics in the reports such as replacing the terms: Phase I, II, and III with a specific timeline and also to include associated costs. It was agreed that the writers would use Ed’s Rec. 1 draft as a model.

John Queen expressed interest in IHAC language and will take this issue to the Senate. Currently the appropriate V.P. decides whether or not to fill vacant positions. If appealed, the matter goes back to IHAC and not into the “general pool” of positions for consideration. Mary Mirch explained that she announced that all positions would go through the IHAC process at the recent Division Chair Retreat. It was agreed that the wording needs to be clear and explain the process thoroughly. The draft reports are to be submitted to Ed by September 15.

**4. Clarification of Recommendation Language**

Any interested IPPC members are invited to participate in a teleconference with the Accrediting

Commission scheduled for Wednesday, September 15 from 1 to 2 p.m. Concerns have arisen over the language used in several of the ACCJC recommendations and this session will provide an opportunity to discuss these areas of concern with two ACCJC staff members to make sure that we are on the right track. Pursuant to the discussion areas within the 9 recommendations were identified for clarification and it was also requested that the session be recorded. It was agreed that the initial focus would be on Recommendations: 1, 4, 5 and 6 for the March 2011 report and the remainder as time allows.

**Discussion**

Recommendation 1 – Most of the eight subsections in this area had questions regarding clarification of language, specifically a, b, c, g and h.

Recommendation 4 – Meaning of “fully implementing professional development plans” and whether this was directed toward PeopleSoft.

Ed brought the issue of our report providing more information than needed vs. just meeting the recommendation. The last part of this recommendation involves SLOs and evaluations, which remains an issue for other colleges also.

Recommendation 5 – Clarification regarding “use all traditionally, federally-recognized EEO ethnic categories” and whether this means in our existing planning only?

It was agreed that just two or three people would ask the questions.

**5. Open Forum Sessions to keep the campus informed of accreditation matters.**

**Discussion**

One or two open forum sessions could be held on the main campus and a third at Garfield. The governance structure will also be used to emphasize institutionalizing this information to the college.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Submitted by Jill Lewis.