

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

MINUTES

September 20, 2010 - 12:15 pm in AD121

Present: Ed Karpp, Jill Lewis, Mike Scott, Mary Mirch, Alice Mecom, Margaret Mansour, Rick Perez, Ron Nakasone, Monette Tiernan, Hoover Zariani, Ana Boghazian, Armond Aivazyan

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Karen Holden-Ferkich, Arnel Pascua, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo, Alfred Ramirez, Vicki Nicholson,

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/Zariani) to accept the minutes of the September 13, 2010 meeting with no changes

2. NEW MEMBERS

Ed welcomed our new student representatives Ana Boghazian and Armond Aivazyan to the committee and outlined our accreditation recommendations and upcoming report and site visit. Jill will coordinate a visit to an upcoming ASGCC meeting to explain our current accreditation status, recommendations and plans for reaffirmation of accreditation.

3. TELECON WITH ACCREDITING COMMISSION

Ed shared the highlights of the September 15 teleconference with two commission staff members. Ten IPCC members attended the teleconference which was conducted by Dr. Lindsay. Eight of the nine recommendations were discussed. Most of the conversation was to clarify terms and to determine if we understand what the commission wants to see as evidence that we are making the changes described in the recommendations. The group agreed that the discussion was productive. A handout was distributed outlining the telecom questions and answers.

Discussion

Rec. 1: Linkage of program review, planning and resource allocation processes. The commission said that "reprioritizing the use of existing resources did not necessitate "zero based budgeting"; however, all positions must be based on data and all plans and program review must justify needs. They further stated that we need to strategize how to do more with less; use innovative new thinking and that harder decisions must be forthcoming. We don't have a current process for funding the plans that we create.

Rec. 4: "Professional development" at the institutional level which could include PeopleSoft, ITS training, plans and training for distance education.

Rec. 5: We should “bring it all together” and be using all EEO federal ethnic categories in all of our plans.

Rec. 6: This was also a recommendation from 1998 and should be tied together with Rec. 1.

Rec. 7: Re: Inadequate staffing levels, we should measure our needs and tell what we are doing and consider comparing what other colleges are doing. We could document our agreement with the Glendale Police Department for the hours between midnight and 6 a.m. as evidence.

4. FOLLOW-UP REPORT DRAFTS

Ed explained that the drafts are available for the committee on the IPCC webpage. Drafts 1, 4, 5 and 6 should be completed first as they will go in the first report for March 2011. Mary and John expressed interest in making the drafts public on the website. It was agreed that all drafts should be accessible to the campus community. Ed and John will work on a format. Ed will draft an anticipated timeline for the drafts to go to the standing committees, Campus Exec. and the Board. Some drafts, such as Rec. 6 for ITS will need to additionally go to the 4 C’s.

5. PUBLICIZING ACCREDITATION AND INTEGRATED PLANNING

Ed has scheduled three open forum sessions to inform the campus community on these topics and also take questions. On the main campus Oct. 20 and Nov. 9 and at Garfield on Oct. 27. A campuswide email will be forthcoming.

Hoover suggested that an assessment should be made after the workshops to determine if attendees had learned something. Armand suggested telling attendees the intention of the meetings and keeping the questions to a minimum.

6. REVIEW OF PLANS

All plans should be identified and evaluated by the end of the year. Ed will forward a form to evaluate plans and another for evaluating resource requests. Mary expressed concerns that some existing plans have not been “vetted” and contain “wish lists”.

7. PROGRAM REVIEW

The new instructional document was approved by the Senate on Sept. 16 and will go to Academic Affairs on October 6. Reporting will begin in October and wrap up before finals begin. There are issues for programs with personnel requests as IHAC begins their work mid October. Dawn brought up the issue of Administrator/Management positions which would be approved by Cabinet and Admin. Exec. Jill explained that program review would also ask participants to evaluate their process so that improvements could be made in the following year, emphasizing the “continuous cycle of improvement” for the accreditors. Hoover suggested that the PRC document questionnaire be distributed with the document.

8. OTHER PLANNING ISSUES

John brought up the issue of the roles of Team A and Team B in the planning process. Ed explained that both Teams A and B have worked on the EMP. No one has applied for the planning coordinator position or expressed serious interest. Campus Executive will take on the new role of assigning annual goals.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Submitted by Jill Lewis