

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

MINUTES

October 18, 2010 - 12:15 pm in AD121

Present: Ed Karpp, Trudi Abram, Saodat Aziskhanova, Jill Lewis, Karen Holden-Ferkich, Mary Mirch, Margaret Mansour, Alice Mecom, Ron Nakasone, Arnel Pascua, Rick Perez, John Queen, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo, Vicki Nicholson, Alfred Ramirez, Mike Scott, Hoover Zariani, Armond Aivazyani

Absent: Ana Boghazian, Monette Tiernan

Guests: Dawn Lindsay,

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:23 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- MSC (Ramirez/Scott) to accept the minutes of the October 11, 2010 meeting with corrections.

2. CONTINUED REVIEW OF DRAFT DOCUMENT (Dated 10.4.10)

Recommendation 3 (Rick Perez, writer)

It was decided that actual dates would be removed and replaced with "in fall 2010..." It was agreed that we would work on a "holistic" draft now and decisions regarding formatting such as dates and details would be done in December. Saodat suggested that we cite the specific student policies and where they are located. Rick will create a table to eliminate confusion.

Recommendation 6: (Arnel Pascua, writer)

Ed's new title needs to be included. Hoover suggested that we outline how we will "ensure" that long-range planning in IT is linked to budget. Linkage of the Tech Plan to budget as well as compliance with program review needs to be spelled out. Ed explained that resource requests can come from plans and from program review. Plans are long-term and are also detailed, while program review is now a shortened annual reporting mechanism which may include unanticipated needs based or those based on data and/or SLOs. Some requests may involve plans and program review. Program review will prepare a year-end report to be presented to Team A in the spring. The duplicity of requests coming from both plans and program review (for IT as an example) was questioned. Mary explained that the IT Plan was written at the institutional level and that any reporting that IT does for program review is at the departmental/organizational level. Along these lines, we have a Facilities Master Plan which outlines institutional construction and also a Facilities Maintenance Plan which focuses on routine painting, repairs etc. to the campus. John suggested that we proceed with our "Flow Chart" this year and the evaluation of our processes which will take place at the end of the year.

The Analysis of this recommendation should be expanded. The 4 C's will have the task of prioritizing needs and all resource requests. Ed mentioned that the "Plan Review" forms had been sent out to the appropriate people and are due at the end of December. Additionally, the annual Spring survey will include questions regarding IT and be forwarded to students, staff and faculty. Arnel will make needed changes for next week.

Recommendation 4: (Vicki Nicholson)

Outstanding evaluations were discussed. All management evals have been completed.

At this time 9% of FT faculty evals, 5% of classified evals and 25% of adjunct faculty evals have not been completed. Vicki stated that evaluation of adjunct faculty remains problematic for a variety of reasons including the fact that there is no reliable reporting mechanism in place to notify division chairs which adjuncts need evaluation, the cycle is every three years, but not all adjunct teach each term and some may only teach a winter or summer. Karen explained that non-credit ESL has over 90 adjuncts and their schedules are quite varied. The process also involves not only a class visit by the division chair or designee, but also student evaluations which are conducted by the instruction office and then must be typed into a report for each class. This step can slow down the completion of the process. Ramona stated that we owe it to the 150 adjuncts to get their evaluations completed in a timely manner due to the "rehire rights" issue. Dawn and Mary said that institutional change to revise our processes for evaluations was moving forward. Vicki will keep us updated on this matter.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Submitted by Jill Lewis