

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

MINUTES

October 25, 2010 - 12:15 pm in AD121

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

Guests: Dawn Lindsay

Absent: Margaret Mansour

CALL TO ORDER

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

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- MSC to accept the minutes of the October 18, 2010 meeting.

2. CONTINUED REVIEW OF DRAFT DOCUMENT (Dated 10.4.10)

Faculty Obligation

Mary reported that we will need to hire 4-5 people to meet our 2010-2011 FT faculty obligation and that most likely 2011-2012 could mean possibly between 8 and 11 people. Responsibility for all prioritizing goes to IHAC. Ed explained that the program review reports distributed to all division chairs include the resource request form that can be used for faculty hiring. This year's IHAC form accompanies the Section 5: Resource Request form and also the trends and SLO data from the program review report. The issue of the CPF (Committee per faculty) calculation was also mentioned as it is no longer in the program review report. Monette and Jill will report back on this next week. Mary is responsible for the IHAC process and Rick has responsibility for the SSHAC process.

Hoover had concerns over no process being used for CHAC hiring. Historically there has been a history of difficulty funding classified positions. Hoover asked why all levels are not prioritized at the same time. Ramona explained that many student services positions come from 01 funding as well as 03 categorical or restricted funds. The status of CHAC was requested and Vicki stated that cabinet is reviewing the process.

Alice reminded the group of the telecom with the commission when Jack Pond responded to the issue of making "tougher decisions" in the future and reallocating funds. Mary will have more information next week. John said that in the future we will need to use program review information from year-to-year and that this should be a priority for next fall.

Team A will meet on Friday, October 22 and will be tasked with making a recommendation to Campus Exec. regarding annual goals. Team A and B will continue to review the EMP and develop annual goals and review the mission. The Program Review Committee will evaluate the new program review document this fall. Additionally, the IPCC will review the program review process and this will be added to the planning flow chart. The issue of having a multitude of plans without an approval process was discussed. Mike asked who would evaluate the plans. Most plans have an administrator who wrote them. All plans should go through the governance system. Ed asked how we could validate plans. The EMP as well as lots of other plans have no approval process. Some plans, such as the Matriculation Plan must meet state requirements. We should

develop a “plan review” process. A checklist for plans should also be accompanied by a validation form for resource requests which come from plans. IPCC feedback could also be forwarded to Campus Exec. Program Review will provide an annual report this year which will outline trends that can influence plans.

ADJOURNMENT

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