

**Glendale Community College  
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

**MINUTES**

**November 8, 2010 - 12:15 pm in AD121**

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

Absent: Alfred Ramirez

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- MSC (Scott/Abram) to accept the minutes of the November 1, 2010 meeting with corrections.

**2. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

Ed outlined “homework” assignments as follows:  
John, Jill and Monette will continue working on the context, format and editing of the draft document. All committee members should review the latest draft which will be put online and discussions will continue at subsequent meetings.

**3. REVIEW OF THE PLANNING HANDBOOK**

Planning Handbook: Ed asked the committee to view this online to determine if the language matches what we really do at the college? The intent is to keep this document updated. It was agreed that there should be one sentence defining the function of Team A and Team B. Who reviews the handbook is confusing at this point. An approval process should be defined. Ed said that Team A should review the handbook and provide feedback. John stated that Team A takes information to all constituencies for suggestions, but that Team B is the “workhorse”. Team A forwards proposed revisions and then Team B discusses any issues, could add content, filter, etc. and then returns it to Team A. Ed will revise this section and bring it back at the next meeting. Margaret asked for clarification regarding SMP vs. EMP goals, and that this information be added to the handbook.

Ed explained that setting college goals should be derived from the 4 EMP primary goals and the 15 strategic initiatives (sub goals). The planning committee structure was reviewed. It was suggested that the membership should be checked for any corrections.

**4. ELUMEN DEMONSTRATION**

Tina Anderson Walberg gave a presentation on the eLumen SLO database. She explained that a great amount of time has been spent just learning how the database works and how to tailor it to meet the college’s needs. “Rights” must be given to various users and eight people from different

divisions are currently piloting the process at the “coordinator” level. The coordinators enter course level SLOs and then instructors can link their particular assessments to the course level, score students and get results. A specific course was highlighted and linked to a rubric (core competencies - six levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy). Each rubric is based on a five level scale, zero to four ranking which translates to an A to F grading system. Tina explained that the current focus was on instructional programs this semester, but will switch to student services in the winter. The pilot team’s goal is to be using the system in the spring. The pilot group is also working on seamless instructions.

Mary asked if cohorts could be tracked through a select series of classes which could equal degree tracts. This would assist matching classes to degrees and work toward the college meeting our “Proficiency” level for SLOs for our March 2012 follow-up report. Mary suggested that some areas could strategically be pushed forward to show that the college has a working mechanism, because it is likely that all programs and degrees will not be completed. Alice stated that we must align our courses with degree outcomes. Tina used Alice’s SLO Handbook questions as a basis for analysis. Alice suggested that this could be a group activity at a division retreat. We also need to focus on the relationship of the SLO assessments to program review. Hopefully the SLO data can be transferred from eLumen into a program review report in the future.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Submitted by Jill Lewis