

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

MINUTES

February 14, 2011 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121

Present: Trudi Abram, Jill Lewis, Mary Mirch, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo, Ed Karpp, Margaret Mansour, Alice Mecom, Mary Mirch, Ron Nakasone, Vicki Nicholson, Rick Perez, John Queen, Mike Scott, Monette Tiernan, Hoover Zariani

Guest: Dawn Lindsay

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Karen Holden-Ferkich, Alfred Ramirez

CALL TO ORDER

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **MSC (Scott/Mirch)** to accept the minutes of the January 24, 2011 meeting, with corrections.

2. NEW BUSINESS

Jill announced that the ACCJC forwarded an announcement for an upcoming "Assessment Academy", but that the initial notice had been dismissed due to the high cost. Upon final notice for applications, the matter was discussed again with Dawn and it was determined that it would be appropriate to bring the issue to the IPCC. Due to the fact that GCCs SLO effort had a long acceptance period, our progress is still not at the level that is expected by the ACCJC to meet the fall 2012 "Proficiency" level requirement of the Institutional Effectiveness Rubric for Student Learning Outcomes. Dawn, Mary and Jill suggested that the committee consider the option to send a full-time faculty member to this training. Jill outlined the participation commitment: 6-10 hours per week, primarily reading assignments and also online discussions, five homework assignments, one major project and three four-day conferences in Oakland and Pomona. The ten month program starts mid March and culminates in mid January 2012. The intent of the program is to develop campus leaders to develop assessment skills and guide assessment committees to build an assessment foundation, provide consultation and guidance and promote assessment-related issues. The academy is facilitated by nationally recognized leaders in higher education. The cost of the program is \$3950 and estimated costs for books and travel would total close to \$6,000. Release time was also discussed, which would likely take the total expense over \$16K. Vicki stated that candidates would be reviewed by the RTEP committee.

Potential funding sources include some unused funding still available from the program review account and possibly PFE funds or support from the Foundation. John stated that he was opposed to the project as a poor use of funds when we are in a budgetary crisis. Dawn, Mary and Jill acknowledged the seriousness of the cost of this project, but felt that it was offset by the fact that we must have a plan to meet our 2012 SLO goals, have our accreditation reaffirmed and continue to move forward with broad-ranged assessments in the future.

The committee discussed the progress that Alice Mecom has made over the past few years and Alice also explained that she is currently in a PHD program and felt that the original hurdles to SLOs had been conquered. Possible candidates were discussed and it was the consensus of the group that the benefit of having a new person assume a leadership role and guide the

assessment effort for years to come would be very beneficial for the college. Jill will put out an informational email to all full-time faculty regarding the opportunity and Alice will contact people on the SLO committee to see if there is interest. Potential candidates will be directed to contact Jill for more information about the process.

- **MSC (Scott/Barrio-Sotillo):** The IPCC accepts that the college move forward with the process to indentify a candidate to apply for the 2011-12 WASC/ACCJC Assessment Academy. The final selection for the submittal of one GCC applicant will be determined by the Academic Senate.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Follow-Up Report

Ed stated that he had originally drafted a letter titled "Statement on Report Preparation" as part of the introduction to the report. The letter is submitted by the president of the institution and the final version of the report will include a revised letter revised and signed by Dawn. The report will be submitted as a second reading and for approval at the next board meeting on Feb. 28.

Vicki discussed previous issues with incomplete evaluations for FT faculty, managers and CSEA and reported that these cases were being resolved. Adjunct evaluations by division chairs have been questioned and it appears to be connected to the transfer of the documents from the chairs to HR and the fact that, per the contract, the chairs are not supposed to retain the original copies of these documents. Some paperwork is missing and others got lost or misplaced in the signature cycle. Vicki reported that HR and the EEO committee are working out the details of an online system that can avoid these types of issues. The software will be able to support applicant tracking, provide an evaluation system for all employees and also track diversity activities on campus. Partial funding for the software is available through an EEO grant and is outlined in the approved HR Strategic Plan and will be taken to Campus Exec. in the near future. Ramona stated concerns about the HR software being partially funded with EEO grant funds.

Resource Requests from Plans

Ed stated that the IPPC project to validate resource requests would start with the two plans that have currently made requests: Credit Matriculation and Staff Development. The requests had previously been forwarded to the committee via email and Credit Matric had requested two salaried positions, a 1.5 faculty position and \$24,000 for assessments. It was discussed that Karen, as manager for Noncredit Matriculation had previously made requests via the March 2005 Credit Matriculation Plan. Rick stated that the Credit and Non-Credit Matriculation groups should consolidate their requests because there seems to be an overlap of duties and personnel between them. Margaret added that the Noncredit Matriculation Plan had been recently revised.

Issues regarding duplication of resource requests between those submitted by plans and those submitted through program review were discussed. It is not completely known at this time if this is happening, but some departments, such as IT could fall in this category. Margaret stated that updates to plans, program review requests and plan requests seem to be disconnected.

Our next meeting will not take place until January 28 due to the holiday next Monday. Ed stated that we will complete a validation of the resource requests from the two submitted plans at that time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Submitted by Jill Lewis