# Glendale Community College Institutional Planning Coordination Committee

## MINUTES January 24, 2011 - 12:15 pm in AD121

Present: Trudi Abram, Jill Lewis, Mary Mirch, Ramona Barrio-Sotillo, Karen Holden-Ferkich, Ed

Karpp, Mary Mirch, Vicki Nicholson, Alfred Ramirez, Mike Scott, Monette Tiernan

Hoover Zariani

Guest: Dawn Lindsay

Absent: Armond Aivazyan, Saodat Aziskhanova, Ana Boghazian, Margaret Mansour, Alice

Mecom, Ron Nakasone, Rick Perez, John Queen

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 12:19 p.m.

#### 1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSC (Tiernan/Abram) to accept the minutes of the January 10, 2011.

### 2. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

#### Follow-Up Report

The report will be presented as a first reading at the Board Meeting this afternoon. After the report gets approved by Campus Exec., that date will go into the report also.

Rec. 4 – Faculty Evaluations & SLOs: Ramona expressed concern over the language in Rec. 4 concerning SLOs and faculty evaluations. She stated that this issue was passed on to a task force, which did meet with a guild representative, but was never taken to the negotiation table as stated in the report. Changes in the language will be made before the next draft is published. Ramona will clarify this point at the board meeting. Vicki stated that we must decide how to handle the adjunct evaluations in this recommendation and that separating adjunct from the rest of faculty is difficulty. Mary commented that the data is inconclusive at this time. Karen suggested that not using any adjunct data might be more appropriate than causing confusion regarding the % of evaluations completed. Vicki added that evaluating adjuncts every 5<sup>th</sup> semester is also problematic for record keeping. Vicki will forward updated evaluation numbers. It was suggested that an evaluation procedure be developed and reviewed by Cabinet. This should also include administrator/management responsibility for plans.

Rec. 8 – Safety of Servers: IT issues have not been resolved concerning the physical problems with the servers. Dawn asked what could be done in the immediate future that won't cost the estimated \$1M. Ron reported that the corrections must be done by the equipment company to continue the warranty. Apparently, the servers were installed incorrectly. As a small concession, the city also supplies annual rebates. It was requested that acronyms (such as AC and UPS in this and all sections) of the report be identified. Ron will submit changes.

<u>Program Review</u>: All resource requests from program review will be forwarded as follows: all non-personnel requests will be validated by the Program Review Committee, given a score ranging from 0-5, and then forwarded to the Budget Committee. IHAC and SSHAC requests were processed in the fall. All other personnel requests will be forwarded to the appropriate area: CHAC for classified requests, RTEP for any release time or stipend requests, Campus Exec. for any administrator, manager/confidential or reorganization requests and to Job Placement for any student worker requests. Budget will distribute requests to the appropriate standing committee for prioritization and then all requests will return back to the Budget Committee. Ron stated that "Must Do" requests have been eliminated by the Budget Committee. All requests are generated through program review or plans. Ed has forwarded resource requests to all administrators in charge of plans.

Other Issues: Admissions and Records sent out notices asking departments to look at the annual catalogue for any potential changes. Ed asked the committee to look at page 9 of the Catalogue, titled Objectives and Functions. This section appears to be linked to the mission statement, but is really educational objectives. After much discussion, it was decided to remove the first few words: "Pursuant to its stated mission".

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Submitted by Jill Lewis