

**Glendale Community College  
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

**April 8, 2013 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121**

Present: Ed Karpp, Deborah Kinley, Jill Lewis, Margaret Mansour, Sarah McLemore, Mary Mirch, Rick Perez, Isabelle Saber, Ron Nakasone, Mike Scott, Donna Voogt, Solene Manoukian, Vahe Sargysyan

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Alfred Ramirez, David Yamamoto, Yvette Ybarra, Hoover Zariani

Resource/Guests: Kathy Bakhit, Michael Ritterbrown

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ed Karpp called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- **MSC (McLemore/Scott)** to accept the minutes of the February 11, 2013 meeting with corrections.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- **MSC (McLemore/Scott)** to accept the minutes of the March 11, 2013 meeting.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**3. Standard Processes for Prioritizing Resource Requests: Memo to Standing Committee Chairs Outlining Suggested Practices**

Standardized plans for the standing committees were discussed. The 4C's and Academic Affairs have looked at options to make the criteria for prioritization clear. This practice should be kept consistent from year to year. Mike suggested that the use of evidence as prioritization criteria could include what is already recorded through the program review process such as real health and safety issues, documented accreditation issues (linked to standards or recommendations), cost, age of current equipment, condition, how many years an item had been requested and relationship to plans if applicable. Some criteria could be used by all standing committees and other criteria may be specific to the committee. Additionally, questions 4 & 5 of the resource request form ask for potential "outcomes" associated with filling/or not filling the request.

The college has an expectation for firm deadlines and wants the ability for multi-year budgeting using prioritized lists from the standing committees. Common criteria will help competent prioritization.

- **MSC (Mirch/Scott)** to uphold firm deadlines for the submittal of program review reports and resource requests. Documents received out of the timeline will not be processed.

The college has an expectation for firm deadlines and wants the ability for multi-year budgeting using prioritized lists from the standing committees. We need common criteria in order to have competent prioritization.

- **MSC (Yamamoto/Scott)** to provide writers information regarding the criteria to be used for prioritization, firm deadlines for submittal of all documents and the consequences of not meeting the deadline will result in requests not moving forward in the process.

## NEW BUSINESS

### 4. Validation of Resource Requests from Plan Review

Ed explained that the resource request submitted through plan review had been validated by a team of three IPCC members (Ed, Jill and Mike). Using a rubric similar to program review, the request was determined to be compliant.

### 5. Accreditation Process

Mary shared that changes and expanded questions were included on this year's Annual Report and Annual Fiscal Report to the ACCJC. She expanded on the discussion last month about the new requirement for institutions to make their own "Institutional Standards". Additionally, California Community Colleges will be using a new "Score Card" that will not be based on benchmarks or goals, but include measurements by which a college "passes". These measurements will no longer be what we are "striving for", but a requirement for us to not fall below our own standards.

More changes include: Substantive Change Reports will essentially become a "mini" accreditation report. More Distance Education courses will also require Substantive Change reporting. Federal requirements seem to be driving changes. Many CCC's are questioning accreditation requirements versus collective bargaining. The consistency of sanctions is also in question: some institutions are being scrutinized for the past 12 years and others for only the past 6 years. Some colleges are preparing to challenge the commission. The accrediting commission and the Chancellor's Office are not in sync. GCC submitted two reports on March 14 and two on March 31.

Ed shared his proposal on the organization and timeline of our 2016 Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness. The new 80% RT coordinator position should be filled soon. The nine standards will each be co-chaired by a team of three (faculty, classified and manager) and include at least one or two students. A timeline of activities leading up to the Dec. 2015 submittal date was discussed. Mary suggested that we focus on answering the questions. We will need to define our focus and strategy. Mike expressed concerns regarding the timeline and a desire to move up #'s 2, 3 and 4.

Sarah added that we should identify the most critical "gaps" in order to direct any needed changes and assess the results. Isabelle and Mike added that a budget needs to be identified to support the work. This would include RTEP for faculty to work on the project in summer and also for faculty editors. We will also need to outline an editing process. Sarah suggested that Grossmont College and Golden West College were good examples of reports to look at. Additionally, she suggested that we work on a system for course outlines to be updated every five years. We also need to address making student assessment results public and where that should be done. Another noted point is that if we have any of the same recommendations as were given in 2010, we will likely go on sanction!

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

*Submitted by Jill Lewis*