A P P R O V E D
9/20/12

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING

May 17, 2012
2:30 p.m., Room 4129
MINUTES

Present:

Position	Name	Present		Position	Name	Present
President (Chair, Non-Voting)	Kevin Walthers	X		**VP Academic Services**	Janice Noble	X
VP Administrative Services	Bob Kratochvil	X		**VP Student Services**	Diana Rodriguez	X
Academic Senate President*	Tina Inzerilla	X		**Academic Senate Vice President***	Melissa Korber	X
Classified Senate President*	Todd Steffan	X		**Classified Senate Vice President**	Renee Pegues	X
Student Senate President	Amir Salehzedeh	X		**Student Senate Vice President**		
Planning&Budget Comm. Chair	Cindy Rosefield			**Facilities Comm. Chair**	Scott Miner	X
CEMC Chair	Thomas Orf	X		**Staff Development Comm. Chair**	Michael Sato	X
Sustainability Comm. Chair	Michael Ansell			**Inst. Effectiveness Comm. Chair**	Rajinder Samra	X
CLP FA Site VP*	LaVaughn Hart	X		**LPC SEIU VP***	William Eddy	

***(or designee)**

Others Present: Heidi Ulrech, Justin Garoupa, Elena Cole, Jill Carbone, Mark Tarte, Jill Carbone

---

1. **Review of Minutes -** The Minutes of April 19, 2012 were reviewed and approved (M/S/P Miner, Orf).

2. **Old Business**

   a. **Institutional Planning & Effectiveness**
   Accreditation Functional Map – Heidi Ulrech and Justin Garoupa gave an overview of the Accreditation Recommendation on the Functional Map. They reported that they have spent considerable time doing research, gathering information, and reviewing models. The proposed new template is more "functional" and actually useful AND useable. It is a bit of a hybrid of other versions.

   Jennifer Adams asked if the previous version was in the last Self-Study and does this mean we're abandoning that template? Neither Heidi, Justin nor Janice Noble had seen it.

Heidi and Justin mentioned that for now we could have the sample/template and that once agreed upon it would need to be completed and fleshed out. Kevin Walthers suggested it would be useful to add several columns, to add linkages, and reference to the Accreditation Standards and the ability to sort by VP area of responsibility. This could be added to the list of projects for the summer.

Scott Miner said that in some cases it may be helpful to add a hyperlink to other documents or sites that provide further details. Heidi and Justin also displayed a draft that showed the details and steps for each process (ex: Purchasing...from requisitions initiated on campus, signatures, submitting to district, etc.). Bob Kratochvil stated this provides a great deal of detail that may take a lot of work to put together, but could be useful to have that to identify redundancies and evaluate them.

Jan Noble commended Heidi and Justin for their work on this project. The College Council was impressed with the work by Heidi and Justin, and consensus was for them to continue moving forward.

b. Academic Senate Resolution on Program Review
Draft Planning Model from the Instructional Program Review Committee

Elena Cole presented the Draft Planning Model from the Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC). She provided background on how and why this is coming forward to College Council and distributed a revised version of model. She said that the IPRC has been talking and asking about this for some time. A working session was held on January 27, 2012 with coordination and facilitation help from Kevin Walthers and Rajinder Samra. She stated that the IPRC does not want to move forward on Program Review until there is a decision on how to proceed, due to revision time needed, how the model would be used, and faculty time and energy.

The IPRC is not wedded to this proposed model, and not trying to push it through, however, wishes to have something for people to respond to. The IPRC held additional meetings with representatives from the IPRC and the College Council. They were asked to add and incorporate additional information that would link and/or pop up when each area is clicked. Elena displayed and reviewed samples of narratives that would appear on the form. Elena and Jill led a discussion of what the College Council's role would be in prioritizing and reviewing Program Review objectives, requests and needs. There could be some sort of "Athenian Council" or smaller group, but College Council seems like the place for prioritizing and reviewing Program Review.

Bob Kratochvil asked if they envision this process addressing "de-allocation" as well as allocations? Right now, Program Review only incorporates requests for more resources, but we will need to look at how to reduce and re-shuffle resources in the future. Kevin Walthers expressed the need to be careful and clear about how we articulate this. The Council needs to differentiate between this model and process -- that would be utilized on an annual/ongoing basis under "regular and normal" circumstances -- but this system would not apply to crisis or short-term reductions (ex: unexpected mid-year cuts). He wants to steer clear of creating a "hit list" by prioritizing resource needs.

Elena stressed the need for having a system in place for Program Review and its role in planning. This model would reflect how and where it is used, and then it could be used in

higher-level planning also. This represents one source of data, but there are others that need to be utilized (external, etc…). This campus has had a history of trust -- which is great -- but we've also been primarily reactive, and have trusted that the "reaction" would work.

Bob Kratochvil asked if the IPRC has reviewed the model with Deans yet, and Elena stated no. There was discussion about the Program Review Abstracts that would be used by various committees and processes and it was asked who would write those. Elena replied that the authors themselves would write their abstracts.

<u>The next steps planned are:</u>
Melissa Korber will work on Academic Senate approval.

Jill said they are thinking about inviting College Council members to join the September 12th meeting of Academic Senate & IPRC to do trial run of prioritization (using these Program Review updates). They are not thinking about recommendations for allocations, but identifying themes that bubble up from the self-studies. Identifying themes also honors and validates the work of the Program Review authors. Michael Sato stated that identifying college-wide themes could give the campus a feeling of working on a common project, which are the things the IPRC is working toward. Elena added that it would foster dialogue to get past the 'silos'.

Elena will work with Jennifer Adams to get a date confirmed and publicized. Kevin Walthers is planning an Administrative Retreat and will be working on the items to present to the College at Convocation. He encouraged everyone to get the background and legwork out of the way, rather than taking an entire semester to put this together.

Kevin sketched out some thoughts on the draft model and it would be great to have some additional visual representations, to add links to other areas. We could incorporate cycles within the main cycle (PR, resource allocation, etc…). LaVaughn Hart felt it is important to express that Fall is a very busy time for faculty (discipline plans, scheduling, etc…) and doesn't want people to be overloaded with extensive writing and additional workloads. Elena understood and agreed, the goal is to streamline and reduce the amount of work required.

c. **Budget Update – None.**

3. **New Business**

a. **Academic Services – Division Realignment** – Janice Noble reviewed the presentation from the May Town Meeting regarding the process used to meet with campus groups and get feedback on the new 3-Division realignment. She showed the new Division groupings as they were worked out. Kevin thanked Janice for working on this project. Michael Sato asked if this will affect committee representation and Melissa Korber said that yes it will, in many cases. Some committees indicate faculty representation "by Division," some do not. Janice suggested it would be useful to revisit the Participatory Governance Document, since it was last revised (officially) in 2005.

b. **SLO Implementation Report -** Janice Noble mentioned that it has been 10 years since the College began working on SLOs. We will be submitting an SLO report to the ACCJC, due on the same date as the Midterm Report. The Council's consensus was to send this

forward to the Board of Trustees on the same timeline as the Midterm Report, as a Board Information Item only, as there is no need for approval.

4. **Informational Items**
   a. **VP of Administrative Services** – Kevin Walthers mentioned that he will post and refill this position. He has been in contact with the Senate and Unions to name Search Committee representatives in an expedited manner. The Committee's first meeting is planned for College Day in August.

5. **Coordination of Information**
   a. Academic Services – Michael Sato mentioned that regarding next year's Staff Development Flex Day Calendar must be sent to the State soon. He received input from College Council, the Academic Senate and Divisions, and the "democratic" decision was to not schedule a mandatory Flex Day in 2012-13.
   b. Administrative Services – Bob Kratochvil reminded the Council of the electrical shut down next Sunday and the start of the Campus Blvd. work when Spring term is over.
   c. Student Services – No report.
   d. College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC) – No report.
   e. Facilities Committee– No report.
   f. Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) – No report.
   g. Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) – No report.
   h. Staff Development Committee– No report.
   i. Sustainability Committee– No report.
   j. Academic Senate – Melissa Korber reported that the meeting next week will be to mostly wrap up a few items, since the regular meeting date was used for the Staff Appreciation party. The agenda will include the DE Policy and possibly the Program Review/Planning process discussed at today's College Council.
   k. Classified Senate– No report.
   l. Student Senate– No report.
   m. Faculty Association- LaVaughn Hart said that FA elections are in process.
   n. SEIU– No report.

6. **Next Steps** – None.

7. **Equity Perspective & Reflection** – Completed with no concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach, Administrative Assistant, Office of the President
for Jennifer Adams, Executive Assistant