LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

November 29, 2012
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

AGENDA

1. Call to Order — Walthers
2. Review and Approval of Agenda — Walthers
3. Review and Approval of Minutes – September 20 & October 18, 2012 — Walthers
4. Old Business
   a. Planning Task Force Report — Thompson
      i. Proposed Mission/ Vision/ Values Statements- Report on Feedback
      ii. Streamlining Committees - Report
   b. KPI Recommendations from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee — Samra
5. New Business
   a. Budget Current Year 2012-13 — Walthers
   b. Budget Planning – FY 2013-14 — Walthers
6. Area Reports and Decisions
   a. Academic Services — Noble
   b. Administrative Services — Walthers
   c. Student Services — D. Rodriguez
   d. College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC) — Orf
   e. Facilities Committee
   f. Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) — Samra
   g. Tangible Resources and Allocation Committee (TRAC) — D'Elena
   h. Staff Development Committee — Sato
   i. Sustainability Committee — Ansell
   j. Academic Senate — Thompson
   k. Classified Senate — DeNisco/Steffan
   l. Student Senate — Aboud
   m. Faculty Association — McCoy
   n. SEIU — Eddy

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

November 29, 2012
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

7. Equity Perspective & Reflection: CCN Equity Point Person Questions
    a. How did the decisions we made impact various members of our community? Consider matters such as equitable distribution of resources, student access to services, barriers related to language, economic status, transportation, and literacy level, etc
    b. In what ways has the meeting process been equitable? Were all constituencies heard from? Were there voices that were not considered?
    c. Do we need more information or support related to this dialogue? What additional information or support is needed to assist the decision-making process?

8. Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting: December 20, 2012
Room 4129
2:30 p.m.

Draft 2

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING

September 20, 2012
2:30 p.m., Room 4129
MINUTES

att. 11-29-12

Present:

Position	Name	Present		Position	Name	Present
President (Chair, Non-Voting)	Kevin Walthers	X		**VP Academic Services**	Janice Noble	X
VP Administrative Services	(vacant)			**VP Student Services**	Diana Rodriguez	
Academic Senate President	Sarah Thompson	X		**Academic Senate VP**	Melissa Korber	
Classified Senate Co-Pres.	Todd Steffan	X		**Classified Senate Co-Pres.**	Frances DeNisco	X
Student Senate President	Christina Aboud	X		**Student Senate VP**		
PBC Chair *	Bob D'Elena			**Facilities Comm. Chair**	Scott Miner	
CEMC Chair	Thomas Orf	X		**Staff Development Comm. Chair**	Michael Sato	X
Sustainability Comm. Chair	Michael Ansell	X		**I.E.C. Chair**	Rajinder Samra	X
CLP FA Site VP	~~Jane McCoy~~ LaVaskin D	X		**LPC SEIU VP**	William Eddy	

(or designee)
*New name: TRAC: Tangible Resource and Allocation Committee.

Others Present: Marilyn Flores, Dean ALSS; Sharon Gach, Administrative Assistant.

---

1. **Call to Order-** The meeting was called to order by Dr. Walthers at 2:35 PM. Dr. Walthers welcomed the attendees and each introduced themselves and their positions.

2. **Review of Agenda –** The agenda was reviewed and no changes were made.

3. **Review of Minutes -** The Minutes of May 17, 2012 were reviewed and approved (M/S/P DeNisco/Noble).

4. **Review of Charge of Committee –** Dr. Walthers asked the Council to review the Charge of the Council, dated 9/15/11. This version is from the 'almost complete' Revision of the LPC Participatory Governance Document, of Spring 2010.

   Dr. Walthers stated that what happened in College Council last year, by default, was a focus on facilitation communication. He suggested that we begin documenting all College decisions and discussions around major decisions in a central spot, possibly College Council.

   Rajinder Samra mentioned it would be helpful if we understood specifically what each bullet point of the Charge means. He said that the IEC (Institutional Effectiveness Comm.) would then be better able to evaluate Program Review, in relation to Mission, Vision, & Strategic Goals He also suggested that we gain a better understanding of our Participatory Governance Handbook. Marilyn Flores shared that there is some commonality in committees she has attended and she would like to understand how the work of each committee feeds in the College Council. Sharon Gach pointed out that the Handbook was under revision in 2010 and we could continue the discussion of each Charge and Committee, and finalize it this year. Janice Noble would like to see us publish the Participatory Governance Handbook this year. Kevin also mentioned that we could look at the wider view of Strategic Goals and the Governance flowchart.

   After discussion it was decided by consensus to continue the current Charge of the College Council.

Streamlining Committees/Small Task Force

Rajinder brought up the possibility of combining some committees, and Sarah Thompson mentioned that often there are the same 5-7 people in different committees. If they can be streamlined so that a core group would meet weekly, business could be conducted more efficiently. This would be especially beneficial in this time of rapid change in the State and ACCJC. It was suggested that representatives of the College Council, IEC, and Planning Task Force meet weekly this fall to coordinate efforts. Discussion included:

- Having only a small group work on items could possibly become a problem for a lack of representation, and could shrink participation. This may 'solve one problem with another problem.'
- LPC's committee structure was compared to other like-colleges, and it was noted that if the committee structure has representatives from all constituency groups, the product works out well.
- Due to the massive amount of work required to be done this year (State laws to enact, Accreditation) perhaps streamlining this year would be a good idea, in that there would be the same people doing the coordinating and planning, but in 2 committees, rather than 6 committees.
- **It was decided to have a small task force work on this idea and report back in October. Kevin committed to work with Sarah, Todd, Frances, Janice, Diana and Rajinder to craft a streamlined plan.**

5. Old Business

a. Mapped Accreditation Standards – Dr. Janice Noble

Janice shared that at an accreditation conference last year it was recommended to map the standards to the actual committees which would complete the work. She and Jennifer Adams did the draft shown on the screen and in the packet. She brought it to College Council today to request input .

It was requested to send the whole document, rather than just their section, to each Constituent group and major committee for review and comment before the October 18th College Council meeting; Janice will do this.

It was suggested that as each committee creates their agendas this fall, they place the accreditation standards for which they are responsible on the back of their agendas.

Rajinder observed that the IEC has 14 accreditation standards to review this year, in just 8 meetings. He suggests that committees be realistic in prioritizing their tasks and be practical in choosing what they actually can do in 8 meetings. Janice offered that committees could pick 2 standards to emphasize and do them well, rather than not accomplish many goals due to being spread too thin.

Related to this discussion above, it was clarified that the guiding or steering Committee for helping committees to prioritize their goals is the College Council.

Janice asked for approval by consensus to send out the Mapped Accreditation Standards to the entire campus community, and approval was given by assent.

b. Accreditaton Mid-Term Report – Dr. Noble reported on the Accreditation Mid-Term Report saying that it is on the LPC website, very top, "Faculty and Staff", left side, "Accreditation Wiki".

This location contains information on each recommendation with the ability for staff to comment and provide evidence for each. The input from this "Wiki" site will contribute to the Mid-Term Report and it will hold every document that the Accreditation Team will need to review in evidence of our progress on all recommendations. Included is the September 18th presentation to the Board on our Mid-Term Report, which Janice also showed on-screen in this meeting. All salient points are well-stated in the presentation, appended to these minutes.

c. **Student Learning Outcomes Implementation Report** – Janice showed the ACCJC SLO Report to the Council and said that particularly notable is the SLO improvement from December 2011 to September 2012. Percentage of complete SLOs was 74% in Dec. 2011, and improved to 92% as of today's meeting. The evidence for this Report is extensive, 5 inches of paper, 3 sets of the report, and all on a disc, which will be sent to the ACCJC by October 15th.

She asked if the Council members had any comments, questions or input, and the members hand none at the meeting and congratulated her on a thorough job. Members may send comments to her any time before October 8th.

The Council approved sending the SLO Report to the ACCJC.

d. **Improvement Plan Document** – Janice showed this draft document and explained how it would track the Accreditation recommendations, and status of each. She presented a proposed summary spreadsheet for College Council input.

Janice has summarized each recommendation by: Standard; Improvement Plan (description); Point Person/Lead; Status; Timeline & Comments. If approved by the Council the Improvement Plan document will be included with the Midterm Report document. She would ask Rajinder to populate the chart and include all IEC and other committees' status of plans.

Jane McCoy recommended that we narrow down the many KPIs from the Strategic Plan of 2009. The Council has reviewed that document many times over the last several years, and the sheer volume of Key Progress Indicators (KPIs) made it difficult to complete a significant amount of college goals.

Kevin and Janice agreed, and said that the Administrative Staff has discussed that it would not be practical to continue with the KPIs from 2009 for all of the hundreds of strategic goals. In addition the relationship between the KPIs and the ACCJC Improvement Plans does not coincide, and is therefore flawed. It was mentioned that the new State and ACCJC requirements have had to supercede these goals. The IEC recommended last Spring to discontinue the KPI method of evaluating College goal accomplishments.

Janice asked the College Council to again formally acknowledge that some of the KPIs of 2009 are flawed and agree to discontinue assessing those that are no longer relevant. . By addressing the 2009 KPIs and determining that they are not relevant to the College now, 3 years after their creation, the ACCJC can see that the College is committed to changing to completion of our last Accreditation Recommendations. **The Council agreed to this.**

Janice will bring the Summary document to the next College Council for discussion and action on flawed KPIs.

Sarah stated that an accelerated review of the mission Statement is do-able and a very good idea to get us to the point we need to be for the 2013-14 Academic Year.

Janice replied that she is pleased with the reaction of the Council and she is not wedded to the model of the shown Gantt chart.

Sarah explained that different colleges use goals differently. College-wide goals can be an extension of the mission statement, a broader statement of 'what we value'. Some colleges' strategic goals are statements of tasks that can be completed. She stated that if we keep our current goals attached to the mission Statement it is a challenge due to the needs of State law enactment on our campus, for example we need to have a plan for redaction and adding back classes should funds be voted by the State voters in November. (Funds would be for 2013-14 Year). She said if we wanted to do this expediently we would need to follow the college priorities as they are now, or we could agree to eliminate them and work solely based on the Mission Statement only.

Janice believes this is the right time to do this because the Accreditation Self-Evaluation cycle starts again in Fall 2013, and we want to be able to have workable goals and mission.

6. New Business

a. **Report from Academic Services – Division Realignment –** Janice reported that the Division realignments are complete and they are:
   - ALSS – Arts, letters and Scoial Sciences
   - STEMPS – Science, Technology, Engineering, math & Public Safety
   - BSBA – Behavioral Sciences, Business &Athletics

b. **Consideration of College Committees' Structures and Charges –** Kevin led a discussion of the charge of the College Council. It was determined that the charge is sufficient.

   He also discussed the September Town Meeting second hour activity and survey. Jane said said not many faculty were in her session but she got a lot out of the session. Kevin feels people need more meaningful results and thus having the Planning Task Force take the lead in streamlining the Goals may be very useful. For future surveys he would like to see us use Googledocs so everyone can participate at the same level, and complete the surveys after the meeting to give them more thought.

c. **Charge of the Planning Task Force**
   Rajinder shared thoughts from the Planning Task Force including Charge and Membership. He said the members would like to keep focused on academics and student needs and avoid pitting one group/discipline against another. They hope to base the priorities to be in line with the DBSG Ring Chart.

   It was Motioned, Seconded and Passed to approve the charge of the Planning Task Force as attached to these minutes (Orf/Noble).

d. **Need for Meeting in November-** The Council discussed the need for its regular meeting in November and decided that it will be held on Nov. 15th. (The Admin. Assistant mistakenly recorded date of November meeting as during Thanksgiving Holiday, but that is not so. It will remain on the third Thursday, November 15th.)

7. Informational Items

a. **VP of Administrative Services** – Kevin Walthers said that this recruiting closed on September 18th and the Search Committee will meet on September 25th for the first time.

Academic Senate Flex Day Report – Michael Sato gave a follow-up to his May report. The Flex Program submitted to the State in May, with no Mandatory Flex Days, was subsequently changed. After much discussion with the State representative it was decided to have 4 Faculty Flex Days – Convocation (Aug. 16), College Day (Aug. 17), and 2 Variable Flex on Instructors' Own Time. Recording for Variable Flex Days will be done by Michael, and these days will need prior approval with the Variable Flex Approval Form found on the Staff Development webpage.

It was asked how this will affect the Academic Calendar if Chabot is having actual on-campus flex days and LPC does not. Kevin questioned the State representative about this scenario and it will not affect the Academic Calendar. Our instructors will plan their Variable Flex Days utilizing substitutes or trades with other faculty.

8. Coordination of Information

a. **Academic Services** – Janice shared that the Scheduler hiring committee will be interviewing on October 2nd and 8th. Sarah Aubert has been working 10 hours/week for LPC, as well as Nicole Huber 20-25 hours, remotely. She will keep them as on-call staff for as long as possible to give the newly hired person good training time.

b. **Administrative Services** – Kevin reported that the Board approved the District budget and the two colleges' Administrative Services offices are working on departmental distributions with the VPs and Deans.

c. **Student Services** – No report, VP Rodriguez at a conference.

d. **College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC)** – Tom Orf reported that with potential cuts to next academic year the committee is finalizing the college's options for course/section offerings, and documenting in a memo to the District. The District Enrollment Management Committee is also preparing, with the idea that sections/courses can always be added back if funding comes through.

Tom said that on the next CEMC agenda there will be discussion of the backlash regarding cuts, procedures for eliminating courses, and we may need a procedure with some 'teeth in it", and take it to the Board.

Kevin said this speaks to the need for the Planning Task Force. We cannot just look at the 'delta'/ the changes, we need to review the unknowns and find out our actual base of doing business – which is a faculty-driven conversation. We must find and be careful of our threshold, as adjunct instructors would be needed and may or may not be available.

The Deans are starting to estimate the impact of cuts on enrollment to determine what is the scale, the number of same courses in comparison, so that we can find our base of operation numbers.

e. **Facilities Committee**– Kevin mentioned that the Campus Blvd. project is moving along. Tom Orf had a question about the Free Speech persons who were blocking the pathways near the narrow fence lines last week. Could there be an alternative location for them? There was a discussion of the Free Speech Board Policy and a Time, Place and Manner policy, which Jane mentioned would need FA agreement first. She said the District seems willing to negotiate this currently, however it was stalled in the last few years.

Sharon noted that for blocking students' passing and harassment by Free Speech persons, Diana Rodriguez is taking notes from people about problems encountered in order to formulate better options for our campus spaces, should there be a next time.

f. **Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) –** Nothing further.

g. **Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) –** The PBC has reviewed its charge and membership and **recommends a new name – "Tangible Resource and Allocation Committee" (TRAC). The College Council noted this and will review their Charge at its next meeting.**

h. **Staff Development Committee–** No report.

i. **Sustainability Committee–** No report.

j. **Academic Senate –** Sarah mentioned that when changing major documents we need them approved by Mutual Agreement. Thus, for the Mission Statement It is critical to have a draft by Wednesday, Sept. 26th for first Academic Senate review, and if no changes are introduced after that the Senate could vote on it as soon as October 15th.

   The Academic Senate is also working on lessening the impact of SB 1456. She also indicated that what the State says about Goals and Completion may contradict the State Ed Code. She said the Senate will work on plans to meet all the requirements.

k. **Classified Senate–** Todd Steffan shared that the Classified Senate has 7 goals for this year, 3 having to do with morale. The Classified Senate purchased a number of training videos with Staff Development Committee funds, and will hold brown bag lunches to try and increase training. The Senate is working on a Spring flex day, as well as trying to build up Student Scholarships.

   He thanked Julie Thornburg and Renee Pegues for helping the Board of the California Community Colleges Classified Senate (4CS) to hold its meeting at LPC this month.

l. **Student Senate–** No report.

m. **Faculty Association-** LaVaughn Hart mentioned that there has been good progress on negotiated items lately.

n. **SEIU–** No report.

9. **Next Steps –** None.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach, Administrative Assistant
Office of the President

Thus, the KPI Summary Document Janice reviewed would place the State and ACCJC requirements in the forefront, and create a list that is workable and is in line with current student needs.

The Council agreed with the KPI Summary Sheet concept shown in the "Improvement Plan Document".

Therefore Rajinder will populate the chart and ask a small group to help decide how to prioritize the KPI Document so that maximum goals can be accomplished. Rajinder mentioned that it is beneficial to choose only KPIs which are SMART [Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Trackable].

To conclude, Janice said that a small group of reviewers including herself, Rajinder, and others will take all the flawed KPIs out of the Document, and remove specific names, replacing with position titles only. There are over 100 KPIs in this group. They will next label the Completed items which will leave about 40 KPIs to complete in future.

e. **Program Review – Summer Projects** – Sharon Gach said that Teri Henson phoned before the meeting to say that the Instructional Program Review Committee will have a report for the October meeting.

Kevin reported that at the last IPRC meeting he stated to the members that he believes there are too many "Programs" and the committee could look at streamlining some down. He stated that not every discipline has to be a "Program" and that there needs to be a discussion of the definition of a "Program", including what it is, and what it is not.

f. **Timeline for Mission/Values/Vision, Goals, and Strategic Planning** – Janice referred to page 8 of the packet the "Mission, Vision and Values Statement Review Process". She said that last Spring she was asked to recommend a process and timeline to the College Council during the re-evaluation these College documents. Again, the review will begin the self-evaluation process for ACCJC and State guidelines and laws, and the quicker review cycle that is coming into play due to desperate State budgets.

The members reviewed the document, and Jane McCoy had a change to the Draft on page 8, to remove "faculty members" and replace with "Academic Senate", and remove "SEIU" and replace with "Classified Senate". This change will be made by Janice.

Sarah Thompson further explained that this topic came to College Council last May when the Academic Senate requested College Council to streamline the goals in order to be able to complete enough that would make a difference to student learning, retention and transfer.

Sarah and Rajinder mentioned that the Planning Task Force 2012 was formed to deal with all the possible contingencies of the November ballot measures (if all pass, if some pass, and if none pass), so that LPC will be able to begin instituting the scenarios that the voters decide upon. The Planning Task Force is literally shackled by the number of College goals, in that very few are completed, because there are so many that no committee or group can actually prioritize and work on any.

It was asked could we start with any ten goals and work on them this year? Rajinder said that the IEC recommends only 2 or 3 strategic goals be tackled per year. If we prioritize goals we must give resources to staff to meet them; if no progress is made after we told the ACCJC we would make progress, we will be rated poorly. We need to explicitely be able to say that our chosen 2 or 3 goals are Complete.

LAS POSITAS
COLLEGE

College Council
October 18, 2012
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

MINUTES

Voting Members Present (co-chairs receive 1 total vote/ not 2):

Position	Name	Present		Position	Name	Present
President (Chair, Non-Voting)	Kevin Walthers	X		**VP Academic Services**	Janice Noble	X
VP Administrative Services	(vacant)			**VP Student Services**	Diana Rodriguez	X
Academic Senate President	Sarah Thompson	X		**Academic Senate Vice President**	Elena Cole	
Classified Senate Co-President	Frances DeNisco	X		**Classified Senate Co-President**	Todd Steffan	
Student Senate President	Christina Aboud	X		**Student Senate Vice President**	——	
Planning&Budget Comm. Chair	Bob D'Elena			**Facilities Comm. Chair**	Scott Miner	
CEMC Chair	Thomas Orf			**Staff Development Comm. Chair**	Michael Sato	X
Sustainability Comm. Co- Chairs	Colin Schatz, Rita Carson	X		**Inst. Effectiveness Comm. Chair**	Rajinder Samra	X
CLP FA Site VP	Jane McCoy	X		**LPC SEIU VP**	William Eddy	

Others Present: none.

---

1. **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 2:34 by Dr. Walthers. It was noted that a quorum was not present.

2. **Review and Approval of Agenda** - The agenda was approved as drafted.

3. **Review and Approval of Minutes – September 20, 2012** – Since there was no quorum the minutes could not be approved.

4. **Old Business**

   a. **Planning Task Force Report** – Sarah Thompson reported that after the Oct. 3 Town Meeting, with the mission statement activity Teri Henson and Justin Garoupa volunteered from the Task Force to write responses to the Town Meeting comments, and present them at the Nov. 7th Town Meeting. She read the current draft of the under-revision Mission Statement: " Las Positas College is an inclusive, learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals."

There was discussion of a next task, to create a new Prioritization Structure for Course Red-Lining and Additions in a wholistic way. The process used to-date was going Division by Division and doing what made sense, however there have been unforeseen consequences and the Task Force recommends that a new Prioritization Structure be created that retains coordination for degrees and programs. A sub-committee was created to begin a draft of this process: Marilyn Flores, John Ruys, Christina Lee, Melissa Korber.

It was asked if there has been any input from the Distance Education Committee on the priorization process, and Sarah answered that there has been input, including how DE will maintain its base. These decisions are CEMC decisions, she clarified, not under Academic Senate purview.

The Council discussed the prioritization model being worked on in DBSG, and the committee representatives are waiting to hear from DEMC if the model is viable and can be used for planning purposes.

Sarah also reported that the TF looked at the Program Review Process and discussed some possible committee structures and how to make these tasks more streamlined (more under 4. e).

The TF is also discussing what would happen if the College Goals were deactivated for a year and we use only the Mission Statement as our guiding principle. The advantage would be that we would not have to work so hard on goals that are unattainable, and were written before the current regulations by ACCJC and the State. The current regulations require that every goal be evaluated in committee and College Council; we have too many goals to make this feasible (more under 4.c.).

b. **Proposed Mission Statement/ Feedback from Oct. 3 Town Meeting** – Teri Henson reported that only 14 resposes were returned from the Town Meeting presentation and workshops on October 3rd. However, the Task Force would like to reply to these responses as they may be representative of others' questions and concerns.

Concerns listed included:

- The support for completion of degrees to the exclusion of other student goals, such as learning via only one class
- What does completion mean- AA, Transfer Degree? We will need to put this in the glossary we are creating.
- Several people were confused about the purpose of the exercise
- A couple of comments suggested a very brief mission statement, with bullet pts that expand the concepts, such as Santa Rosa and Glendale Comm. Colleges'
- Several people didn't like losing the last sentence about "knowledge, skills and abilities", however the Task Force feels this belongs in the values statement rather than the mission statement. Teri explained that the Values Statement can promote many more things – but if an item is in the Mission Statement the college has to do it.

The Mission Statement review now begins to go through the Participatory Governance process for approval. It has already been sent to the Governance entities.

c. **KPIs – Report on Discontinuance of Some KPIs** – As mentioned in the September meeting, Janice Noble presented on-screen the KPI document with the hundreds of goals that were created 4 years ago, but cannot be documented or completed. The Council last month discussed possibly deactivating the goals and utilizing the Mission and Values Statements as our goals for ACCJC purposes.

   It was asked if deactivation means not pursuing any of the old KPIs at all. Jan said there is a middle ground in which some of the KPIs could be kept, perhaps 1 or 2 from each of the goal areas. Rajinder had in mind that each goal kept would relate to a Program or Core Competency, or both.

   Sarah stated that the Academic Senate discussed deactivating the KPIs for the 2012-13 academic year, with the understanding they would be reconstrued or reinstated in the 2013-14 year.

   It was dicussed to ask the IEC to act on this proposal to eliminate some KPIs and continue with some in progress. Sarah added that for anything we keep this year to make sure they are meaningful and time-effective.

   It was motioned, seconded and approved to ask the IEC to discuss and make a recommendation to the College Council on whether to deactivate all KPIs for 2012-13, or some KPIs. If some KPIs are recommended to be kept, to make sure they are meaningful and time effective. It was hoped that the IEC could discuss this at their Nov. 8th meeting and report back at the November College Council meeting. (Noble/Rodriguez/ Passed.)

d. **Accreditation Update** - Janice Noble reported that the Accreditation Mid-Term Report went to the District Board for approval on October 16th. She expects that the Mid-Term Visit will be during January or early February. The same reviewers from ACCJC will be looking at all our reports (Mid-Term, SLO, etc.), so there will be continuity of knowledge among the reviewers. Our SLO report is also embedded in our Mid-Term Report.

   Jan thanked everyone involved in getting the Mid-Term Report finished, especially Diana Rodriguez, Rajinder Samra, Jeff Sperry, Teresa Henson, Elena Cole, and Kevin Walthers.

   Rajinder added a hearty thank you to Janice for her work also.

e. **Streamlining Committees – Report from Small Group** – Sarah Thompson reported that there has been discussion among the major college committees that something like a "College Planning and Integration Council" – a "mega committee" could be instituted. Perhaps 5-8 representatives from each Governance entity would commit their time to serve on the mega-committee so that fewer meetings are held per month, and business can be conducted more speedily.

The idea of a mega committee is to prevent the same 5-8 people who are in 4-6 committees a month together, from having to wait until the next type of committee meeting to be able to make a decision. Streamlining could occur in that several key committees could be combined, and business done more quickly. The mega committee would meet each week, and create a schedule for hearing new business, recommendations, and vetting them through the Governance processes.

It is hoped that the decision process would be shorter, instead of 6 – 10 months: 1st month for study, 2nd month to hear recommendation, 3rd month to roll out to the Participatory Governance groups, and 4th month to the College Council. Combining the key committees will save 1 – 2 months of cycling ideas and recommendations through committees.

The Council will give the mega-committee idea some thought. One concern is how the Classified Senate will be allowed to meet (while still getting their regular work done), as they do not receive reassigned time or release time. In addition, the Planning Task Force would need to create a more thorough recommendation, including what the commitment level of the participants would be.

5. New Business

a. **Proposed Program Review – and Link to Planning** – Teri Henson reported on the Program Review work done in order to link Program Review to Planning (and allocation). She and Jill Carbone have worked on this quite diligently over the last 3 years and the Program Review Task Force believes its recommendations will be useful to the College and for Accreditation.

The Program Review Committee is now expanding to include Student Services and there will be 1 common form and process for doing program review. Teri explained the accreditation rubrics and how they would be linked to planning and explained the various stages. These are shown on the drafts attached to these minutes.

Some of the considerations to keep in mind include:

- Stage 4 assumes that a Participatory Governance Planning Committee has been formed to determine how to link PR to planning and allocation.
- Future summary PR documents may be much smaller, there is a need to be succinct to effectively allow review and useful allocation of resources
- Frequency of PRs will need to be determined; is it necessary for every program to write a PR every year? Teri gave examples of several colleges' programs which are seen by ACCJC as doing PR well.
- Timeline for review and approval – recommendation by PRC is by Nov. 30th; actual timeline will need to be determined.

Teri stated that there is now a draft definition of a Program which will presented to Academic Senate the week of October 22nd. She said the Program Review Committee

has researched and offered proposals, however now the drafts will need to go through the Participatory Governance process. It is not up to the PRC to answer all questions for the college, this is meant to be a collegial process.

The College Council members heartily thanked Teri, Jill and Elena for their hard work on these recommendations.

b. **IEC – Proposed Charge of Committee –** Rajinder presented the new proposed charge of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. There was lively and lengthy discussion on pros and cons for a new charge. The new charge recommended is: "The IEC provides ongoing and systematic evaluation of key college processes and metrics that lead to recommendations or sharing of information for improving student learning and institutional outcomes." The main phrase that narrows the committee's work down is "key college processes and metrics".

Since there was no quorum at today's CC meeting, further discussion was held. It is hoped that this could be voted on at the November CC meeting.

Discussion included:

- This charge creates a situation where the committee doesn't have to take on every goal in every year. There will be 'key' processes for each year, which allows the committee to work on the institutional outcomes that are most important for that year, to provide the most success for most students.
- The proposed charge is measurable and reflects the college's goal of instruction. The State wants each committee's work to be measurable.
- Will the SLO work roll into the IEC Committee? Yes, with appropriate outcomes.
    - The role of the IEC is not to review SLOs but to review the procedures of the SLO committee to assure it is able to do its work, and that our SLO process is able to ensure student success
- This charge says we have key concepts – but it is not an exclusive list of all we do. This charge broadens the scope but narrows the work.
- Improvement of student learning is central to have in the charge, as that is our college's main goal
- The Accountability Document from State Chancellor's Office says this is needed: improving student learning.
- If we are going to do this, it will not take time from student learning, it should free up time.
- No one wants to focus on compliance, however if we don't do something like this, we will need to rush later, which will affect instruction on the back end. If we create a good process now it will free us up for creativity in teaching and learning over time.
- Perhaps it would be good to write into the IEC committee Charge that by the end of May 2013 the committee will identify 4-5 items for the 2013-14 year to work on as an annual plan
- The IEC would like to make the work meaningful for the individuals attending. Some committee members were hesitant to join again this year because of the difficulties in the scope of work last year .

It was agreed that it would be realistic to move in this direction and bring the charge back to CC in November for vote when there is quorum next month.

6. **Area Reports and Decisions**

   a. **Academic Services** – Janice reported that as accreditation is a year-round task the Substantive Change Document for the DE Program has begun. There are 6 programs being taught over 50% online current. Scott Vigallon did a great report for 2010. The next DE report will likely be vetted in February, go to the March Board meeting, and in May to the ACCJC. In addition, Environmental Science and Sociology both have transfer degree programs available online now.

   b. **Administrative Services** – Kevin reported that there is approximately $21 Million left in the Measure B bond fund to distribute for additional district projects. He also said that when the SSA building is complete, Doug Horner frugally estimated, several other capital projects can be decided and worked on. There is also technology language in the bond measure, so tech updates can be done. In order to decide which projects, the costs and priorities will need to be studied and the Facilities Committee will create a process to hear and recommend proposals to College Council. Some items may need to be prioritized based on the Master Plan.

   c. **Student Services** – No report.

   d. **College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC)** – No representative present.

   e. **Facilities Committee** - see Administrative Services Report above.

   f. **Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)** – No further report.

   g. **Resource and Allocation Committee (formerly PBC)** – No further report.

   h. **Staff Development Committee**– No report.

   i. **Sustainability Committee**– No report.

   j. **Academic Senate** – No further report.

   k. **Classified Senate** – Frances DeNisco mentioned the goals and activities of the Senate for Fall term. The emphasis is on morale and there will be a potluck and motivational movie held in early December.

   l. **Student Senate**– No further report.

   m. **Faculty Association (FA)** - No report.

   n. **SEIU** - No representative present.

7. **Next Steps**
   (no items)

8. **Equity Perspective & Reflection: CCN Equity Point Person Questions**
   a. How did the decisions we made impact various members of our community? Consider matters such as equitable distribution of resources, student access to services, barriers related to language, economic status, transportation, and literacy level, etc...
      Decisions were made with all members of community in mind, and discussions reflected this.

   b. In what ways has the meeting process been equitable? Were all constituencies heard from? Were there voices that were not considered?
      The council worked hard to make sure all constituencies were heard from.

   c. Do we need more information or support related to this dialogue? What additional information or support is needed to assist the decision-making process?
      Although there was not quorum, so voting could not be held, the council felt that they considered many facts and that agreements were made with all segments of the college community in mind.

9. **Adjournment**
   The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 PM.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Sharon Gach
   Administrative Assistant, Office of the President