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 Strategic Goals 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 response 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, it is possible, , with appropriate outcomes.
    - The role of the IEC is not to review SLOs but may be 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