LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

FILE

College Council

October 18, 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, 2012**	Walthers
4.	**Old Business**	
	a. Planning Task Force Report	Thompson
	b. Proposed Mission Statement – Feedback from Oct. 3 Town Meeting	Samra
	c. KPIs – Report on Discontinuance of Some KPIs	Noble
	d. Accreditation Update	Noble
	e. Streamlining Committees – Report from small group	Walthers/Thompson
5.	**New Business**	
	a. Proposed Program Review -Planning Model	Henson
	b. IEC – Proposed Charge of Committee	Samra
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	Walthers
	f. Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)	Samra
	g. Tangible Resources and Allocation Committee (TRAC)	D'Elena
	h. Staff Development Committee	Sato

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

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

i.	Sustainability Committee	Ansell
j.	Academic Senate	Thompson
k.	Classified Senate	DeNisco/Steffan
l.	Student Senate	Aboud
m.	Faculty Association	McCoy
n.	SEIU	Eddy

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: November 15, 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

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	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 consensus.

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.

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 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.

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

SOME STARTING IDEAS FOR A RUBRIC TO BE USED BY INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE

Prepared by Maureen O'Herin, IE committee member, English Faculty

My ideas for what each of these columns would entail are listed below each column heading

College Process to be Reviewed and Evaluated	Goal of Process	Data/Matrix Provided by Process/committee Contact Person	Data/Matrix Provided by IR	Analysis of Data and Goal alignment by IE Committee	Evaluation Recommendation
In addition to its current name, we should also, perhaps, list all the names and previous "housings" of the committee and/or process, in order to have some history of its permutations.	This would be provided by the Committee Contact Person, along with any Committee Charge statements, etc.	List titles of data/matrices. Actual data/matrices would be included in a shared Google doc, perhaps, and we could also make available a WIKI for commentary on the data by the IEC and the members of the committee/process which is being reviewed.	This would include any additional information that was not available to the committee being reviewed, but is accessible by IR and is deemed pertinent to assessing the goal of the process/committee. This could also be made available to all committee members during the analysis process.	• Is the goal compatible with college mission statement? • Does data show that the goal is being reached? • Are SLOs supported by the process? Etc.	☐ More data is needed in order to make a recommendation. Please submit the following: _____ And/OR ☐ Please begin collecting data as described in attachment. ☐ Goal should be revised to align with college mission ☐ Reassess steps and procedures in process. ☐ Process should be placed in a different Committee OR Committee should be realigned in overall LPC processes. Etc.

This Rubric and Recommendation is being forwarded to the following Committees/Individuals:

_____

On the following day:

_____

By the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

STRATEGIC PLANNING KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	POINT PERSON/ LEAD PARTY	STATUS	TIME LINE	COMMENT
TEACHING AND LEARNING				
Increase the number of teaching and learning activities reflected in annual committee reports.	President's Office	Proposed for elimination as a Key Performance Indicator	2012-13	No staff resources available for this activity.
Percentage of budget allocated to teaching and learning resources.	Office of Administrative Services	Proposed for elimination as a Key Performance Indicator	2012-13	No fiscal resources available for this activity.
Increase in allocation of resources to tutorial services, supplemental instruction and other learning support systems on	Office of Administrative Services	Proposed for elimination as a Key Performance Indicator	2012-13	No fiscal resources available for this activity.
Establish a freshman experience program that promotes student access and success.	Office of Student Services	Proposed for elimination as a Key Performance Indicator	2012-13	No fiscal resources available for this activity.
Increase activities related to instruction for emerging student populations.	Office of Student Services	Proposed for elimination as a Key Performance Indicator	2012-13	No fiscal resources available for this activity.
Increase percentage of courses and programs with student learning outcomes and completed assessments.	Office of Academic Services	In progress	Ongoing	This information is being collected.
Increase number of opportunities for dialogue and training about assessments.	Staff Development Committee, Office of Academic Services	In progress	Ongoing	This information is being collected.
Create coordinator position focused on providing centralized support and resources for learning communities	President's Office	Proposed for elimination as a Key Performance Indicator	2012-13	No fiscal resources available for this activity.
Increase number of learning communities linked to counseling.	Office of Student Services	In progress	Ongoing	This information is being collected.
Increase number of service learning opportunities identified.	Office of Academic Services	Proposed for elimination as a Key Performance Indicator	2012-13	Key person responsible for this activity is no longer employed at the college.
Increase number of service learning partnerships developed.	Office of Academic Services	Proposed for elimination as a Key Performance Indicator	2012-13	Key person responsible for this activity is no longer employed at the college.

4.2.

Increase number of students engaged in service learning activities.	Office of Academic Services	Proposed for elimination as a Key Performance Indicator	2012-13	Key person responsible for this activity is no longer employed at the college.

Sharon Gach - Fwd: Program Review/Planning Proposal

From: Sharon Gach
Subject: Fwd: Program Review/Planning Proposal

>>> Teresa Henson 10/15/2012 4:38 PM >>>
Hello Everyone
The attached proposal for linking program review and planning, and an associated list of tasks, was presented last week to the Instructional Program Review Committee, the Academic Senate, and the Planning Task Force. The proposal was created by the IPRC co-chairs Teri Henson and Jill Carbone, in consultation with Dr. Janice Noble, President of Academic Services.

Because the development and implementation of the process is beyond the purview of the IPRC, we are asking faculty, staff and administrators to discuss this proposal during their division and other meetings. Our goal is that this process will be developed and put it in place by the end of this year. We need feedback from all concerned. There will be on-going discussions in the IPRC, the Academic Senate, the Planning Task Force, and the College Council. Through shared governance and dialogue, we need to work out the details of the stages outlined in the proposal and define the structures, timelines, and resources we need to have in place, in order to make this work.

It has already been determined that Student Services will be joining with Academic Services in one unified program review process with common forms/templates (to be determined). Discussions have begun to include non-instructional program review as well. Once the stages of the process have been hammered out, we will begin the work of developing the forms/templates which will be used to write program review.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal,

Teri Henson and Jill Carbone
Instructional Program Review Co-Chairs

Original Proposed Mission Statement: Las Positas College is an inclusive, student-centered institution providing learning opportunities and support for completion of transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals.

Revised Proposed 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.

Some feedback from the Town Meeting breakouts:

Students' goals – not our goals or state's goals.

The differing definitions of completion should be spelled out in the glossary that will accompany the Mission Statement. The focus should be on the completion of the students' goals, whatever they are.

Several responders recommended following the model of Santa Rosa JC and Glendale CC, which have brief Mission Statements, followed by a bulleted list that expands the concepts in the Mission Statement.

Some felt we should keep the last sentence of the current mission statement, "students develop the knowledge, skills, values, and abilities to become engaged and contributing members of the community." The consensus of the Planning Task Force is this should be kept, but belongs in the values statement as it is more aspirational. The reference to lifelong learning in the original mission statement also can be included in the values statement.

Rationale for revising the Mission Statement:

The Mission is what we are required to do. We can promote life-long learning, personal development, etc. even if not in the mission.

College goals are derived from the Mission Statement.

Goals should specific, measurable, achievable, trackable.

NOTE: there will be opportunities for additional feedback as the proposed mission statement moves through the shared-governance process for approval.

LINKING PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

TASKS (responsible parties)

1) IPRC establishes a definition of "program" as soon as possible. Use ACCJC and ASCCC guidelines, and other research, to develop a definition. This definition will be presented to the Academic Senate for approval. (IPRC)

2) Define what validation is. This definition will be presented to the Academic Senate for approval. (IPRC)

3) Define the role of the IPRC in the program review process. This definition will be presented to the Academic Senate for approval. (IPRC)

4) Determine whether/how Students Services Program Review is folded into Instructional Program Review (IPRC, Student Services make recommendations, to be approved by Academic Senate and College Council)

5) Determine the form and nature of the "summarizing" described in Stages Two and Three. (Collegial discussion between IPRC, Planning Task Force, Academic Senate, College Council)

6) Determine the frequency of PR cycle (most likely an annual (short) program review). Determine the role and frequency of the self-study. (Collegial discussion between IPRC, Planning Task Force, Academic Senate, College Council)

7) Determine time line for carrying out program review and the planning process. (Collegial discussion between IPRC, Planning Task Force, Academic Senate, College Council)

8) Proposal reviewed by key stakeholders: Administration (President, VPs), IPRC Committee, Academic Senate, Planning Task Force. After allowing time for review and comment by faculty, a finalized proposal must be approved by the Academic Senate and College Council. (Goes to Board?)

Possible Time Line: Proposal presented to: Academic Senate, IPRC on Wed., Oct. 10; Planning Task Force on Friday, Oct. 12; to Divisions on Wed., Oct. 17, to College Council on Thursday, Oct. 18. Reviewed, commented on, details worked out. Final proposal to be approved in November by Academic Senate and College Council.

PROPOSAL TO INTEGRATE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

The following steps outline a possible instructional Program Review process and elucidate Program Review's role in planning and resource allocation while ensuring Accreditation Standards are met. These stages provide further logistical detail to support the Planning Model previously generated and presented by the Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC).

The process for an annual instructional Program Review is overseen by the IPRC and assisted by the Offices of the Vice President for Academic Services and Institutional Research.

STAGE ONE: Each instructional program (as defined by the IPRC) completes a Program Review. The template for Program Review will include the four resource categories used in ACCJC's Standard 3 and will be designed to facilitate completion of resource allocation requests. The directions to writers will incorporate language from Standard 3. The writers will construct a summary abstract at the end of their report in addition to a list of the program's needs prioritized by descriptors such as: urgent, critical, nice to have.

During Stage One, the IPRC offers peer-review support to writers. Writers have the opportunity to modify their Program Review materials before submission to their Dean.

STAGE TWO: Deans review Program Reviews and offer additional feedback and support to the writers. After writers have the opportunity for modification, the final version is given to the IPRC and to the program's Dean.

After Stage Two, some form of summary, will be produced by the Deans and, independently, by the IPRC, most likely organized by the four resource categories used in ACCJC's Standard 3. The Dean's abstract will be distributed to all members in the Division and will be discussed in a Division meeting. There will be opportunity for feedback and modification to the Division summary. The IPRC summary will be presented to the Academic Senate for approval.

STAGE THREE (assumes a shared-governance planning committee has been formed): The Deans and IPRC send their abstracts to the Vice President of Academic Services. The Vice President meets with the IPRC Co-chairs and Deans to create an abstract of themes (organized by the ACCJC categories) which reflect the needs from Instructional Program Reviews. The Vice President relays this abstract to the Planning Committee.

STAGE FOUR (assumes a shared-governance planning committee has been formed): The Planning Committee reviews the Vice President's abstract. This abstract, along with external data, are used to formulate the College plan for the upcoming academic year. The Planning Committee should be charged with making recommendations to the President of the College about overarching plans, prioritization, and budget allocation. The plan is publically communicated to the college, community and District.

STAGE FIVE (assumes a shared-governance planning committee has been formed): The Allocation Committees use College plans and prioritizations, along with their own defined ranking processes, to assist in making informed, justified and transparent recommendations about resource allocation. Allocation Committees review Program Review materials when necessary to further inform their rankings.