CALL TO ORDER
Co-chair Meridith Randall called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Committee Members Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x Caryn Bailey</td>
<td>Kevin O’Rorke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Marc Beam</td>
<td>Meridith Randall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Stearns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Benson</td>
<td>Tina Duenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Robb Lightfoot</td>
<td>Morris Rodrigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Loring</td>
<td>Mark Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES – 8/16/2014- postpone until the next meeting.

COMMENTS –New members: Tina Duenas, representing Classified (CSEA) and Lindsey Matheney, representing students.

REPORTS

Midterm Report- Meridith Randall
This report is due soon. In 2011 the District was put on probation with four (4) recommendations. There was a follow up visit fall 2012, and then a follow up report addressing all four (4) recommendations was filed. An additional follow up report is due fall 2013. If there are comments, questions or concerns on this please send them directly to Meridith by September 23rd. There will possibly be a College Council meeting on September 30th, the 5th Tuesday of the month. Meridith will send out an announcement to the entire college community asking for feedback. Once the report is submitted we will probably hear back sometime in February. Joe added that Meridith has put a lot of work into this, with 129 pieces of evidence.

DISCUSSION/ACTION

Board Policies / Administrative Procedures – Mandated (Information Only)
None
Board Policies / Administrative Procedures – First Reading

- BP/AP 3505 – Emergency Response Plan (formerly Civil Defense)-additional procedures have been added. The changes are based on advice received from the CCLC.

- AP 3515 – Reporting of Crimes- updated to be more official, this one is guided by CCLC language, and added in some information from the Cleary Act. The Cleary Act guides districts on how to handle sexual assault, and this includes federal law mandates.

- BP/AP 3520 – Local Law Enforcement-This is a new AP -Reporting of crimes following CCLC language and Cleary Act.

- BP/AP 3540 – Sexual and Other Assaults on Campus- This is a new AP following the CCLC language and Cleary Act. Laws evolve and change quickly and there could be changes to this policy frequently.

- BP/AP 6340 – Bids and Contract-This update is based on CCLC language – VPs making purchases (new law).

- AP 6350 – Contracts – Construction-Updates to reflect the different elements of contracts, following CCLC language.


- AP 7260 – Classified Supervisors and Managers- This one to be deleted, it was a duplicate of BP7260.

Board Policies / Administrative Procedures – Second Reading

(*First reading was spring 2015)

1) BP 2105 – District Elections (Not relevant-To be deleted)
2) BP/AP 2105 – Election of Student Member(s) (New Policy replacing existing BP2105)
3) BP 2760 – Business Requiring Board Review and Approval*
4) BP/AP 3280 – Grants*
5) AP 3510 – Workplace Violence Plan (New)
6) BP 5030 – Fees (Revised)
7) AP 5040 – Student Records, Directory Information, and Privacy (Revised)
8) BP 5052 – Open Enrollment (Revised)

Lightfoot motioned to approve the above 1-8 BP/APs as presented. Bailey seconded. Discussion-
These policies will be shared with Academic Senate at their next meeting. No other discussion noted. Motioned carried unanimously.

Approval of Strategic Plan Task Force-
Meridith and Sue met last week and they are recommending the following membership:
Joe Wyse- President
Robb Lightfoot-faculty
2 managers appointed by President
2 faculty appointed by Academic Senate (one CTE and one non-instructional faculty)
2 classified staff (1) from Administration and (1) from Student Services appointed by CSEA and the President
1 student appointed by Student Senate

The document reviews what the task force will do to come up with a first draft by February. A timeline has not been developed because the objective is to get a draft on this plan by February. There was general consensus that the plan looks good and to move forward. Joe will head up this taskforce, and Mark will get the word out to the CTE instructors.
**Cost Estimates in Area Plans**

Sue suggested putting in a range on the cost estimates instead of a specific amount because that would save time. Joe said to keep in mind that when initiatives are ranked we shouldn’t pay attention to just the cost, but more the need for the initiative and how it could/would improve the mission of the college.

Mark added that with the new rubrics they looked at the need and justification and core indicators, and they are usually pretty accurate. Meridith gave an explanation of having a drop down box with a range instead of a specific amount. Morris explained that Technology and Facilities works on the front and backend of the estimates, and sometimes the more complex the project the more work it requires to get an accurate estimate. Mark added that we usually know the direct cost and it’s the indirect costs that we will need to get the numbers on. Meridith said the downside to leaving the process the same, is that instruction has so many initiatives. Morris said in our revision of this policy we talked about getting more upfront help from Technology. In conclusion, all agreed to leave the process/policy as is.

**Program Reviews for University Studies / General Studies Programs** - Meridith Randall

In the past a decision was made to not require program reviews for General Studies and we do not currently have a PLO on University Studies. This could be viewed as an accreditation problem. The purpose of this Council does not include doing program reviews. Secondly, there are a good percentage of programs that haven’t had graduates in the last five (5) years and there needs to be some oversight or review process so a decision can be made on the vitality of a program. Because the Council oversees the Integrated Planning Manual, Meridith would like the Council to request that this task be assigned to a group/committee/council.

Stearns motioned to assign someone to do program reviews for General and University Studies Programs.

Discussion included the following:

- To obtain an AA degree there must be an 18 unit core in some sort of discipline
- University Studies has many areas of study
- General studies is the same but you don’t have to take the transfer GE
- Possibly go back to the faculty who developed the programs and ask if they want to run them through an elimination process or start doing a Program Review
- The district was notified in 2008 to do doing PRs on all Programs
- Some programs do not fit the AAT pattern, and may not show up at a university
- There maybe programs that are almost like orphans and have had no activity
- Many programs were added years ago because the Chancellors Office gave an opportunity to easily add programs. It was considered a “window of opportunity” that could be changed later and that is why we have so many of them today
- Many of the programs have never had graduates or awards
- Some programs have had fewer than five (5) awards
- There hasn’t been the oversight necessary, so programs just stay in the catalog from year to year
- Having programs listed that are not active could be viewed as a misrepresentation to students
- There is no requirement for how many programs a college must have
- This should be resolved within the next 2-3 years for accreditation purposes
- We don’t want to rush an instructor that needs time to reflect and research
- PRs are a significant amount of work, and there can be some cross over to other curriculum
- Possibly have a committee or subgroup appointed for reviewing all programs by fall 2015

All agreed that fall 2015 was a reasonable amount of time to assign this task. Stearns amended her motioned “to assign faculty to do program reviews for General and University Studies Programs by May 2015. Mark seconded. Robb said he will share this information with Academic Senate next week. No other discussion noted. Motion carried unanimously.

**Program Vitality Plan** - Meridith Randall

There is currently no structure or process in place for reviewing programs (overview and analysis). This has been discussed with various groups through the years. The question is “Do we want Program Reviews to end up somewhere and to get some kind of an analysis?” This task is required for accreditation, plus it’s just good practice to do reviews as an important part of doing business. Meridith said the issue appears to be how should we move forward to ensure this is happening. Lisa asked about the PIC group and if the analysis should go to them. Meridith said that is one model, but it
can be a scary model for some because it implies that a group will look at the programs and possibly recommend elimination, adding that could feel aggressive so maybe we should set criteria or guidelines and just look at what we have. There was a suggestion to do an executive summary that goes back to the disciplines and deans, and perhaps it could eventually end up at PIC. Meridith said this is a real missing piece in our integrated plan because we do PRs but then we don’t have a process for anyone to look at them when they are done like we do with our Area Plans. Meridith said we do a good job on PLOs, and we do have data to work with.

Robb stated that the responsibility is big, and there is some reluctance to having a committee that appears to be looking around for something to get rid of, and suggested it might be helpful if we had metrics in place, at least there would be something to follow, such as declining enrollments or other things.

Two ideas:
1) Set metrics/criteria/standards and College Council could do this piece.
2) Change PIC (Program Improvement Committee) to PVC (Program Vitality Committee) or make the PVC group a subcommittee of PIC.

Morris said when he was involved with PIC, metrics were created, and when the existing PIC was developed it required a lot of work and had many challenges and considerations to take in. One of the biggest challenges was the fear revolving around the metrics. Meridith said that at one point we thought PIC should take on the responsibility of analysis. Morris said yes, making it a two prong committee (encouragement and improvement and then recommendations for removal). It was called PIC/PAC “Improvement” and “Assessment.”

Meridith stated that we currently do not have an oversight committee for programs, and PIC has shown a reluctance to take on the bigger job of analysis, but College Council could charge PIC with coming up with a way to do the rest of this. Robb said the clear and easy path is the low hanging fruit such as the programs that are inactive, but the programs that are limping along are harder to assess. Saving a program could cost dollars, and he doesn’t know that PIC should be charged with that task. Meridith said she agreed, but the bottom line is that the college needs some group to look at these programs. Robb asked if it was an easy and realistic way to revamp PIC and charge them with the additional piece.

Meridith said if PIC is charged with the additional analysis task, they should develop their own process for PRs. Lindsey asked Morris to explain the algorithms. Morris said it revolved around enrollment in the classes. And certain CTE programs were allowed lower enrollments due to the nature of their curriculum. Lindsey asked if it could be that a class only gets flagged, and then look at weighing completion heavier than enrollments. Morris said the issue is that the more you try to make one tool or metric fit, the more you will find exceptions to the rule, it’s just not easy.

Marc said that the Woodland model is a vitality committee and has had many of the same metrics we’ve already discussed. Marc explained that the middle step for the Woodland college model is faculty driven and faculty provide input and feedback about the quality of what they wrote, such as was it worded correctly, is it clearly conveyed, and this helps faculty provide better evidence on the quality of their program. This internal peer review is helpful and an important step before they get to the decision of the ranking a program, it’s a step to presentation. Meridith said she doesn’t want the committee to be set up as literary critics. Marc said he views the Woodland model as helping faculty who wrote the program review, and providing feedback and input from other faculty is its objective, they didn’t rank, they just gave feedback.

Meridith said if the Council decides it like the Woodland model, it is time intensive. Marc said he thought the Woodland model might be an Academic Senate subcommittee, and that our Instructional Council might be a good fit as well. Robb suggested that the Council invite PIC to the next meeting and hear from them directly. All agreed. Joe said that we have a couple of years to work on this, but we need to move forward and not be having the same conversation in two years. No other discussion noted.

**Feedback on SSSP Plan**
Both Tim and Kevin are attending a mandatory SSSP training in Sacramento today. Meridith informed all to continue with sending all feedback Tim on the SSSP.
OTHER/ANNOUNCEMENTS- the Council may not need to meet on 9/30, Meridith will get back to the Council on this. Joe said it will depend on the accreditation report.

Marc said a reminder has been sent regarding the staff survey, but some of the external emails have been lost. Laura said if Marc could send HR the list of emails her staff will research it.

UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS:
September: Notification to begin work on Annual Area Plans/Program Reviews
October: Strategic Plan Task Force appointed

ADJOURNMENT 4:35 p.m.

Notes taken by:
Sherry Nicholas
Student Services Division

Next Meeting: 10/7/14
3:00-5:00, Board Room