COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, March 15, 2016 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

Members: Hsieh, Bell (absent), Hopkins, Ramsey, McMahon, Arancibia, Hubbard, Allen (absent), & Light (absent)

Attendees: Ornelas, Jacobson (absent), Ascione, & Miramontez

McMahon called the meeting to order at 1:31p.m.

A. Approval of the Agenda
Motion to approve made by Hsieh, seconded by Ramsey, and approved by all.

B. Approval of Previous Minutes
Motion to approve March 8, 2016 minutes made by Hsieh, seconded by Ramsey, and approved by all.

C. Guests/Introductions
McMahon recognized Laura Murphy and Briele Warren (for Steve Quis).

D. Updates from the Chancellor's Cabinet
Hsieh reported that the meeting for Tuesday, March 15, 2016 was canceled, so there was no update.

E. New Business
1.) Academic Senate Resolution (Hsieh)
Hsieh reported that the Academic Senate had passed a resolution regarding the Academic Support Component. After consulting with McMahon, the plan at this point is to meet with the Academic Senate Exec next week. Hsieh noted that she wanted to keep the CEC apprised of the status.

2.) Institutional Effectiveness Goals Framework (Miramontez) (attachment)
Miramontez shared that the previous year was the first time that the State Chancellor's Office implemented a framework. The College had to adopt a framework, go into a portal, and provide information on specific metrics. The College will need to do this again for the current year, and is being asked to report on one-year benchmarks and six-year goals. Miramontez noted that moving forward, anything related to finance will come from the District, and the College will work with the District to utilize the information.

Murphy asked if when Miramontez said 'goals,' he meant 'benchmarks,' and Miramontez responded yes.

Miramontez commented that the Successful Course Completion is included in the Scorecard and can be pulled out, the College will just need to figure out their six-year goal/benchmark. The College needs to report on metrics, including Successful Course Completion, and Unprepared for College. The one-year benchmark has been satisfied, they just need to set the goals for the six-year benchmarks.

Miramontez proposed taking the metrics using the process already set in place, and the Strategic Plan Assessment workgroup can move on from there. The information will eventually be brought back to the CEC. Murphy clarified that the strategic plans are six-year plans, and they did not start benchmarking until the midway point (so the College's benchmarks are three-year benchmarks). However, the idea was that when the strategic plan would be revised/reviewed, then benchmarks would be set for six years due to the six-year plan.

Hsieh asked about the optional goals mentioned in the attachment, and Miramontez responded that the College could choose to report on all of the goals, but it would take time to set the six-year benchmarks for each one. Hsieh said that if the College did choose an optional goal, what is Miramontez' recommendation, and Miramontez replied that he had none at that point. Hsieh asked about doing CTE Rate, and Ornelas commented that their school already has the data for their usual report out, so it could likely be easily absorbed and monitored. Ornelas confirmed that she did not have an objection to including CTE.

Miramontez stated that he needed an official acceptance of the framework and the direction forward. If the framework is accepted by the CEC, then the workgroup will set the benchmarks.

Murphy mentioned about the framework going through the governance process, and McMahon noted that it should be looped through the Academic Senate as well. Miramontez noted that when the benchmarks are being set in the workgroup, the content experts are always invited to be part of the conversations and gather the information. Hsieh said that when the College went through the first cycle and benchmarking, she had asked for regular report-outs to be given to the College, and she was glad that McMahon mentioned a report at the Academic Senate to make the faculty fully aware of the work and discussions. Hsieh asked for the same to be done for the Classified Senate and the students, to invite them in order to raise awareness and be involved in the discussions.

Miramontez asked for a motion to officially accept the framework as presented, including the optional indicator, and they will move the three metrics (Optional College [CTE], and the two required ones: Successful Course Completion, and the Completion Rate for Unprepared for College) to the Research Subcommittee for the benchmarks to be created. Hsieh noted that there are no motions in the CEC meetings, only a consensus with no objections. Murphy asked when it needed to be submitted, and Miramontez responded that it is the beginning of June. McMahon asked the CEC if there were any objections, and confirmed the consensus.

3.) IEPI-PRT Menu of Options – Successes (Miramontez) (attachment)
Miramontez reported that moving forward from the PRT visit, the College needs to develop an innovations and effectiveness plan, then the team will return for the second visit. At this point, the IEPI taskforce will discuss what the plan will look like. Paul Parnell, the PRT lead, is no longer part of the team, so the team is looking for a replacement before they return to the College. Miramontez said that regardless of the delay, the College can still accomplish work on their end.

Hsieh suggested going back to the team members who might be knowledgeable to take the leadership role to coordinate the College's information, and asked Miramontez to follow through and make the suggestion. Miramontez confirmed that he would.

Murphy mentioned that she was concerned about how the information would be integrated into the plans already in place. Miramontez agreed that the College needs to 'gelling' between processes as they adjust the benchmark from three years to six years. Hsieh commented that the College is in a good position since they have already tried to align the cycle.

McMahon asked where the best forum for the synthesis of the plans would be, and Murphy responded that she would be taking it to the PIEC. Hsieh noted that the College also needed to think about how to develop the plan into the self-evaluation as well.

F. Old Business

1.) Accreditation: Gaps Identified & Quality Focused Essays (Miramontez) (attachment)
Murphy reported that she was writing and editing the standards and getting into the detail level to identify all of the gaps and whether each should be dealt with in the short term or the long term. Murphy was focused on Standards I and II, since there are a lot of missing narrative and evidence. There are a lot of action plans that can be implemented now as opposed to later. Murphy highlighted Standard I.A. (the mission) as an example of a gap, and broke down which actions could go in which category. The College is coming up with a lot of plans, but there needs to be more action for the plans. Murphy brought the item to the CEC to bring this to everyone's attention since the self-evaluation document writing needs to be done by October 2016.

Hsieh thanked Murphy for bringing the item forward, and mentioned that these evaluations/assessments/outcomes are ongoing processes. Hsieh suggested that in addition to the lead

writers, for the various participatory committees to be involved, as everyone can work toward better presentation and less redundancy. She also encouraged the committees to invite Murphy to speak at their meetings.

Murphy noted that the lack of alignment is what concerns her. Miramontez asked that to make these cosmetic changes, would it be a FYI to the participatory governance, or would they need approval? Hsieh responded that it would be a FYI, because there is already participatory governance representation. Murphy asked for a cataloguing recommendation to be provided to her from the CEC. Ramsey said that he would review their division plans.

Hsieh mentioned that the governance topic was selected for the quality focused essay writing, and congratulated Arancibia and McMahon on the CGC action of forming two taskforces to focus on the review of all the mechanics of the CGC according to the handbook, as well as the content of what is being done and how they contribute to student success, achievement, and learning outcomes.

Murphy commented that there are a lot of good and positives things happening.

Miramontez recommended that for the College mission, when the strategic plan and master plan are updated, they will include the mission, and could be long-term for now.

Hsieh said that while it is good to have the plans in place, but movement needs to be happening as well.

2.) **ACCJC Annual Report (Due to ACCJC on 3/31/16) (Miramontez) (attachment)**
Miramontez reported that the ACCJC annual report would be going out to the constituency groups that week, and he thanked everyone, including Murphy, Ornelas, Kats Gustafson, and others for the information. On an attachment, he noted that the fall 2015 number in item #9 will be updated from 121 to 149. Miramontez noted the benchmarks for the student achievement data, also listed on the attachment. He then moved into the CTE data for discussion and deferred to Ornelas. Ornelas said she looked at the numbers, and they actually received clarifying updates on how to gather the information. She referenced how they had only counted certifications and degrees that were eligible for Financial Aid and certifiable under the Gainful Employment Act. She did research and found that they have a Department of Education eligibility that certifies all of their certificates and degrees. Because of this, Ornelas noted that the numbers listed on the attachment will change based on the report. In items #19a and #19b, 102 is the correct number of certificates of achievement and associate degrees that are approved in their report, instead of 39. Murphy asked if the other numbers would change based on the new information, and this was confirmed by Miramontez.

Ornelas noted that they are not required to provide data on several particular certifications. Her question is, should they stick to reporting on what they know they have, or should they list these other program areas understanding that they are offered, but with no national registry or public record to get the data. Hsieh asked if Mary Kjartanson was consulted. Ornelas said that she spoke with George Beitey and was told that there was no way to get the information. Hsieh recommended that Ornelas talk to Kjartanson as the content expert, because although the information may not be available at the institutional level, it might be available somewhere else. Ornelas said that she would look into it further. Murphy commented that there had to be information somewhere if the State requires a reporting.

Miramontez noted that their narratives on benchmarking for the SLO's are updates from the previous year, and there is nothing new. He also quickly mentioned (due to lack of time) a substantial change that the College is reporting on for the current year, and that the information is included on the attachment.

Ramsey asked about item #35, and whether or not a finite period of time should be specified. Murphy said that a period of time could be specified, and recommended two years.

McMahon asked Miramontez if there would be time for input on this item at the Academic Senate meeting later that afternoon, and he confirmed that there would be.

3.) Performing Arts Center Capital Campaign (Ascione)
The item was tabled due to lack of time.

4.) Implementation of Cultural & Ethnic Diversity Plan (Hsieh, Hubbard, & Patacsil) (attachment)
Hsieh asked for a quick update due to the Diversity Committee's recent meeting, and Hubbard reported that a taskforce meeting would be held that Friday. The committee's understanding was that they were only due to report twice a year (in November and April), and that the item could be taken off the CEC agenda as a standing item, since it was not at the request of the committee. She mentioned that Ramsey had attended the meeting as the managers' representative.

Murphy mentioned that the attachment is not listed on the website, and asked if it could be posted. Hubbard said that the most updated document was sent to Miramontez, but Miramontez said that he did not receive it. Hubbard said that she would resend the document.

Hsieh clarified that they had previously agreed on a quarterly implementation update, but then later on Darrel Harrison had wanted to focus on diverse faculty recruitment in particular. A taskforce was created, so it was agreed that it was an urgent topic to keep this as a standing CEC item. The item is still on the agenda because there has not yet been a report from the taskforce. Hsieh shared that she wanted to see progress and action on the item because there might be another faculty recruitment coming. Hubbard commented that at the meeting it was agreed to do the next update in April, and Hsieh responded that since there will be another meeting that Friday, she is looking forward to hearing an report at the following CEC meeting on March 22nd. If there is anything that the College can do to help with the progress of this item, they would all work together towards that end.

G. Place Holders

1.) Scholarship Awards Ceremony, 4/13/16 (Jacobson)
The item was tabled due to lack of time.

2.) Invest in Success, 5/7/16 (Hsieh)
The item was tabled due to lack of time.

3.) Commencement, 5/13/16 (Jacobson)
The item was tabled due to lack of time.

H.   Reports
(Please limit each following report to two minutes maximum. If you have any handouts, please email them to Briele Warren   ahead of time to be included for distribution electronically.)

- **Academic Senate**
  The item was tabled due to lack of time.

- **Classified Senate**
  The item was tabled due to lack of time.

- **Associated Student Council**
  The item was tabled due to lack of time.

- **District Governance Council**
  The item was tabled due to lack of time.

- **District Strategic Planning Committee**
  The item was tabled due to lack of time.

- **Budget Planning and Development Committee**
  The item was tabled due to lack of time.

- **College Governance Committee**
  The item was tabled due to lack of time.

Announcements

There were no announcements made due to lack of time.

I. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 2:38 p.m.