Cañada College

AGENDA for JOINT MEETING OF
BUDGET COMMITTEE & COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
Wednesday, September 19, 2012
2:00 to 4:00 P.M. – Building 2, Room 10

Budget Committee
Members Present: Ari Alvarez, David Clay, Linda Hayes, Maria Lara-Blanco, Robin Richards, Gregory Stoup, Lezlee Ware
Ex-Officio: Robert Hood – Director of Marketing, James Keller, Interim President
Absent: Margaret Hanzimanolis, Jeri Eznekier, Vickie Nunes
College Planning Council
David Clay, Sarah Harmon, Linda Hayes, Rosalina Mira, Joan Murphy, Jonna Pounds, Robin Richards, Gregory Stoup, Doris Vargas
Ex-Officio: James Keller, Interim President
Guests: Leonor Cabrera, Roberta Chock, Doug Hirzel, David Johnson, Debbie Joy, Kim Lopez, Jan Roecks, Joan Rosario, Maggie Souza, Janet Stringer, Mike Tyler, Dave Vigo

AGENDA ITEM	CONTENT	PRESENTER
1) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**	The minutes from the last meeting were approved as submitted.	David Clay & Ariackna Alvarez, Budget Co-Chairs Jennifer Castello & Joan Murphy, College Planning Council Co-Chairs
2) BUSINESS I. Five Year Performance Data	Over the last couple of months, ACCJC announced a set of requirement that each college must speak to, dialog about, and capture in their self-evaluation study. To begin addressing this request, a 12 page Table/Graphs document entitled "Review of College Performance Trends" was reviewed and discussed. It was noted that this information also parallels the Program Review evidence packet each college department has received. The information will be included in the packets and be part of the program review plan. 4 tables and graphs that look at 4 sets of measures. Table I. Enrollment Patterns & Course Offerings – Total Course Enrollment and Section offerings over the last five years with data for years 07/08, 08/09, 09/10, 11/12 and reflecting: • Unique headcount; Total Course Enrollments; # of Course Offerings; # of Section Offerings; Average Enrollment per Section *Comments made:* • *Any outside occurrences could skew or impact data i.e. parcel tax, election results – our*	Gregory Stoup, Director of Planning, Research & Student Success

trend or is it influenced by something from outside? For future graphs – identify external things that happen i.e. parcel tax/different fees that might impact
- *Dip in 10.11 due to budget cuts? – decrease in sections/budget considerations*
- *Spike – Measure G in effect*
- *Measure G funds could not be put in effect fast enough*
- *Funded sections like*
- *No research should any connection between class sizes/grading/student performance at K-12 or higher education*
- *Number of courses we are offering – is it a lot?? Should we look at the number of courses being offering at the other colleges*
- *Load based on college performance??*

Table 2. College Efficiency – Load and FTES levels over the last five years reflecting WSCH, FTES, FTE, Load

Comments made:
- *TBA hours to meet a better idea for load study – do students benefit from TBA?*
- *FTE assigned to section – sections cut in 2009 – did students go elsewhere to complete*
- *Include measure of percentage of capacity in classroom size – number of seats/contractual language*

Table 3. Student Performance & Enrollment – Success Retention & Persistence Rates over last five years that includes Success Rate; Retention Rate; Fall to Spring Persistence; Fall to Fall Persistence; Percent A Grades Awarded; Percent A or B Grades Awarded; Percent Withdraws; Retained Pass Rate

Comments made:
- *How resistant to change many of the measures are – same at other colleges*
- *What do we have control over*
- *Grades affected by budget cuts??? UC effects?? Students coming back*
- *Fall to fall persistence percentage so low – what could trigger it*
- *Anyway to tease out students going to other two colleges – courses not offered here*

Table 4. Student Enrollment Status – Percentage growth of each student population since 2007/2008 (07/08, 08/09, 09/10, 10/11, 11/12) with Headcount/Percent of Total for First Time Student; Continuing Student; Returning Student; Concurrent Enrollment (K-12); and Percent First Time; Percent Continuing; Percent Returning; Percent Concurrent

	Table 6. Student Demographics – Ethnicity with Headcount/Percent of Total for years 07/08, 08/09, 09/10, 10/11,/11/12. Data on Student Ethnicity displayed and reviewed for this time frame included Success Rates, Retention Rates, Size of Persistence Cohort, Fall to Spring Persistence, and Fall to Fall Persistence. Due to the time allotment, it was agreed to continue the review and discussion of Tables 4 and 6	
Shared Governance Manual	This agenda item was presented by Vice Presidents Robin Richards and Hayes. Presented a proposed process to review the Draft Manual on the "Participatory Governance: Collaboration on Planning, Program Review, and Budgeting." The proposed process was reviewed and included: 1) 9/19/12 Establish process for review of the document for CPC to discuss/adopt the proposed process for review of the draft participatory governance manual 2) 9/30/12 Draft document prepared 3) 10/3/12 Draft document presented to CPC for initial review where CPC conducts the initial review and if acceptable is sent for campus review with any changes. 4) 10/4 to 11/22/12 Draft document is distributed to key governance groups – IPC, SSPC, APC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, College Cabinet for review and comments. An Open Forum will also be held. Comments collected and provided to the CPC. 5) 11/7/12 Review of comments by CPC where the draft manual will be revised 6) 11/8 to 11/30/12 Revise Final Draft Circulated to the campus community for final comments 7) 12/5/12 Final Draft adopted by CPC It was noted that many of the processes that will be included in this manual are already in place and just need to be incorporated in the document. Also reviewed and discussed were: • draft of the Table of Contents – suggested that we incorporate short term and substitute emergency hires • Appendices for the document were reviewed • Proposed that we use "Participatory Governance" instead of "Shared Governance" as it is noted in the Ed Code as "the right to participate effectively." • Folding the Budget Committee into the College Planning Council • New Organization Proposed for the College Planning Council The entire document proposal is attached to the minutes. It was agreed that the timeline proposed is good. The document draft will be presented at the next meeting for initial review by CPC.	Robin Richards, VPSS Linda Hayes, Interim VPI
Assessment Against	There are three areas that ACCJC looks at and asks the College to meet specific standards – Program Review, Integrated Planning, and Student Learning Outcomes.	Gregory Stoup, Director of Planning, Research & Student

Standards	Presented a tool that he has developed that we can use to see where we are with Program Review and where any gaps might be. A Program Review Rubric Action Plan exercise was conducted using the elements of sustainable continuous quality improvement that included: • Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. *Comments:* - -Yes but did they all happen? Not for administration, finance, marketing and research • The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness - -IPC does look at Program Review that faculty put together and provide feedback - there has been a lot of refinement of program plans - student services have done a lot of reflection on program and annual plans • The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning - Results of PLOs will do transfer and certificate rates - Achievement part is changing to improve - SLO process - Learning – trac dat - Evidence from Flex Day activities - Expand participating in some of these activities - College paid stipends says a lot to expanding participation Based on the information from this exercise, Greg will complete the Program Review Rubric Action Plan form and report back to CPC.	Success
IV. Replacement Hire for Science & Technology	A process is needed for replacement hiring using the college's established budget funds and also serves as a policy document that outlines the questions we want to ask in going ahead with a replacement. This is currently being discussed and vetted by the Academic Senate. The process is different for classified staff as there is an education code that needs to be followed. The college will be having a fulltime faculty member retiring at the end of this semester. There is consensus with the Academic Senate to move ahead with hiring. A document was presented, reviewed, and discussed addressing specific questions for faculty replacement. It was suggested and agreed that this document would be circulated at the next CPC meeting asking for approval	James Keller, Interim President David Clay, Academic Senate President
3) DIVISION/ COMMITTEE UPDATES	• Business, Workforce &Athletics Artistry in Fashion event on 9/29 from 10 to 5 p.m. Accounting Department "Monopoly Fundraiser" for student scholarship on 10/27 in The Grove.	Division/Committee Reps

		• Humanities & Social Sciences Division Assemblyman Rich Gordon will be on campus 9/25, 12:45 p.m. in 3-142 addressing our students Transfer Discipline Parade on 10/25, 8:30 to 10:30 a.m. and 7 to 9 p.m. in Main Theater Social Sciences/History Department Student Scholarship fundraiser on 10/17 featuring Robert Reich speaking • Student Services – deadline for degrees/certificates is 10/31	
4)	**NEXT STEPS**	Student Equity Plan Participatory Governance Manual Replacement Hire	David Clay & Ariackna Alvarez, Budget Co-Chairs Joan Murphy, College Planning Council Co-Chairs
5)	**MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST**	College Arts & Olive Festival on October 7th from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Volunteers are needed.	David Clay & Ariackna Alvarez, Budget Co-Chairs Joan Murphy, College Planning Council Co-Chairs
6)	**ADJOURN-MENT**	The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.	David Clay & Ariackna Alvarez, Budget Co-Chairs Joan Murphy, College Planning Council Co-Chairs

To: College Planning Council

From: College Cabinet

Date: September 19, 2012

Re: **Rationale for Changes in the New Governance Manual**

The new governance manual has been drafted based on our current processes and information that was gathered at the College Planning Council meeting on September 5th. The goal was to document our processes. In the process of doing this documentation, there were a few changes that have been made that require explanation as to why this was done. Here are the primary ones:

1. Change in the Title: Participatory Governance vs. Shared Governance – In reviewing both Education Code and several other college documents, the word "Participatory" is used as opposed to "Shared". This word is much more descriptive of the actual process – the campus community *participates* in the governance process.
    -   Education Code 70901(b)(1)(E) states the following: *"Minimum standards governing procedures established by governing boards of community college districts to ensure faculty, staff and students the right **to participate** effectively in district and college governance, and the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration and the right of the academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards."*
    -   The Community College League of California, in its presentations, also identifies that "participatory" is a much more accurate description than "shared".

2. Folding the Budget Committee into the College Planning Council – For the past year, the Budget Committee and College Planning Council have been meeting together. We have not received any negative comments about this arrangement. In the "new" College Planning Council organization, there are "work groups" that have been established to provide input to the CPC. These work groups are organized around the accreditation standards. One of the groups (IIID Finance) would be the group that would serve to focus on the budget issues, thus this task would be completed.

3. New Organization Proposed for the College Planning Council: At the September 5th CPC meeting, Doug Hirzel made a presentation on a revised structure for the CPC to include work groups. Although not an action item at the meeting, the group felt it was a good idea and requested this process be incorporated into the governance document.

DRAFT – September 19, 2012

To: **College Planning Council**

From: Linda Hayes and Robin Richards

Date: September 19, 2012

Re: **Proposed Process to Review the Draft Manual on *"Participatory Governance: Collaboration on Planning, Program Review and Budgeting"***

We are currently working on documenting our participatory governance process on campus which includes the processes we use. This document is an important one for campus and needs to be reviewed by all. The following is a proposed timeline for this review to hopefully assure broad participation:

Step	When	Step	Description
1	September 19, 2012	Establish Process for Review of the Document	CPC discusses/adopts a proposed process for review of the draft participatory governance manual
2	September 30, 2012	Draft Document prepared	Processes for planning, program review and budgeting are documented as well as those for staffing requests and new program development; key participatory governance groups are described and roles outlined
3	October 3, 2012	Draft Document presented to CPC for initial review	CPC conducts an initial review. If the draft is acceptable for review (i.e. there may be changes, but essentially it is OK for the campus community to begin reviewing), then action is taken to send out to key governance groups.
4	October 4 to November 2, 2012	Draft Document Distributed	Each of the key governance groups - IPC, SSPC, APC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, College Cabinet - will review the document and provide comments. At least one open forum will also be held. All of the comments will be collected and provided to the CPC.
5	November 7, 2012	Review of Comments	The draft manual will be revised based on the review of the comments received by the CPC.
6	November 8 to November 30, 2012	Revised "Final" Draft Circulated	The final governance manual will be circulated to the campus community for final comments.
7	December 5, 2012	Final Draft Adoption	The CPC will adopt the final governance manual.

DRAFT 9/19/12

Participatory Governance:
Collaboration on Planning, Program Review and Budgeting

1. **Overview, Mission, Values, Strategic Directions, and Decision-Making Philosophy**

2. **Participatory Governance Groups & Responsibilities**
   - Organizational Structures
   - College Planning Council
   - Academic Senate: Academic and Professional Matters (10+1)
   - Associated Students
   - Classified Senate
   - Educational Administrators
   - Participatory Governance Decision Matrix

3. **Integrated Planning, Program Review and Budgeting Processes**
   - Operational Flowcharts
   - Integrated Annual Planning, Program Review and Budgeting Process
   - Comprehensive Program Review Cycle
   - Integration of SLOs/PLOs /ILOs
   - Technology Decision-Making Process

4. **Staffing Request Processes**
   - New Positions
   - Replacement Positions

5. **New Program Development Processes**
   - Instructional Programs
   - Student Services Programs
   - Grant Programs

6. **Other Processes**
   - Resource Allocation
   - Emergency Requests that come up from the College Community
   - Allocation of Office Space
   - Program Closure Process—PIV

7. **Groups and Committees**
   - Groups and Committees with Function/Membership
   - Career Technical Education (CTE) Advisory Committees Handbook and Roles

8. **How to Get Involved**

9. **Office of Planning, Research & Student Success**

10. **Evaluation Cycles for Decision-making Process**

DRAFT 9/19/12

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Accreditation Rubrics
Appendix 2: Planning and Program Review Forms
Appendix 3: Board Policy 2.05 –Academic Senate—Role & Scope
Appendix 4: Board Policy 2.08 – District Shared Governance Process
Appendix 5: Board Policy 2.18: Participation in District and College Shared Governance
Appendix 6: Board Policy 2.75: Institutional Planning
Appendix 7: Board Policy 8.11: District Budget
Appendix 8: Establishing and Operating an Ongoing or Ad Hoc Group
Appendix 9: Cañada College Participatory GovernanceHandbook Definitions
Appendix 10: Committee Descriptions
Appendix 11: Excerpts from Title 5