Cañada College

MINUTES for JOINT MEETING OF
BUDGET COMMITTEE & COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
Wednesday, November 7, 2012
2:00 P.M. – Building 2, Room 10

Budget Committee
Members Present: Ariackna Alvarez, David Clay, Linda Hayes, Vickie Nunes, Robin Richards, Gregory Stoup, Lezlee Ware
Ex-Officio: Robert Hood
Members Absent: James Keller – Ex-Officio, Maria Lara Blanco, Doris Vargas
College Planning Council
Members Present: David Clay, Sarah Harmon, Linda Hayes, Kate Lam, Lina Mira, Joan Murphy, Jonna Pounds, Robin Richards, Gregory Stoup
Ex-Officio:
Members Absent: James Keller – Ex-Officio, Gregory Stoup
Guests: Regina Blok, Leonor Cabrera, Roberta Chock, Doug Hirzel, Debbie Joy, Sheila Lau, Jan Roecks, Rita Sabbadini, Maggie Souza, Janet Stringer, Elizabeth Terzakis, Mike Tyler, Dave Vigo

AGENDA ITEM	CONTENT	PRESENTER
1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES	The minutes of October were approved as amended.	David Clay & Ariackna Alvarez, Budget Co-Chairs and Joan Murphy, CPC Co-Chair
2) BUSINESS I. Accreditation Update	An update was given on where we presently are and what still needs to be done that included: • 10/31 Second draft of document is due • 11/1 to 12/15 Technical Review where the Co-Chairs review the document draft and meet with necessary tech supervisory personnel to validate its content and fill the gaps. • 1/1 to 1/31/13 One voice editing and synthesizing • 3/1 to 3/15 Further editing, synthesizing and formatting of third draft; writing of executive summary. • 3/15 to 5/20 Present to college community, capture feedback, gain endorsement through Participatory Governance structure • 5/20 to 6/30 Incorporate feedback from college community and synthesize into Final	Gregory Stoup, Accreditation Co-Chair

		Report.	
II.	Review Participatory Governance Manual Campus Comments	Reported that the latest draft of the Participatory Governance Manual was circulated to the campus community along with being reviewed by the campus shared governance groups – Academic Senate, IPC, SSPC, APC, Classified Senate, ASCC, and campus divisions. Comments received were compiled into a document and reviewed at this meeting. These changes will be incorporated into the document and sent out again to the campus community for their review and input. A copy of the comments reviewed will be attached to the meeting minutes. The document with the proposed changes will be brought back to the Budget Committee/College Planning Council in December for a final review and approval.	Linda Hayes, Interim Vice President of Instruction Robin Richards, Vice President of Student Services

III.	Student Equity	Reported on the status of the Student Equity Plan. The document will included:
		1. Executive Summary
		2. Mission of the Committee for Student Equity
		3. Programs and Services focused on Student Access and Success
		4. Review of recommendations of the 2004-2005 Student Equity Plan
		5. Campus Research
		   - Cañada Student Performance and Equity Dashboard
		   - Institutional Equity Tracker
		   - Five Year Trends in Equity Performance
		The Campus Research portion of the document was handed out and reviewed at the last Budget/CPC meeting. Copies of the document that include items 1 through 4, listed above, were handed out, reviewed, and discussed. Those present were encouraged to send their input to the Student Equity Co-Chairs, David Clay and David Johnson. The document will continue to be discussed with the campus shared governance groups.
			David Clay, Academic Senate President
			Gregory Stoup, Director Planning, Research, & Student Success
			David Johnson, Dean of Humanities & Social Sciences

IV.	2012-2014 Hires	Vice President Richards reviewed the 2012-2013 Timeline for Identifying Possible New Positions:	David Clay, Academic Senate President

Date	Group	Process
Nov 7	CPC	Discuss and approve process and timeline
Nov 30	Divisions	Written justifications/requests to Deans or VPSS
Prior to December 15	Divisions	Review positions to prioritize what comes forward for presentation
Jan. 31	Academic Senate	Faculty Position Requests to the Senate President

February 13 2-4pm	Jt IPC/SSPC/APC and Academic Senate	Presentations: College data presented and Position Presentations given
February 20 2-4pm	Joint IPC/SSPC/APC	Discussion: Group conducts discussion of the college needs and develops a list of rationale to merge to one list for PBC
March 6 2-4pm	PBC	Discuss list and process integrity; forward list to President
Early March	Academic Senate	Forward list to President
March 15	President	Announces positions to be hired
Late March	Hiring Committees	Meet for job descriptions and questions
Late March	HR	Post positions

V. Measure G Update	A report was presented that included expenses as follows:
	Resource Plan & Accomplishments/Activities Planned Amount 2012-13
	
	- ***Instruction Plan*** ***$1,177,262***
	  <u>Measure G Criteria</u> – restoring funding to offer an adequate number of classes and labs to meet growing student demand
	  <u>Accomplishments/Activities</u>:
	    - Funded 145 sections that served approximately 3625 students
	    - Used funding to coordinate and improve basic skills, distance educations and workforce development offerings.
	    - Funded a Workforce Development Specialist
	    - College for Working Adults was launched in 2010-11 and Neighborhood College
	
	- ***Student Support Plan:*** ***$844,347***
	  <u>Measure G Criteria</u> – maintaining academic counseling programs and other student services to promote student achievement, graduation and access to high-paying jobs. Keeping libraries open and maintaining library services.
	  <u>Accomplishments/Activities</u>:
	    - Expanded academic counseling with 7,000 drop-in appointments utilized by students
	    - Launched a new Peer Mentoring Program to assist first generation students
	    - Added services for veterans and financial aid students
	    - Expanded Library and Learning Center evening and weekend hours, serving an
		Vickie Nunes, College Business Officer

	additional 1200 students
	- Hired an Electronic Resources Librarian/Distance Education Coordinator
	- Offered Math and English tutoring on Saturdays
	- Funded a Director of Articulation and Orientation who increased transferability o courses
	- Hired an Instructional Aide for Learning Center
	
	- ***Course and Program Innovation Plan: $328,390***
	  <u>Measure G Criteria</u> – preserving job training programs in nursing, healthcare, computers, engineering, green technology (such as solar & wind energy), police and firefighting. Preparing students to transfer to four-year colleges and universities and maintaining Core Academics.
	  <u>Accomplishments/Activities</u>:
	  - Increased by nearly 50% the number of associated degrees and occupational certificates awarded in 2010-11
	  - Partially funded PEP for our lock high school seniors
	  - Conducted Leadership Training for the student government leaders
	  - Partially funded Math Jam to improve success rates in Math
	  - Funded Word Jam to improve success rates in English
	
	Total Measure G funds budgeted for 2012-2013 year $2,350,000		

3) DIVISION/ COMMITTEE UPDATES	Retirement Reception to honor campus retirees Chuck Iverson, Jacqueline Phillips, Julie Mooney, Rita Sabbadini, and Danny Glass.		Division/Committee Reps
4) NEXT STEPS	None		David Clay & Ariackna Alvarez, Budget Co-Chairs and Joan Murphy, CPC Co-Chair
5) MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	None		David Clay & Ariackna Alvarez, Budget Co-Chairs and Joan Murphy, CPC Co-Chair
6) ADJOURNMENT	The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.		David Clay & Ariackna Alvarez, Budget Co-Chairs and Joan Murphy, CPC Co-Chair

Dear Campus Community:

Thanks to everyone who helped review the draft Participatory Governance document! During this past month, the groups listed in the table below have discussed the document and provided over nine (9) pages of comments (attached). These comments will be reviewed at the CPC/Budget meeting on Wednesday, November 7th to identify what should be included in the final draft document. (Note: the 10-4-12 Draft that was circulated is also attached for reference.)

Group	Meeting Date	Time	Location
Academic Senate	Thursday, October 11	2:10-4:10	CIETL
Classified Senate	Monday, October 29	1:30-3:30	Room 8-119
APC	Wednesday, October 10	9:30-11:00	Room 8-110
SSPC	Wednesday, October 24	2:00-4:00	Room 5-112
ASCC	Tuesday, October 16	3:30-5:00	Room 2-10
Open Forum #1	Monday, October 29	1:00-2:00	CIETL
Open Forum #2	Tuesday, October 30	4:00-5:00	CIETL

Accreditation Teams:
    Standard IV
    Standard IIID
	
	Tuesday, October 23
	Tuesday, October 23
		
		2:00-3:00
		3:00-4:30
			
			Building 6
			Building 8

Timeline for Review of Participatory Governance Draft
Below is the timeline for review of the document adopted by the College Planning Council/Budget Committee in September.   The shaded steps have been completed.

Step	When	Step	Description of Activity	Status of Activity
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	CPC/Budget Committee adopted the timeline on 9/19/12
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	Draft document provided to CPC/Budget Committee members for initial review prior to circulating to campus
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.	CPC/Budget Committee reviewed the document and made changes; Changes incorporated into the draft
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.	Draft document distributed to campus with the dates, times and locations of the groups providing feedback as well as the information on two open forums.
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.	

Robin and Linda

Comments on the Draft Governance Manual
October 4-November 2, 2012

Page	Group/Area	Comment/Suggested Addition or Change
1	Table of Contents	Change College Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) to Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC)
3	Academic Senate: Revise last sentence in the Overview	There are also several accreditation requirements (in Standard IV – Governance) related to participatory governance and these are outlined in the Appendix.
4	Academic Senate: Revise sentence #11	11. To maintain reasonable balance and continuity of representation within each participatory governance group.
4	Academic Senate: Revise sentence #14	14. Consideration of equity as reflected in the Student Equity plan.
5	Academic Senate: Include AFT in the list of participatory governance groups	This recommendation is to include AFT as one of the primary governance groups in the list.
5	Individual comments on AFT as a primary governance group	There are several comments made about the recommendation to have AFT as a primary governance group from several individuals and are outlined as follows: In Title 5 (53200-53204) and the District Policy on Shared Governance (2.08), the Academic Senate is <u>the</u> participatory governance group representing the faculty. According to AFT's constitution, its purposes are to promote professional standards, to establish working conditions, to obtain just compensation, and to obtain free collective bargaining rights. These objectives fall outside of the realm of issues covered by participatory governance and are fully met in the negotiation and enforcement of faculty contracts. AFT's purview does not extend into areas of governance unless decisions by governance are in violation of the contract. At this college, the AFT has historically not been included as a shared governance structure and its representation is only required on the Professional Development Committee (by faculty contract) and on the Presidential Screening Committee (by District policy). AFT representation is not required by either faculty contract or district policy on any other committee or governance body. To reason by comparison, the AFT is not included in the shared governance structures of our sister colleges. CSM does not include any AFT reps within its primary shared governance committees including College Council nor is AFT included in their IPC Structure map or Reporting Structure map. Skyline does not include the AFT in its annual Compendium of Committees which is the closest equivalent document to our Participatory Governance Handbook. There is not an AFT rep on Skyline's College Council. They do have an AFT rep on Academic Senate.

5	Academic Senate: Add committee names	Extend line to all boxes also include Basic Skills, Curriculum, Equity under the A.S. box. Individual Comment on this recommendation: The college has over 30 committees and it was difficult to determine the ones that are the important ones to include under the participatory governance structure. SSPC Comment: Did not feel there should be a list of committees on the organizational chart – it should be kept simple.
6	Academic Senate: Revise the second and third bullet items under Goals	• By ensuring that leadership, governance structures, and decision-making processes are effective and integrated across institutional planning; • By ensuring that instructional, student support services, and administrative services are effective and integrated across institutional planning;
6	Individual Comment on Membership	• Why are AFT and CSEA represented on the CPBC? The Academic Senate president addresses faculty issues along with the division representatives and the Classified Senate representative addresses classified issues.
6	Academic Senate Membership	Possibly Academic Senate VP instead of or in addition to President?
6	Classified Senate: Membership	Change "Students at-large (2)" to "ASCC Representatives (2)"
6	Individual email Membership and Part-time Faculty participation	Concern over the ability of part-time faculty – PTF - (currently 71% of the faculty at Cañada, responsible for teaching somewhere just shy of 50% of the classes, if non-teaching, reassign time for full-time faculty is taken into consideration). The governance structure, as laid out, is inadequate when it comes to the EFFECTIVE participation of the largest single employee component at Cañada: the adjunct or part-time faculty. For instance, one page 6 and 7, we see that there is one PT rep of the CPBC committee, but no structure, no feedback loop, for that committee member to solicit or bring to the table PTF concerns, nor a structural component that supports communication of information of particular relevance to PTF back to the PTF group. There is no dedicated list serve or email list of part time faculty members. There is no acknowledgement in this document that PTF members have, in any way, a perspective on governance that depends on formal representation, and formal methods for communication with PTF-- or with avenues that bridge the gap in status, pay, and participatory opportunities with FTF. With few exceptions that I know of, or perhaps in no case, are PTF compensated for their regular participation in group decision making. This means that their viewpoints are routinely elided by virtually all of the governance processes, by apparent design. All other stakeholders (classified staff, FTF, and administrators) participate in the governance processes as "paid" members of a shared community... whose work is "on the clock" so to speak. That individual PTF find time or are in a position to participate without compensation is not in any way to be construed as an ideal governance condition nor should it be seen as the norm. PTF participation in governance is very, very limited, constrained by

		scheduling problems and lack of compensation, and by a culture which routinely devalues the efforts, ideas, and input of PTF.
		How any accrediting organization serious about its work, any institution of higher education serious about its mission, or any individual CC administration or administrator seriously devoted to "full" "effective" governance processes could ignore the massive, near insurmountable structural impediments to meaningful and effective governance participation of the majority of the instructional workforce, for decades, is mystifying! The document mentions "shared office space" for adjuncts, and one PTF member at large on the CPBC. That's it. The document does not seem to consider, nor identify means to correct, the MIA status of 3/4 of the instructional staff in the governance bodies and processes of the college. (I believe PTF are paid for one day of meetings per semester--or a half a day, actually. This is an excellent start!). It is impossible for the large majority of PTF to participate in governance (review data, vote on policy or curricular changes, etc.) without substantial compensation for such. Since there are no mechanisms which would reimburse PTF for uncompensated governance tasks, the "governance plan" as written, seems to me incomplete! Why isn't this issue on the radar of accreditation teams? on the radar of administrators? It would be good to at least acknowledge the largely MIA status, and the lack of coherent governance networks related to contingency within the institution, that adversely affects the participatory opportunity of 71% of the faculty, at least as a footnote, or acknowledgement somewhere. If we at least articulate, at some point in the process, the huge gap in governance participation, and identify the structural reasons for such a gap, and articulate what the institution might have been, might be in the future, missing out on by allowing a kind of permanent disenfranchisement of such a large sector of stakeholders, then we will have made a very small step in the right direction! As individuals are reading this, it is part of their jobs. I am writing this, for free, outside of my compensated duties. You see the problem? The question really is: If you are paid to "talk to, consult with" part-time faculty and part-time faculty are not paid to "talk to, consult with" you, what kind of conversation can we really have? Multiply this exchange, this interchange, by 200 or 300 and we have a lot of asymmetrical conversations, which are, all too often, non-conversations.
7	SSPC: CPC abbreviation	Change CPC to PBC in the charts
11	Reword the section on educational administrators to more closely follow accreditation standards	Educational administrators lead, plan, facilitate, recommend, supervise, and maintain accountability in the academic environment. They create an environment of empowerment and encourage innovation, help identify institutional values and help set and achieve goals.
11	Std. IIID Committee and SSPC: Need to	IPC: The Instructional Planning Council is advisory to the College Planning Council on a range of issues related to instruction: 1. Development of a calendar for program review, staffing, equipment and facilities needs as

	add a brief overview of the roles of the IPC, SSPC and APC	they pertain to instruction 2. Development of an evaluation process for the program review cycle 3. Recommendations about policies and procedures as they relate to instruction 4. Recommendations about prioritization of resources as they relate to Strategic Goals regarding instruction and review of Instructional Strategic Goals yearly. 5. Evaluation of proposals for new instructional programs and instructional program discontinuance 6. Support of accreditation review process and self-study 7. Completion of a yearly review of the mission statement and roles of this Planning Council SSPC: The Student Services Planning Council is advisory to the College Planning Council. The role of the Student Services Planning Council include: 1. Develop, implement, and evaluate a Student Services Planning cycle (including staffing, equipment, and facilities needs) 2. Integrate and synthesize Student Services Division Plans 3. Make recommendations about policies and procedures related to student services 4. Make recommendations to College Planning Council regarding prioritization of resources advancing the Strategic Goals regarding Student Services 5. Meet at least once a semester with Instructional Program Planning Council to communicate and integrate plans 6. Evaluate proposals for adding, modifying, and discontinuing student services programs APC: In collaboration and communication with SSPC and IPC, oversees the implementation of a comprehensive process for planning and assessing administrative services, instruction/student services based on program review, the effective integration of student learning outcomes into program activities and services, and alignment with the college's mission and strategic goals. Develops, implements, and evaluates an Administrative Program Plan cycle (including staffing) and makes recommendations about policy.

12	Academic Senate: Revise grid	Task	Origination	Review, Discussion, Coordination	Recommend-ing Body
		Position Request: Grant or Categorically Funded	Grant proposal or categorical plan (ex: Basic Skills)	Academic Senate, Cabinet, (instead of President)	College President
		Equipment and Instructional Materials	Annual Plans/Program Review Division-level Prioritization	IPC, SSPC, APC, Technology Committee	VPI/VPSS

14	SSPC: Need to be clear that all programs do an annual plan	First sentence: All programs at the college develop an annual plan, program review and budget recommendation document each year.
15	SSPC: need to list all of the programs for three areas – APC, IPC, SSPC	APC Programs • Research and Planning • Public Information/Marketing/Web • Outreach • Cañada International & University Studies • Business Office

		SSPC Programs 1. Outreach and Application 2. Assessment, Orientation and Registration 3. Articulation and Transfer 4. Financial Aid and Financial Literacy 5. Counseling (and CRER Courses) 6. Career Services 7. Student Life and Leadership 8. Wellness: Disability Resource Center, Psychological Services, Health Services 9. Student Support: TRiO, Beating the Odds, Veterans, EOPS/CalWORKs & CARE 10. Academic Support (Learning Center) IPC Programs • Distance Education • Center for Design and Technology and Creative Arts • Engineering/Computer Information Science • Social Sciences • Cooperative Education • Paralegal • Radiologic Technology • Fine and Performing Arts • Early Childhood Education/Child Development • Human Services • Learning Center • Library • Biological Sciences • Mathematics • CBET/ESL • Computer Business Office Technology • Language Arts • Kinesiology, Athletics and Dance • Medical Assisting • Honors Transfer • Accounting and Business • Foreign Language • Physical Sciences
17	SSPC: Add information from the SLO Report to this section	For academic programs, the program-level data is updated and available as part of Annual Program Planning (APP). To help identify gaps, faculty discuss a topic of inquiry and request research data to help provide answers. In March 2012, faculty identified assessment plans for Program SLOs, which are being implemented this fall term. Results will be available for the next APP cycle. For student services, the annual plans include a section related to dialogue about SLOs and the changes to be made as a result of the conversation (1.3). The dialogue takes place at the bi-monthly Student Services Planning Council meetings and is documented annually in the plans. College-wide data is regularly presented to the campus and to subgroups through the college governance committees, and they review data and discuss its implications regularly.

18	SSPC: Revise the Hiring timeline chart as noted	Date	Group	Process	
		September	Budget Planning/CPBC	Make overall recommendation to move forward	
		October	IPC/SSPC/APC	Discuss process; identify criteria for hiring; President's parameters	
		November	Divisions	Revise written justifications submitted in Annual Plan on 3/31; which positions will be forwarded	
		December	Divisions	Review positions to prioritize what comes forward for presentation	
		December 15	Division Dean/VPSS	Submit to VPI or VPSS; and for faculty positions, send to Academic Senate	
		~~January~~ By February 15	Presentations of Positions	IPC/SSPC; Academic Senate; Administrative Planning Council; Classified Senate; College data presented and Position Presentations given	
		~~February~~	~~IPC/SSPC/APC/Academic Senate~~	~~Discussion of presentations and identify list for consideration~~	
		By February 28	Joint IPC/SSPC/APC	Discussion of presentations and listing of "rationale" to merge to one list for CPBC	
		~~February~~Early March	CPBC (Meet before Academic Senate)	Discuss list and process integrity; forward list to President	
		~~February~~Early March	Academic Senate	Forward list to President	
		~~Early~~ Mid-March	President	Announces positions to be hired	
		March	Hiring Committees	Meet for job descriptions and questions	
		March	Human Resources	Post positions	
19	Forum	Change title of "Hiring Process" to "Hiring Process for _Permanent_ Replacement Positions"			
19	SSPC: Add sentence under hiring process for Replacement postions	If a retirement or resignation occurs, there is a separate process which is followed to review the position. This process can occur at any time during the year.			
19	SSPC: Revise the questions	1) Does the loss of a faculty member bring that department to having NO full-time faculty? 2) ~~Does the program require~~ Are there any special regulations such as law, Title 5, Education Code, Student Success Initiative or accreditation standards, etc., that would require the full-time faculty member? 3) Are the offerings/services in the department integral to transfer pathways (required courses) or to CTE programs? Or, are all of the offerings general education? 4) Does the request support the goals of the college strategic plan located in the Educational Master Plan? 5) Are the offerings/services in the department rapidly changing, related to technology standards, or closely connected with local industry needs and/or standards? 6) Do the data indicate a demonstrated program/service need? ~~Suggestion: 4 out of 6 questions need to be true to justify a replacement hire outside of the "normal" hiring process and timeline.~~			
20	Forum	**Change title of "Hiring Process" to "Hiring Process for Grant or Categorical Funded _Permanent_ Positions"**			
20	SSPC: Revise the questions	1) ~~Does the program require~~ Are there any special regulations such as law, Title 5, Education Code, Student Success Initiative or accreditation standards, etc. for the position? 2) Does the request support the goals of the college strategic plan located in the			

		Educational Master Plan? 3) Do the data indicate a demonstrated program need?
20	SSPC: Revise the title and the first step	*New Hire or Replacement* ***Hiring Process for Grant or Categorical Funded Positions*** Step 1. • Grant proposal form/categorical funding is reviewed by Cabinet • If OK, it is signed by the President ~~and grant submitted~~
21	SSPC: Revise title	**5. New Program Development Process (Fund 1)**
22	Process for Program or Course Reductions (PIV)	A question about PIV. Would this apply solely to instruction? At the moment, I can't think of a student service program that might be eliminated, but at some future point, might there be? If so, then SSPC would be included in the process somewhere.
22	Add to Technology section (revise to label "Technology and Equipment")	Financial resource allocation for equipment and technological needs identified through the annual plans and the ITS strategic plan, will be reviewed by the three instructional deans, one student services dean, VPI, and VPSS for action. This group will also review and take action on general emergency equipment requests. Individual emergency technology requests using the Technology Request form and providing a quote will go to the Technology committee for review and action. The complete form needs to be approved by the Dean of the Division, then forwarded to the co-chairs of the Technology committee for review and action, then forwarded to the respective VP for review and action.

22	Forum	**Under PIV, make changes to address student support programs, not just academic:**
		    Principles of PIV
		    • Cañada's mission and college goals are guides
		    • IPC articulates a vision for Cañada College (long-range) to guide where we are headed with instructional programs and ***SSPC for student support programs***
		    • The Academic Senate and Administration work closely together on the process
		    • A careful review of section scheduling and section reductions is used
		
		    Tools:
		    Instruction
		    • Faculty and Deans' knowledge of academic programs and schedules
		    • Course Overview Matrix maps every course at the college. It allows us to look at factors in our mission and 4 goals such as:
		      1. Identify every course offered at took at factors such as transferability; CSU/UC articulations; IGETC; Cañada AA/AS, Cañada AA-T/AS-T, and certificate; basic skills; ESL
		      2. Look at percentages, section size, trends
		    Student Services
		    • **Faculty, staff and administrators knowledge of student services programs**
		    • **Data on use of the student services programs**
		    Process:
		      1. Deans work with faculty to look at section reduction, scheduling, program needs, etc.
		      2. IPC will review PIV and instruction plan; SSPC will review PIV and student

		services plan 3. Conduct a meeting and invite feedback from: • Academic Senate President • IPC Co-Chair • **SSPC Co-Chair** • Curriculum Chair • AFT President
22	Individuals Technology Decision-making Process	**Edit this section:** **Equipment and Technology Decision-Making Process** Step 1. Setting Standards/Criteria for Equipment and Technology Although technology on campus is managed by the district IT department, the college has the responsibility for reviewing local planning in order to make certain technology remains up-to-date—. The Technology Committee has the responsibility of working with the district which determines the standards and criteria by which requests for equipment and technology should be reviewed. For example, the committee will address such items as: replacement cycles, ADA Compatability, and types of standard equipment to be purchased (for given functions), etc. The committee also reviews one time "emergency requests" as needed. Step 2. Identifying Needs in the Annual Plans/Program Reviews In the Annual Plan/Program Review, each program is asked to identify equipment and technology needs for the upcoming year. These needs are summarized from these plans and provided to the Technology Committeeappropriate participatory committee. The Technology committee co chairs will coordinate with the District ITS to analyze technology requests, then forward the requests to the identified group, IPC/SSPC/APC, for their review. and prioritization. Step 3. Providing Input on the Need Requests – Participatory Governance Group Using on the criteria/guidelines from the district ITS and Technology Committee, the IPC/SSPC/APC review and prioritize the equipment/technology lists and provide feedback. Step 4. Providing Input on the Need Requests – Cabinet The IPC/SSPC/APC then forwards their recommendations to the Technology Committee who reviews recommendations and Cabinet. The Cabinet reviews all requests and provides input. This input is used by theforwards to the VPI/VPSS/President who will make final decision based on funding. Also, need to ensure we are ADA compliant with the technology being used.
24	Add sub-committee to the Senate list	1. Academic Senate, sub committees include: Trustees Program Improvement Fund
24	Add sub-committee to CIETL	CIETL Advisory a. Flex Day
24	Add committees	Sustainability Committee, EEOC, Scholarship

24	SSPC: adjust committee title	15. EOPS/CARE/CalWORKs Committee		
30	Std. IV Accreditation Committee – Add more to the timeline for evaluation	**Annual Timeline**	**Group**	**Activity**
		March	PBC	Reviews evaluation questions for key governance groups, which may include: • Are we achieving the desired levels of awareness and participation from faculty, staff and students? • Is the governance group advancing the appropriate agenda? • How is the coordination among the governance groups working? • How well did the annual planning process work this year? • How well did the new hire priority setting process work? • Are there any structural issues which should be addressed? • Are agendas and minutes communicated to the entire campus? • How effective is the group? • What could be changed for the upcoming year?
		April	IPC/APC/SSPC/ PBC	Respond to the evaluation questions from PBC
		May	PBC	Report from the governance groups reviewed