

College Planning Committee Minutes

2.4.16

Attendees: Georges Robles, Veronica Avila, Anita Muthyala-Kandula, Karen Hunter, Lorna Maynard, Randy Bryant, Mayra Cruz, Jason Bram, Mallory Newell, Lisa Ly, Susan Chu, Coleen Lee-Wheat

The committee reviewed the notes from the meeting on October 29, 2015. No changes were needed.

The committee then reviewed the timeline and standards assigned to the governance groups. We determined that since the College Planning Committee will become the Accreditation Steering Committee that it should include representation from all governance groups that are assigned a Standard. It was determined that the only group not represented was the library. We will ask Lorrie Ranck to join our next meeting. We determined that we will now meet monthly on the first Thursday of each month from 3-5 p.m. in ADM 109.

We then reviewed our spreadsheet with assigned Standards. We went over each standard and discussed if we should work with any other group on particular ones. At our next meeting we will work through all of the standards and divvy up the work. Each member will also review Napa's Self-Study report as a model before the next meeting.

It was recommended that in the fall, each governance group watch the ACCJC training video as a refresher.

The committee agreed that it would be responsible for setting deadlines and reminders for the governance groups. Next week Mallory will send a reminder to the chairs of the teams and remind them that by now they should have reviewed the document, determined how the work will be completed, and developed a timeline for completion. The group will also work on developing a document that monitors and tracks monthly progress on the Standards. All documents will be stored and shared in Office 365 for each group. At the next meeting of the Steering Committee there will be an Office 365 training. Since the documents in 365 will always be a working document, Mallory will save a draft weekly as a backup. The due date of the status updates will coincide with our meetings so that we can review progress at each meeting. Newell will work on the status report document and share with the group at the next meeting.

The committee then reviewed a draft proposal to College Council regarding the planning quilt. After the site visit in fall 2017 we will move to a 7 year cycle. To align the cycle with program review, the Educational Master Plan and the mid-term report, the group agreed that having a comprehensive program review every 6 years would be best. This way, the comprehensive program review always falls on the same year as the Mid-term report for accreditation and feeds into the Educational Master Plan the following year. It should be noted that this next cycle will include 7 APRU cycles before the Comprehensive in order to get on the 7-year cycle. After that, the Comprehensive will be every 6 years with a year of reflection after the comprehensive.

The second proposal to College Council are questions to be answered by all governance groups as well as the planning and budget teams in order to close the loop on the planning cycle annually. The committee recommended that each group answer at least 4 questions at the end of the year to reflect on their processes, their alignment to equity and to the mission of the college. A subcommittee of CPC

will develop the questions for review at the next meeting. The responses from the groups will be included in the Educational Master Plan update each year. A more robust set of questions will be provided to the teams in the year of reflection. It was determined that these questions will replace the Annual Governance Assessment survey as the questions are a better assessment of the colleges processes and practices in all areas aligned to our mission.

The third proposal to College Council is that in the fall of each year, the CPC reviews progress made on the Institutional Metrics as defined in the Educational Master Plan. Based on the review, the CPC will make a recommendation to College Council to focus its attention on one or a few key metrics in which we may not be achieving at the rate necessary to meet our goal by 2020. The recommendations will serve as a way to prioritize the college's attention on particular areas within the metrics. It will be up to College Council how the college should focus its attention on the particular metrics.