Present:

Senators
Aguilera, Leonor
Cannon, Cari
Carrion, Rudy
Cummins, Shawn
Deaver, Doug
Deelely, Steve
Dela-Cusack, Lisa
Elchlepp, Elizabeth
Frost, Alicia
Hovanitz, Eric
Matthews, Evangeline
Mettler, Mary

Officers
Evett, Corinna (President)
DeCarbo, Michael (Vice President)
Wagner, Joyce (Sec/Treasurer)
Rutan, Craig (Curriculum Chair)

Non-Voting Members
ASG: Blake, Matt

Guests:
Adams, Rick
Flores, Marilyn
Jones, Vanessa
Mora, Aracely
Roe, Maureen
Smith, John
Voelcker, Aaron

Absent:
Freidenrich, Leah

I. Order of the Agenda (no changes)

II. Approval of Minutes
A. The minutes of September 17, 2013, were approved (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Taylor).

III. Public Comments
A. Prof. Adams read the following statement: "Good afternoon: A couple of weeks ago, I had the sudden and wonderful pleasure of being invited by the Honors Committee to serve with Elizabeth Elchlepp as the Co-Coordinator of the Honors Program. And I wanted to share with you some thoughts that have occurred to me as I try to apprehend such a privilege. The first is that I wish to go on record by thanking SCC’s Academic Senate—and in particular, the Senate President, Ms. Corinna Evett, the Senate Executive Board, and all the Senators. Your leadership helped codify our Honors Program as the signature program it is and positioned it appropriately as a bonafide part of SCC’s shared governance. The second is that I publically acknowledge that this result was a process involving a firm academic vision that provoked (and sometimes wrestled against) administrative resistance to achieve a positive end for both faculty and students. Further, it reinforces the necessity of a strong Senate leadership that must and should work with administration to accomplish what can only be achieved ultimately through healthy, hearty dialog and cooperation. I also find it amazing and refreshing that the faculty and students—who both count on the legitimacy of this program and its strength beyond the boundaries of SCC—were not compromised, dismissed, limited or disregarded during this process. Voices were heard, dissent received/processed/levied, and the present positive end was achieved. This is a small example of what we can achieve together through purposeful insistence and determined mediation. I’m proud of my Senate—I appreciate this small opportunity to serve our students through a program revitalized by your steady hands. And Corinna, I’m especially grateful to you for holding firm and shepherding this over the last year or so. The results, I pray, will be happy for all. As for me, I’m delighted to get stared under the current conditions you’ve negotiated, and I look forward to your ongoing support as new challenges present themselves."
B. Prof. Smith:
1. Assembly Bill 955 (two-tiered funding) has passed both state legislative houses and is on the Governor’s desk. Consider writing a letter to the Governor urging him not to fly in the face of how we passed Proposition 30 by promising students no more tuition increases in exchange for new taxes to fund schools.
2. Prof. Smith is currently on the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) Board of Governors, Region C, but is not planning to run again when his term is up in Spring 2014. Encourage faculty, here or at SAC, to run for positions on FACCC because our District needs a presence in Sacramento. If you are interested, please contact Prof. Smith.
C. Prof. Elchlepp read the following statement: “Good afternoon: I also would like to go on record by thanking the SCC Academic Senate, particularly our president Corinna Evett and her executive board, for making the Enrollment Management Committee a reality. We had our first meeting on September 17, and I am hopeful about the goal of this committee to create a framework for enrollment management. Although we are in the initial stages of this new process for SCC, we are beginning by soliciting suggestions from department chairs for the kind of data they need to help them in preparing class offerings and schedules. So if you are a chair or if you have a chance to talk with your chair and/or other chairs, please let them know that we need to hear from them. What struck me at the first meeting was the broad range of people—faculty, classified, and administrative—comprising the committee. Already a spirit of cooperation, appreciation for one another’s viewpoints, and optimism about the important work ahead is clear. I think this is largely due to the tone set by our co-chairs—Craig Rutan and Marilyn Flores—and by the determination of the SCC Academic Senate leadership and the cohesiveness of the entire SCC Senate to bring us to this important stage in enrollment management at SCC. I hope we, the SCC Senate, can stay united and focused as we continue to make the faculty an integral part of planning at SCC. This could only happen with our strong Academic Senate leadership. Thank you.”

IV. AS Executive Board Reports
A. President (Prof. Evett):
1. Upcoming events
   a. On Thursday, October 3rd, from 5:30-7:00, at the Orange County Mining Company, FARCCD will hold its first annual fall mixer.
   b. On Thursday, October 3rd, at 6 p.m. in H-106, Francisco Ayala, Ph.D., a well known scholar and a member of the National Academies of Science, will speak on “Can One Believe in Evolution and God?”
   c. On Tuesday, October 8th, at 10:15 a.m. in H-106, Erwin Chemerinsky, famed constitutional lawyer, will speak about recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions and the progress and direction of the high court. Thanks to the members of the Speaker Symposium group for continuing to provide SCC with such substantial speakers for the edification of all.
   d. On Tuesday, October 29, from 1:30-3:30, at the district board room, the Book vs. Machine: Trends in Digital Textbooks & Online Academic Open Source Materials presentation will feature former State Senator Dean Florez, SAC Professor Roy Shahbazian, and SCC’s own Jared Kubicka-Miller.

2. ASG Senate Representative, Matt Blake, wrote a resolution in opposition of AB 955. Our senate executive board will be joining SAC’s senate executive board to discuss turning Matt’s resolution into a joint resolution for both senates.

3. Prof. Evett’s comments about email communication and letters from FARSCCD (the following paraphrases President Evett’s comments):
   - A handful of you have raised questions about a few emails and letters that you have received, which is why I am going to provide you some clarification from my perspective and participation.
   - First, however, I’d like to remind us of our responsibilities as a Senate. We are charged with upholding AB 1725 and the precepts delineated in 10+1 that directly relate to academic and professional matters. That is our purview.
   - As many of you serve on our local and district committees alongside other faculty coupled with the good work we have done together in the senate, you know firsthand how we have been diligently working to meet our responsibilities and facilitate academic and professional matters on behalf of the students, faculty, college, and District.
   - More specifically, as your Senate President, it is my responsibility to assure that faculty have a place at the participatory/shared governance tables, that faculty are well informed, and that faculty are empowered to effectively represent and advocate for students and faculty when it comes to academic and professional matters.
   - The aforementioned is the only agenda that I have: to maintain our seat at the appropriate tables, to accurately inform you, to try to inspire and empower you, and to effectively and collegially represent you.
   - Furthermore, despite what you have heard or read, I am not directed by the District, nor am I directed by the administration, neither am I directed by other faculty groups. Instead, as is evidenced even in an email I sent to you last week, I am directed by you—the Senate—who is directed by the faculty whom you represent.
   - When you are not available for me to seek direction, I consult with any of the following: the Senate Executive Board, our Past Senate President, SAC’s Senate President, and the ASCCC leadership. I hope that you’ll agree with me when I say that I do my best to seek input from you and the faculty so that I can accurately represent you.
   - Even so, there are times when trying to keep my goals of upholding AB1725, and 10+1, maintaining senate purview with academic and professional matters, providing you the best information that I can, and seeking to empower you and the rest of the faculty, that I make decisions as your elected Academic Senate President.
In those cases, I behave, as I believe I always behave, in a spirit of professionalism, collegiality, and civility.

This is the case when I wrote a letter that was sent to the FARSSCD board of nine members, our Senate Executive Board, and the SAC Academic Senate President. I raised concerns that related to the Senate Faculty Forum as your Academic Senate President on behalf of the faculty, and I had hoped that faculty leadership could be able to resolve the situation.

The only persons who knew of the letter and from whom I gleaned advice regarding the writing of the letter were the SCC AS Executive Board and my husband. I did have the support of the Executive Board members. Even so, as your Academic Senate President, I am the final decision maker and take full responsibility for having sent the letter.

I will admit, however, that upon indirectly hearing that FARSCCD considered my letter to be uncivil a number of weeks ago, I did seek advice from one other colleague with whom I shared the letter. To my knowledge neither that colleague, any of the Executive Board members, nor I, have forwarded the letter to anyone else in RSCCD.

Since my intended audience was only to be faculty leadership, if you are interested in seeing the letter, please consult with FARSCCD leadership, for FARSCCD broadened the audience of the letter when they shared it with board members and the chancellor and mentioned the letter to you in a subsequent letter of their own.

Regarding the letter FARSCCD sent and the email that Stew Myers sent, neither the SCC Academic Senate Executive Board nor I received either of them from the senders. Other faculty forwarded the information to us. I can also confirm that others beyond faculty in this Senate, members of the RSCCD Board of Trustees, and the Chancellor received FARSCCD’s letter as well, but not from your academic senate leadership.

In terms of Stew Myers’ situation I want to clarify the following:

- I always thought his was a working condition issue that falls entirely under FARSSCD’s purview.
- As such, I did my best to encourage and support FARSCCD in their endeavor.
- Unfortunately, more than one entity believed Stew’s issue to be an academic and professional issue related to equivalencies.
- Even though for months, I maintained that Stew’s was a work conditions issue, I was approached and asked if I would sign an equivalency.
- After attending a timely plenary session on minimum qualifications and equivalencies, sitting with then and current ASCCC Treasurer, researching Ed Code and minimum qualifications and equivalencies on the State Chancellor’s website and in ASCCC articles, it was clear that in meeting state mandates to maintain the integrity of our academic programs, even though I would have liked to, I could not sign a modern day equivalency for Stew, for unfortunately, (I expressed my sorrow to Bonnie as well as to him) 25+ years of experience does not equate to the minimum qualifications.
- Even so, during my research and discussions with state leadership, I did discover quite a bit about “grandfathering” as well as if a process was documented and followed to determine eligibility to teach in ‘83-’84 that Stew ought to be able to continue to teach his courses today.
- Again, this was a work condition issue and not an academic or professional matter. Yet I did what I could to assist, but it wasn’t what some wanted.
- The items about which I spoke in my letter to FARSCCD and at our last Senate meeting only pertained to the situations in which I was made a part of. Therefore, I can’t speak to the remainder of what transpired after people stopped asking me about equivalencies.
- Be that as it may, as I stated in my letter and personally to a number of FARSCCD members, Bonnie, and Stew, I congratulate FARSCCD on successfully assisting Stew in this matter. And now that Stew is reinstated to teach his classes, I consider this matter over.
- To be sure, as of late, things have been messy, unclear, and uncomfortable. However, as has been my goal all along, I hope that we can move forward from here and continue the good work we are doing together as we advocate for academic and professional matters in the Senate as well as the good work that faculty are doing on our participatory governance committees. I also look forward to working with FARSCCD in those instances when work condition issues and academic and professional matters cross over.

4. Comments from Senators:
   a. A senator contacted FARCCD, after receiving their email, and got a copy of Prof. Evett’s letter. The senator found it to be professional, cordial, and collegial. It was not found to be uncivil.
   b. Equivalencies are a constantly moving target. Faculty need to stay aware of suggested changes to minimum qualifications at the state level.
i. Prof. Barembaum, Prof. Zarske (SAC), and Judy Chitlik (Human Resources) created a new equivalency and minimum qualification process.

ii. Pres. Evett will ask Prof. Barembaum to make a presentation at a future joint chairs meeting, so faculty can make informed decisions on equivalencies.

c. It is important to be in a venue like this senate meeting where we can hear what is happening. When there is not open communication and transparency, there are sidebar conversations, speculation, and people passing judgment. We should not be afraid to have discussions. What Prof. Evett did today is a service to all of us. The senator is proud to be Prof. Evett’s colleague.

B. CIC Chair (Prof. Rutan):

1. Scott James provided training to the CIC on the Distance Education Addendum.
   a. The current form was built into CurricUNET in 2008, and was based on a form from Mt. San Jacinto Community College.
   b. The form is compliant with regulations, but the CIC has not enforced that faculty give thorough details.
      i. It is not enough to state what tools will be used in a DE class; it needs to be explained how the tools will be used.
      ii. Faculty must outline how they will initiate instructor/student contact.
   c. Any faculty who had recently submitted curriculum with DE addendums had their curriculum sent back with a request for the addendum to be edited. Examples from other colleges were provided, and eventually, acceptable internal examples will be provided.
   d. It is important for accreditation purposes to be able to demonstrate that faculty are actually doing what our documentation claims.
   e. Distance education is held to a higher set of standards than face-to-face courses. There cannot be much variation between instructors of a course taught in the distance education modality.
   f. Distance education courses, done correctly, will probably take more instructor time than face-to-face courses because of the need for regular, effective contact.

2. There is discussion at CIC about possible changes to the prerequisite/co-requisite board policy.
   a. The options appear to be content review only or content review with statistical validation.
      i. Content review only requires an implementation plan which establishes criteria on how we determine which courses will get a prerequisite, how we ensure enough sections of the prerequisite course will be offered, and how we ensure enough courses without prerequisites get offered so students can fill their schedules.
      ii. The implementation plan must be approved by the Board and filed with the Chancellor’s Office. The goal is to protect colleges from legal action by avoiding disproportionate impact to any particular group of students.
   b. The CIC will take a stand on this issue at their meeting on Monday, October 7. Please let your CIC representatives know of your opinions.

3. Comments from faculty:
   a. The move toward course outlines being more prescriptive flies in the face of history. How will course outlines be any different than course syllabi? Flexibility will go away.
      i. ACCJC experts looked at our DE forms and said they were insufficient and that, as a result, SCC may be sanctioned.
      ii. There will be less flexibility in teaching distance education courses because these courses will be under higher scrutiny.
      iii. The Department of Education requires students in DE classes to be active participants. This is in response to financial aid fraud.
   b. There needs to be a discussion on how to define attendance and active participation in a DE course.
   c. At a future Senate meeting, the technology committee will present a distance education handbook that will hopefully clarify some policies.

V. ASG Report

A. On Thursday, September 26, the ASG Council unanimously took a position of opposition to AB 955. Several ASG members were asked to speak on behalf of the Student Senate for California Community Colleges (SSCCC) for an upcoming article in the OC Register about AB 955.

B. The SSCCC General Assembly will be November 1 to 3. ASG is encouraging students to apply to attend.

VI. Action

A. Resolution F2013.7: Adoption of Fall 2013 Revised Academic Program Review Template—First reading
   1. The template was approved by the Educational Master Planning Committee (EMPC) last week.
   2. Highlights of changes:
      a. The introduction was overhauled and many of the links were moved to the end.
b. Part I: The overview of academic information will be partially pre-populated with each program’s data.

c. Part II: Programs will map their goals to the SCC goals that are found in the Educational Master Plan.

d. Part III: Student achievement data analysis:
   i. Programs should compare their success rates with the institutional set standard of 63% and analyze why their rates are at, above, or below this standard.
   ii. Some programs will need to find the “rates of progress through the basic skills course sequence within your program using the California Community College Chancellor’s Office Data Mart Basic Skills Progress Tracker.”

3. Graphics which outline the program review process will be added to the template.
   a. Program review is a bridge between the local activities of programs and the more global activities and decision-making at SCC.
   b. The flow of the program review cycle was pictured in one of the graphics.

4. Questions and Comments:
   a. Should programs include wage trend information from the wage tracker at the Chancellor’s office?
      i. This is not yet required by the ACCJC. There are also some questions about the accuracy of the wage tracker.
   b. EMPC members are available to help department chairs with program review.
   c. If some departments finish early, their program reviews will be shared with others.
   d. The 2013-2014 at-a-glance document has not yet been updated. The EMPC will need to vote at their next meeting on the deadline for program review, which should be sometime between the upcoming flex week and spring break.

5. Moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi.

B. Resolution F2013.4: Affirmation of the 2012-2013 Basic Skills Allocation End-of-Year Report—Second reading
   1. Prof. Roe presented highlights from the report.
      a. The budget was about $185,000 and includes:
         i. Program and curriculum planning development, the writing center, MaSH, the Crossroads program (preparing high school seniors for placement exams), and CRAAM (“College Readiness is All About Math” workshops targeting students who place into Math 080).
         ii. Student assessment, advisement, counseling services, probation workshops, and Family Night (which will be held again on November 13).
         iii. Supplemental Instruction (SI) and tutoring.
         iv. Professional development.
      b. Data analysis shows improvement in many areas.
      c. Our goal is to “move the needle” and improve success.
         i. We should make sure that students are taking basic skills classes early, before taking classes that might require them to use some of these basic skills.
         ii. If the money disappears, we need to know if and how we would institutionalize some of these programs.

   2. The motion to approve resolution F2013.4 was passed without dissent (moved by Prof. Deeley and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).

C. Resolution F2013.5: Adoption of Committee Senate Summary Report Submission Process—Second reading
   1. The motion to approve resolution F2013.5 was passed without dissent (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Rutan).

D. Resolution F2013.6: Creation of a Senate Committee Schedule Task Force—Second reading
   1. Profs. DeCarbo, Taylor, Shields, and Nance responded to the initial call for members.

   2. The motion to approve resolution F2013.6 was passed without dissent (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Deaver).

***Approved resolutions are posted online: [http://sccollege.edu/Departments/AcademicSenate/Pages/resolutions.aspx](http://sccollege.edu/Departments/AcademicSenate/Pages/resolutions.aspx) ***

VII. Discussion Items
   A. Academic Affairs Update (VPAA Aracely Mora responding to questions submitted in advance by faculty):
      1. Which courses would be offered in intersession and would there be an impact to departments by having those courses offered in intersession?
         a. The choice of courses is being discussed in the different divisions among the faculty, department chairs, and the dean.
         b. Intersession courses will possibly impact the spring demand.
         c. Departments need to determine the realistic demand and how the courses help students to complete their pathways.
         d. The SCC goal for intersession is 120 FTES, which is around 35-40 sections.
      2. Who do you think is entrusted and authorized to determine matters of pedagogy (whether or not classes are offered, what types of classes, etc.) when it comes to our distance education classes?
a. Discipline content experts should make the decisions regarding pedagogy, no matter how the classes are offered.
b. Scheduling decisions should be made as the deans, department chairs, and faculty look at data that helps to inform what, when, and how we offer classes.

3. Would you pledge to be supportive of the right of faculty to make determinations regarding distance education offerings without interference?
   a. It is important to look at the data and have conversations on complete student pathways and what is working in terms of student success.
   b. Department chairs and deans are critical in the conversation and in helping to guide the direction.
   c. Without knowing what the circumstances might be, it would be unwise to make a pledge.

4. How do faculty deal with the reality that different deans have different viewpoints regarding the scheduling of distance education classes? Sometimes it feels that decisions are based on emotions and not data.
   a. Some students have expressed concern about not having a choice of course modality.
   b. Whether every section of a course could be offered online is a discussion for the enrollment management committee.
   c. Without knowing what the circumstances might be, it would be unwise to make a pledge.

5. Since first being offered, there has not been a dedicated budget for microbiology and organic chemistry classes. When will there be a dedicated, real budget for these offerings?
   a. Many things on last year’s list of priorities should have already been built into the budget.
   b. Anytime we offer a class, there should be a line item budget to support it.
   c. The CIC is only about curriculum; there needs to be a place where we discuss how we pay for a class.

6. What happens to the SI and STAR positions/facilities when Title 5 is completed? Are we to use departmental funds to support them or do they just go away after the grant is completed?
   a. Some positions will be institutionalized as part of the grant.
   b. Of the areas that are not automatically institutionalized, the ones that are moving the needle will be given the higher priorities.
   c. We need to look at how we support students. In particular, are there efficiencies that can be obtained by combining some of what we are doing by looking at it differently?

7. We should move forward on resources that students need to be successful. It is important that the library get line item budgets for books and online databases. What thoughts do you have on how we might move forward to accomplish this?
   a. We have all struggled over the last five years. There have been discussions on how we get back to where we were before, and do we even want to.
   b. The senate and the senate leadership are to be commended for the vision they had to put in place committees that will work for us.
      i. The Budget Committee has done a great deal of work in transitioning from the previous budget model.
      ii. The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee has widespread representation.
   c. The program review is a central document in terms of planning. It is exciting to see how the pieces are connected and tied to planning.
   d. Whatever the institutional values and priorities end up being, they need to be tied to planning.
   e. There is a great deal of work that has gone on, specifically in the last two years, to line us up so that we understand how decisions are made on campus and how planning is driving resource allocation.

B. Academic Senate Scholarship (discussion postponed)

VIII. Summary Reports Discussion (none—see attached summaries)

Meeting Adjourned at 3:10 pm.
Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Wagner
SCC-AS Secretary/Treasurer
Summary Report
Committee: SAC Senate
Meeting date: September 24, 2013

The following are informal highlights:

1 Discussion items:
   • Trustee Phil Yarborough discussed planning and the board of trustees.
   • There was a question on whether intersession LHE is counted as part of spring LHE for adjuncts and for full-time faculty.
   • SAC faculty hiring requests will be prioritized on October 4.
   • There is a plan to change to a new key/lock system at SAC by August.
   • The suspension policy was approved. Non-credit courses were not excluded.
   • SAC’s college council meets once a month in person and one a month using CCC Confer.
   • Their technology committee is working on a replacement schedule for older technology, a district-wide Adobe license, and making sure technology is not overlooked again in the budget process.
   • SAC curriculum committee seems in favor of beginning the implementation plan toward allowing content review.
   • There was mention of sending out bullet point summaries of their senate meetings prior to the next meeting.
   • There is an accreditation push to show employment data for all certificates.
   • Bonnie Jaros, one of their leaders in accreditation, mentioned the possibility of creating an SLO committee and a Learning Center oversight committee.
   • Some suggestions to improve SAC’s commencement were to start earlier, pre-seat faculty, limit the number of speakers, and improve the sound system.
   • The senate watched the emergency procedures and practices video.

2 Duties met:
3 Actions proposed:
4 Events Planned:
5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated:

Summary Report for the Senate
Faculty Development
September 24, 2013

Actions Taken:
   • None

Events Planned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (Sep 23rd)</td>
<td>Send email for repeat sessions (Done)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (October 7th)</td>
<td>First general call for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (October 21st)</td>
<td>Second general call for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (November 4th)</td>
<td>All proposals are due and finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (November 18th)</td>
<td>Senate approval (depends on meeting schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (November 25th)</td>
<td>Send an all faculty email with calendar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items for Recommendation: none
Other Resources needed/acquired/allocated: None

Useful Information:
We are working on a mission statement
We are working on developing a website
Discussed new ideas for spring flex

Summary Report

Committee: Student Success

Meeting date: Monday, September 23, 2013

Content
1 Discussion items:
   • Early Alert (EA) update
     o May need to know student contacts using SCC’s EA system and other systems for Student Success Act. Funding may be tied to this data.
   • Loss of Enrollment Priority for Fall 2013
     o Dismissals, A-2 Probation and 100+ unit data
     o EAR committee appeal data
   • Early Welcome Data
     o # of applicants, high schools participating, ethnicity, placement
   • Reviewed proposed changes to BOG Fee Waiver in the Student Success Act
     o No BOG if >100 units
     o If on probation, no BOG
     o Course repetition – maximum two times
     o BOG – B (self report of income) may be eliminated
   • BSI Task Force Update – Family Night for high school seniors

3 Actions proposed:
   • Possible survey of non-users of SCC’s Early Alert system to explore what systems they use.
   • See if we can access Blackboard’s EA system

4 Events Planned:
   • SCC Family Night – Wednesday, November 13, 2013

5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated: n/a

Summary Report

Committee: Sustainable RSCCD

Meeting date: 09/18/13

Content
1 Discussion items: The committee had a discussion with representatives of HMC architects regarding the creation of a sustainability plan. Among the proposals were a series of workshops for input from the campus community about concerns and practices. Some plans from other campuses were considered as models for what might be done here.

2 Duties met: Subcommittees made brief reports after the presentation. There was a general discussion about the constitution of the committee – specifically whether we should reduce the number of classifieds. The consensus was that the current constitution was fine.

3 Actions proposed: A brief discussion of sustainable water practices culminated with the suggestion that perhaps we need to have an additional subcommittee regarding water use.

4 Events Planned: The idea of workshops was tabled for the present.

5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated: None

SUMMARY REPORT

Committee: Technology Committee
Meeting date: September 12, 2013

Content
1 Discussion item 1: Newsletter

Tentative Newsletter distribution date is late October / early November.
ACTION: Commitments of article for the Fall 2013 Technology Newsletter made by several Members.

Discussion item 2: Mapping the process for assuring that technology needs are included and addressed in the allocation of budgetary resources

As the Technology Committee [TechComm] will participate in the new PIE Committee, TechComm needs to consider 1) what processes it will need to map and 2) what information it may need to mine to inform its participation in PIE. This may become clearer once the PIE Committee meets and begins to organize its work and establish its own processes.
ACTION: A working subgroup composed of Kari Irwin, Scott James, and Vanessa Jones will begin work how TechComm can best meet its committee charge of insuring that technology needs are considered in the allocation of the College’s budgetary resources.

Discussion item 3: Report--Website Redesign Group

Per the Website Redesign Group:
While no faculty/staff redesign focus group is planned (as of the TechComm meeting, 9/12/13), ALL faculty and staff can and are strongly encouraged to provide direct input regarding the redesign to the Website Redesign Group.

All faculty and staff are strongly encouraged to attend the November 7 meeting where a final design will be selected. This meeting of the Redesign Group will be Wed., Nov. 7 at 1:00 in U-101.

ACTION: Despite the provision for faculty and staff to provide direct input to the Website Redesign Group, there remains a lingering concern regarding the lack of a more planned and systematic approach to getting this input. This concern will be communicated to the Website Redesign Group.

2 Duties met:

- Providing input concerning the implementation of technologies/technology policies
- Communication with College and district personnel

3 Actions proposed:


Summary Report

Committee: Enrollment Management Committee
Meeting date: September 17, 2013

Content

1 Discussion items:

- EMC discussed the need to develop a mission and list of responsibilities this semester. It was suggested that committee members start with the Enrollment Management Guiding Principles passed by the Academic Senate in spring 2013.
- EMC discussed the previous scheduling guidelines produced by the joint chairs. The previous document was designed for reducing the class schedule. It was agreed that the committee should develop guidelines for increasing and decreasing the class schedule.
- There was a discussion of enrollment management data that could be used in schedule construction. Committee members will contact department chairs about the types of data they would like to have access to.
- EMC reviewed a draft of a Strategic Enrollment Management Framework. Committee members will send feedback to the EMC co-chairs prior to the next meeting.

2 Duties met:

- Duties remain to be determined.

3 Actions proposed:

- Once completed by EMC (hopefully before the end of fall 2013), the Strategic Enrollment Management Framework will come to the Academic Senate for review/approval.
4  Events Planned:
   • Flex week presentation(s) may be planned for spring 2014 to share the work of EMC and the new enrollment management data available to department chairs. These sessions will be discussed at the October 15, 2013 meeting.

5  Resources needed/acquired/allocated: (none)

Summary Report

Committee:  Fiscal Resources

Meeting date:  Wednesday, September 25, 2013

Content

1  Discussion items:
   • 50/50 Law
   • The need for a FON policy
   • Budget analysis

3  Actions proposed:
   • Ensure POE understands the need to balance hires and the 50/50 law.
   • A subgroup was formed to investigate the assess District use of resources.

4  Events Planned:
   • None

4  Resources needed/acquired/allocated:  n/a

Summary Report

Committee: Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee

Meeting date: 18 Sept. 2013

Content

1  Discussion items: Future website creation, history behind creation of PIE, governance framework and flow of communication, preliminary discussion of possible committee responsibilities and mission, and discussion of a request form process.

2  Duties met: N/A

3  Actions proposed: Participatory governance committees are encouraged to discuss how they might implement a request process for services/funds/equipment, etc. and the types of questions that ought to be asked in a request form. Committee chairs are asked to bring back feedback to a future PIE meeting.

4  Events Planned: N/A
Summary Report

Committee: Planning & Organizational Effectiveness (POE) Committee

Meeting date: 25 Sept. 2013

Content

1 Discussion items:
   • Updates on Comprehensive Master Plan
   • Updates on Function Map and Timeline
   • Reviewed Accreditation Standard III and how it applies to POE, especially when looking at the 2008 recommendation regarding a diversity plan
   • Discussed Assessment of Budgeting/Planning Processes
   • Had a discussion of POE’s responsibilities and the need for planning to inform allocation of resources and what that looks like at the district level
   • Reviewed the Grant Development Schedule

2 Duties met:
   • Discussed Fiscal Resources Committee (FRC) recommendation regarding assessment of budget/plan process

3 Actions proposed:
   • A small group will create a survey to assess the budget/planning process and bring it to the committee for review at the next meeting
   • Final draft of the Updated Comprehensive Master Plan will be up for a vote at the 14 Oct. 2013 Board Meeting. To review it, go to first page of the RSCCD Intranet.

4 Events Planned: N/A

5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated: N/A