Santiago Canyon College
Academic Senate

Minutes-*Approved*
Senate Business Meeting
October 15, 2013
1:30 pm-3:00 pm   E-306

Present:

Senators

Aguilera, Leonor

Cannon, Cari

Carrion, Rudy

Cummins, Shawn

Deaver, Doug

Deeley, Steve

Dela-Cusack, Lisa

Elchlepp, Elizabeth

Freidenrich, Leah

Frost, Alicia

Hovanitz, Eric

Matthews, Evangeline

Mettler, Mary

Salcido, Andrew

Shekarabi, Nooshan

Shields, Jolene

Sproat, Barbara

Taylor, Michael

Officers

Evett, Corinna (President)

DeCarbo, Michael (Vice President)

Wagner, Joyce (Sec/Treasurer)

Rutan, Craig (Curriculum Chair)

Guests:

James, Scott

Kawa, Steve

Voelcker, Aaron

Wong, Lana

Absent:

Nance, Craig

Shoro, Natasha

The meeting began with a moment of silence in respect for SAC Chemistry Prof. Mike Kelcher, who recently passed away. It was moved to donate $100 from our Senate to a fund being created for Prof. Kelcher's son. **The motion passed without dissent (moved by Prof. Dela-Cusack and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).**

I.   Order of the Agenda (no changes)

II. Approval of Minutes
   A.   The minutes of October 1, 2013, were approved (moved by Prof. Sproat and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).

III. Public Comments
   A.   Prof. Wong: The nonsmoking policy does not seem to be working well in the library. There seems to be an increasing use of chewing tobacco, which is being found in sinks, water fountains, floors, and trashcans.
   B.   Prof. Rutan: The Governor signed SB 440 which is in conjunction with SB1440 which created associate degrees for transfer.   SB 440 requires community colleges to implement the transfer degree in all of their existing majors. CSUs are now required to accept transfer degrees in each of their individual areas. For example, CSU Fullerton has 14 different areas in Communication and must now accept the communication transfer degree in all 14 areas.

IV. AS Executive Board Reports
   A.   President (Prof. Evett):
      1.   Faculty hiring:
         a. At the District Human Resources Committee meeting last week, it was proposed that SAC hire 28 positions and SCC hire one position to maintain the faculty obligation number (FON).
         b. The Distance Education position is already funded and does not count toward these numbers.
         c. An official policy for deciding minimum faculty hires for each college will need to be discussed by the District Fiscal Resources Committee and the Planning and Organizational Effectiveness Committee.
         d. At our college, the Budget Committee and the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee will need to determine how many positions we can afford to hire and how we will decide whether to hire more than the minimum.
         e. The SCC budget is very tight right now. The District may be asked for help in funding additional faculty hires.
         f. The Senate will still rank all 22 of the requested positions.
         g. The District is currently 11 faculty positions under the FON. If the District gets penalized $65,000 for each of these positions, the Chancellor will pay the fine out of the District stabilization fund this year only.
      2.   Intersession:
         a. The District is funding this winter's intersession.

b. So far, SCC has 46 classes scheduled.
        c. Current calculations show that SCC is ahead of our current FTES target. The potential growth money may enable us to hire more faculty in the future.
        d. Each college will need to fund its own future intersession.
        e. Since the benefits seem to outweigh the increased cost of intersession, SCC will probably be planning for future intersessions.
    3. Prof. Evett offered thanks to the number of faculty who attended and said kind words about the Academic Senate and its leadership at the most recent Board of Trustees meeting, which was held at SCC.
    4. Prof. Resnick will be attending the next Senate meeting, on November 5, to give a brief FARSCCD report.
    5. Vice President of Student Services, John Hernandez, will also be at the next Senate meeting. Please send any questions to Prof. Evett.
    6. Vice President of Continuing Education, Jose Vargas, is scheduled to attend the Senate meeting on November 19. Trustee Phil Yarbrough is scheduled to attend the Senate meeting on December 3.
    7. The Chancellor may provide District funds for those who wish to attend the Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity event on December 6, 2013, from 8:00-3:00, at California State University Fullerton. Contact Prof. Evett if you are interested in attending.
    8. Other upcoming events include the Wellness Wednesday Workshops, Prof. Rutan's Faculty Excellence Lecture on November 21, and the Holiday Showcase on November 30.
  B. Vice President (Prof. DeCarbo):
    1. Prof. DeCarbo expressed to the Web Redesign Committee and the Web Committee the Senate concerns that the upcoming web redesign will merely be cosmetic.
    2. There are going to be some systematic changes, and the decisions will be informed.
    3. Please check out the DePauw website and complete the survey that was sent out by the Web Redesign Committee. It is important that the committee receives faculty input.
    4. Minutes and other information from the Web Redesign Committee can be found at http://teams.rsccd.edu/scc/webcomm/Web%20Redesign%20Docs/Forms/AllItems.aspx
    5. The librarians looked at the DePauw website, found some flaws, and wanted to know specifics on why students had chosen that site as their favorite.
    6. The tags and drop down menus on the DePauw website were noted to be visually clear and easy to read.
    7. No faculty attended the recent Web Redesign Committee meeting.
  C. CIC Chair (Prof. Rutan):
    1. SCC currently have over 180 course outline proposals that still need to be approved this semester by the CIC. Some faculty seem to be ignoring deadlines.
    2. The CIC will need to have overly long meetings the remainder of this semester.
    3. Next year, every course submitted after the deadline is "dead." If the course was due for quadrennial review and was not submitted in time, it will not be scheduled.
    4. Courses with prerequisites, distance education addendums, or honors addendums require additional time to review.
    5. The CIC has not approved any submitted courses with distance education addendums since the training by Scott James, but is hoping to at their next meeting.

V. ASG Report (no student representative)
  A. Prof. Evett mentioned that the Governor did sign AB 955, a pilot for two-tiered funding in intersession and summer. Of the six community colleges mentioned in the bill, only Long Beach City College is going through with the pilot. Students voiced opposition at the recent Board of Trustees meeting. The SCC and SAC Senate Executive Boards are considering writing a joint resolution in opposition. However, there does not seem to be a sense of urgency because of the limited participation in the pilot and the need to reassess this proposed policy after the pilot is completed.

VI. Action
  A. **Resolution F2013.8**: Adoption of the 9 May 2013 Distance Education Handbook (Scott James)—First reading
    1. The handbook is designed to be more than a policy document. The handbook is a tool to guide online course development and to provide support throughout an online course.
    2. Senators need to pay extra attention to the expectations and policies that have been added or changed.
        a. All new online instructors will go through an online teaching and certificate program, either off campus or on campus.
        b. Current instructors will not have to do the training, but will have a currency requirement that can be satisfied with @One courses, or other Technology Committee approved online workshops.
        c. All new online instructors will have their first online course evaluated.
        d. Certain expectations for online courses were specified, such as "regular and effective content" and the last day to drop students who are not making substantive progress.
    3. The resolution was moved by Prof. Mettler and seconded by Prof. Freidenrich.

4. It was suggested that a glossary for acronyms be included.
5. There was a question on the difference between an online course and a virtual hybrid course:
   a. An online course has no specifically scheduled time for students to meet.
   b. A virtual hybrid course has specific times scheduled for students to be online for various class activities.

B. **Resolution F2013.9:** Affirmation of the 9 May 2013 Technology Master Plan 2013-2017 (Prof. Wong)—First reading
   1. The plan is designed to provide a framework for the development of technology and its related resources.
   2. The framework addresses the areas of learning, assessment, teaching, and infrastructure.
   3. The plan looks at unifying the technology infrastructure on campus and the commitment to it.
      a. There is no one person who is responsible for technology on this campus.
      b. Infrastructure includes equipment and personnel.
      c. Specific concerns include instructional design, the website (no one person is in charge), and resource allocation priorities.
      d. There are significant deficits in how SCC plans and budgets for technology. How do we use data about our different technologies to inform planning?
   4. Kudos to the workgroup from the Technology Committee who developed the plan.
   5. Suggestions from senators:
      a. Include a glossary to help with all the technology terms.
      b. Include a more updated College Governance Framework diagram.
   6. Moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Frost.

C. **Resolution F2013.7**: Adoption of Fall 2013 Revised Academic Program Review Template—Second reading
   1. Final graphics are still being created.
   2. SCC will not be on the three year program review cycle until after the next program review in 2015.
   3. The Educational Master Planning Committee determined that the due date for this academic program review will be March 17, 2014.
   4. **The motion to approve resolution F2013.7 was passed without dissent** (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).

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

VII. Discussion Items
   A. Administrative Services Update (VPAS Steve Kawa responding to questions submitted in advance by faculty):
      1. The Library was concerned about not having enough money for databases and other expenses.
         a. The SCC general fund budget is $30 million and includes all salaries, part-time instruction, supplies, equipment, and contract services. The salary portion is about $24.5 million, which includes about $5.5 million for part time instruction.
         b. Last year, SCC overran our budget by about $800,000, but was able to use the $950,000 that had been saved from previous years.
         c. Last year was a lean spending year with no extras, so it will be difficult to decrease spending this year.
            i. SCC had asked the District for an additional $1.5 million, but was turned down. Some of the money had been earmarked for custodians, a dean in Continuing Education, a distance education coordinator, and a financial-aid analyst for veterans.
            ii. Our budget expenditures are almost identical to last year's expenditures at this time.
            iii. Intersession will cost about $300,000, but that money will be recovered from the District at the end of the academic year.
            iv. SCC is hoping for additional recovery money from the District.
            v. SCC is also hoping for growth money for next year.
         d. Some help may come from lottery funds, which are about $450,000.
            i. Some of the money is reserved for supply money for the Humanities Building.
            ii. The District will fund the refurbishing of the D-building, and some of the lottery money will help with supplies.
            iii. Eventually, there should be some lottery funds left to increase the supply money for all departments.
            iv. The PIE Committee and the Budget Committee will work together to establish priorities and find funds for supplies and other requests.
      2. Should Lot 7 be reserved for staff parking only?
         a. That will be a possibility after the Humanities Building is finished. Right now, staff may be mostly parking in lot 6, so it is better to allow students to use some of Lot 7.
      3. What is the update on the M&O building?
         a. A forklift, pallet jacks, and furniture will cost about $50,000. The plan is to wait to spend this money until after the gym and the Humanities Building are furnished.
         b. The M&O building should be ready to occupy by February 2014.
      4. What safety measures are being taken in light of campus shootings?

a. The Chancellor created a task force headed by Alistair Winter which will, among other things, explore the possibility of armed security officers on campus.
   i. The Santa Ana Police Department, because of force reductions, has a response time of up to 20 minutes.
   ii. The Orange Police Department usually responds within 5-10 minutes, so SCC is less likely to need armed security officers.
   iii. One possibility is to contract the Orange PD to be our security force.
   iv. The task force will be meeting for the first time in about three weeks.
b. Melissa Campitelli-Smith, SCC's college psychiatrist, has allocated funds for assistance should there be a terror attack on campus.
   i. Alistair Winter and an outside firm are holding a training session this Thursday on what to do if there is a shooter on campus. The training will be expanded to other groups.
c. The new surveillance cameras, which are only available to security, have proven useful. A graffiti suspect was caught on camera and later arrested by the Orange PD.

5. What is the update on the Humanities Building?
   a. Various people are getting trained on the equipment that is in the building.
   b. The solar panel system on the roof has not yet been approved by Edison. We can occupy the building, but cannot use the solar power.
   c. Sharp projector systems were ordered, but the company is getting out of the projector business. A new purchase order, with a different company, will have to be placed.
   d. Purchase orders for classroom furniture should be going out this week.

6. How is the PIE committee going to prioritize requests that are often very different from each other?
   a. That discussion is currently happening in the PIE committee. The thought is that the PIE committee would generate a list using a number of different planning documents. That list would be sent to the Budget Committee to determine which items can be funded, and how. The results would go back to the PIE Committee, which would reevaluate the list and send it to College Council.

7. Other information:
   a. The cost to do work on the HVAC (heating and air conditioning) system in the Science Building will be between $300,000 and $350,000 and will be District funded. It is not clear when the work will be started.
   b. The boiler in the D-building will be replaced soon since it is not AQMD certified. The work will be funded using capital outlay.
   c. $16 million has been set aside to bring the Orange Education Center up to code.
      i. $4 million is coming from redevelopment agency funds, $5 million from Measure E, and $7 million from the District stabilization fund.
      ii. This will deplete the redevelopment agency funds, which we have been collecting over the years.

B. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Resolutions
   1. The Area D meeting is this Saturday at Imperial Valley College. Profs. Evett and Rutan will be representing SCC and want to get feedback from faculty regarding the proposed resolutions.
   2. The complete resolutions can be found at http://www.asccc.org/fall2013/resolutions.
   3. Resolutions and Senate input:
      a. 2.01: ASCCC Statement on Accreditation
         i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the following statement on accreditation to be used to guide the ASCCC in its ongoing work to support college accreditation efforts.*
         ii. There seems to be no harm in adopting the statement that is included.
      b. 2.02: Request of ACCJC to Model Effective Self-Evaluation Practices
         i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the ACCJC to model and exemplify for its member institutions effective self-evaluation practices by acknowledging and addressing any areas of non-compliance identified in evaluations by the USDE's Accreditation Group and the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Improvement (NACIQI), and to document what steps it will take to address any areas of non-compliance.*
         ii. It seems fair to ask the ACCJC to do what it asks of community colleges—to complete a self-evaluation and address areas of non-compliance.
      c. 2.03: Sufficient Advance Notice for Changes to Required ACCJC Annual Reports
         i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC provide member institutions opportunities to provide meaningful input to the ACCJC about any proposed changes to the required annual reports, and that any adopted changes to the annual reports be published at least six months in advance of the date they are due*
         ii. A suggestion was made to request a change from six months to nine months. Our representatives will bring that up at the Area D meeting.

iii. It was mentioned that this should also be considered here at SCC in order to give department chairs enough advance notice of changes in required assessment and other reports. This topic will be added to a future Senate agenda.

d. 2.04: Employ the Term "Deficiency" Rather Than "Recommendation" for Evaluation Findings That Must Be Addressed by the Two-Year Rule

i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC adopt and employ the term "deficiency" for those findings of non-compliance that must be addressed under the Two-Year Rule, and reserve the term "recommendation" exclusively for Commission suggestions to increase institutional effectiveness of noncompliance and leave recommendation for suggestions.*

ii. San Francisco City College seemed unclear about whether some of the recommendations they received in 2006 were under the two-year rule.

e. 15.01: Endorse LEAP General Education Outcomes

i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the AAC&U LEAP outcomes as minimum standards for GE or institutional learning outcomes.* http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm

ii. LEAP stands for "Liberal Education and America's Promise."

iii. It was felt that more understanding and deliberation are needed before a decision could be made. Our representatives will bring back information from the Area D meeting.

f. Four of the resolutions deal with the ACCJC. There seem to be two goals:

i. To state the role of the statewide Academic Senate in the accreditation process.

ii. To call to task the ACCJC about how they have handled things.

1. Some people feel that the ACCJC has been too harsh.

2. Others feel that the ACCJC is justified because California community colleges are behind community colleges in other states.

C. Academic Senate Scholarship (Prof. DeCarbo):

1. History of the Senate scholarship

a. In the past, the Senate donated $500 each year for a scholarship.

i. Our main criterion in the past was academic excellence.

ii. When screening applicants, leadership and involvement on campus was also taken into account.

iii. Financial need was not a major consideration

b. Two years ago, the Senate created the Academic Senate/ Castle Foundation Scholarship.

i. The Osher Foundation offered to donate $6,666 if the Senate could raise $13,334. This money would allow the Senate to offer $1,000 in scholarships each year in perpetuity.

1. Of the needed $13,334. $7,000 was donated by the Castle Foundation, $2,400 was contributed by individual faculty members, and $3,934 came from the Senate.

2. The Senate had sent out a survey to the faculty before going forward with the Osher offer.

ii. It was later found that to be eligible for this scholarship, applicants needed to be receiving a BOG waiver.

2. Concerns:

a. Worthy students would be excluded from consideration because they are not receiving BOG waivers.

b. Could Osher add additional requirements in the future?

3. The SCC Foundation is willing to purchase the scholarship and pay back the Senate $3,934; it is unclear how the individual donations will be handled.

a. There would either no longer be a Senate scholarship, or the Senate would have to decide whether to donate a fixed amount each year.

4. Senators need to ask their constituents whether the BOG waiver requirement is acceptable or unacceptable.

5. The Senate Executive Board will look back at the information gleaned from the prior faculty survey.

6. Some possibilities for the future:

a. Keep the scholarship as it is now (with the BOG waiver requirement).

b. Sell the scholarship to the Foundation, and go back to donating money each year toward a Senate scholarship with whatever requirements the Senate determines.

c. Sell the scholarship to the Foundation and no longer offer any Senate scholarship.

d. Keep the current scholarship and also donate money each year toward a Senate scholarship with whatever requirements the Senate determines.

VIII. Summary Reports Discussion (see attached summaries)

Meeting Adjourned at 3:15 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Wagner SCC-AS Secretary/Treasurer

Resolution F2013.8

Adoption of 9 May 2013 Distance Education Faculty Handbook

Moved:

Seconded:

Whereas, Santiago Canyon College (SCC) demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity; and

Whereas the mission of the Santiago Canyon College (SCC) Technology Committee is to "promote the use of technology to increase efficiency of college operations and to support teaching and enhance student learning;"

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College, adopt the Technology Committee recommended 9 May 2013 Distance Education Faculty Handbook.

Date Presented:15 October 2013
Date Approved:

Santiago Canyon College is an innovative learning community dedicated to intellectual and personal growth. Our purpose is to foster student success and to help students achieve these core outcomes: to learn, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)

Santiago Canyon College
Academic Senate

SENATORS

Business and Career Education
Deeley, Steve 2014
Salcido, Andrew 2015

Continuing Education (OEC)
Shields, Jolene 2015

Counseling & Student Services
Aguilera, Leonor 2015
Carrion, Rudy 2014
Mettler, Mary 2014

Humanities and Social Sciences
Deaver, Doug 2014
Elchlepp, Elizabeth 2015
Cannon, Cari 2015
Dela-Cusack, Lisa 2015
Shekarabi, Nooshan 2014

Fine & Performing Arts and Communication
Freidenrich, Leah 2015

Library
Sproat, Barbara 2015

Mathematics and Sciences
Cummins, Shawn 2015
Hovanitz, Eric 2014
Taylor, Mike 2015
Nance, Craig 2014
Frost, Alicia 2015

Adjunct
Matthews, Evangeline 2014
Shoro, Natasha 2014

OFFICERS

President
Evett, Corinna   2014

Vice President
DeCarbo, Michael 2014

Secretary/Treasurer
Wagner, Joyce   2014

Curriculum
Rutan, Craig Chair 2016

Resolution F2013.9

Affirmation of the Santiago Canyon College 9 May 2013 Technology Master Plan 2012-2017

Moved:

Seconded:

Whereas, The mission of the Santiago Canyon College (SCC) Technology Committee is to "promote the use of technology to increase efficiency of college operations and to support teaching and enhance student learning;"

Whereas, It is the responsibility of the Technology Committee to maintain a technology plan that aligns with state recommendations, meets the learning needs of our students, and supports the college's institutional mission; and

Whereas, The Technology Master Plan is developed to provide the framework for the development of technology and related resources at SCC by which the institution can prioritize the technology initiatives, set annual technology goals, and make progress toward the implementation of these goals;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College affirm the Technology Committee recommended 9 May 2013 Technology Master Plan 2012-2017.

Date Presented: 15 October 2013

Date Approved:

Santiago Canyon College is an innovative learning community dedicated to intellectual and personal growth. Our purpose is to foster student success and to help students achieve these core outcomes: to learn, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)

<u>Summary Report</u>
Committee: SAC Senate
Meeting date: October 8, 2013

The following are informal highlights:
<u>Content</u>
1   Discussion items:
- SAC Chemistry Prof. Mike Kelcher recently passed away. There was discussion about memorials.
- The SAC faculty priorities group met last Friday and created a prioritized list of faculty hires for next year. The top positions on the list were Comm. Studies, EMT, English, Math, Business, NC ABE, Counseling, Human Dev., DSPS, Art, Automotives, Kinesiology, Library, ASL, Nursing, Biology, Music, Learning Center Coordinator, NC ASE, Math. The list may undergo modification after administrative input.
- Program reviews are due on October 30.
- The proposed new locks will allow doors to be locked from both sides.
- There was mention of creating a senate approved list of what is required on syllabi and why. There is confusion between what is required and what is recommended.
- The 2013-14 Senate goals were approved.
- Planning and budget committee: By law, our budget model needs to be evaluated annually, SAC is carrying the district with respect to the 50% law, and there should be a plan on how the money being spent on OEC would be replaced.
- Bonnie Jaros gave a brief accreditation presentation.

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

Summary Report
Committee: Budget Committee
Meeting date: Tuesday October 1, 2013

Content
 Discussion items:

- 50% Law: SCC is at 48.91%, RSCCD at 47.75% We need to finish year at 50.1%
- FON-Faculty Obligation Number.   75% of courses RSCCD = 65% State has given us a pass in the past. State will to begin enforcing and we'll be fined. We'd need to hire appx.28 FT faculty district-wide.
- District expenditures should be analyzed annually. First meeting of task force MON October 8. Steve Kawa will send meeting notes to Budget Committee. Analyze Budget vs. Spending. District holds money for unfilled positions, which should be disbursed to colleges.
- $16M set aside for OEC Upgrades. $5M Measure E, $4M Redevelopment Agency money set aside by SCC $7M from stabilization fund

Duties met:
Committee discussed budget items affecting SCC.

Actions proposed:
Fiscal Resources Committee(FRC) will meet on October 8 met to determine how we will conduct a review of the District Operations budget and expenses. Michael De Carbo, Jose Vargas and Steve Kawa will represent SCC.

Events Planned:
Next meeting Tuesday, November 5, 2013   Location – E-107

5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated:
None at this time

Summary Report
Committee: Facilities
Meeting date: 8/26/13

Content
- Humanities building as been approved for occupancy. Furniture is being ordered
- D-building roof should be done soon. A new boiler for D-building will be going in soon. There is still concern for funding to finish D building.
- Sound system has been ordered for the gym. Cost around $138,000
- Price tag to fix the air conditioning in the Science building is $350,000
- Bird spike were discussed and approved to be put on surveillance camera on campus to prevent bird drops from blocking the camera's few.
- Signs will be ordered for drop off area near U buildings.
- We are being sued for inadequate handicap spaces near U building and access to soccer fields.
- OEC is completely vacating the Katella site.
- Work in parking lots is complete
- We discussed the moving of Career Ed and Business Division office to a new location on campus.
- Board of Trustees will have the Oct 14 meeting here in SC-105.
- Child Care Development Center is being re-certified.
- New chiller for D-building has to be approved.

2   **Duties met:** none
3.   **Actions proposed:**   none
4   **Events Planned:** Next meeting in Oct 21 3:00pm SC-103
5   **Resources needed/acquired/allocated:**

Summary Report for the Senate
Faculty Development
October 8, 2013

Actions Taken:
- Approved the new mission statement.

Events Planned:

Week	Activity
5 (Sep 23rd)	Send email for repeat sessions (Done)

7 (October 7th)	First general call for proposals (Done)
9 (October 21st)	Second general call for proposals
11(November 4th)	All proposals are due and finalized
	Put calendar together
13 (November 18th)	Senate approval (depends on meeting schedule)
14 (November 25th)	Send an all faculty email with calendar

- We will send a resolution to the Academic Senate for name change, committee composition change and mission statement

- We plan to work on the committee website during winter break

Items for Recommendation: none

Other Resources needed/acquired/allocated: A request for funds will be forwarded to PIE committee

Useful Information:
- A resolution will be drafted and sent to the Academic Senate for name change, committee composition change and mission statement