

**CHABOT-LAS POSITAS
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
STUDY MEETING**

**MINUTES
March 2, 2010**

PLACE

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, 5020 Franklin Dr., Pleasanton, California 94588.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. Recording Secretary Mary Hargiss called the roll. Trustees Cedillo and Mertes and Student Trustees Dwaraknath and Gil were absent at the time of roll. Trustees Cedillo and Mertes were excused from the meeting.

ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Trustee Isobel F. Dvorsky
Trustee Donald L. "Dobie" Gelles
Trustee Hal G. Gin
Trustee Marshall Mitzman
Trustee Carlo Vecchiarelli

Members Absent:

Trustee Arnulfo Cedillo (excused)
Trustee Barbara F. Mertes (excused)
Student Trustee Sudharsan Dwaraknath
Student Trustee Evani Gil

Managers Present:

Dr. Joel L. Kinnamon, Chancellor
Dr. DeRionne Pollard, President, Las Positas College
Mr. George Railey, Representing President, Chabot College
Mr. Ken Agustin
Mr. Jeff Baker
Ms. Julia Dozier
Mr. Wyman Fong
Dr. MaryAnne Gularte
Dr. Laurel Jones
Mr. Jeffrey Kingston
Mr. Lorenzo Legaspi
Mr. Yulian Ligioso

Dr. Pam Luster
Ms. Jeannine Methe
Ms. Tram Vo
Ms. Laura Weaver
Ms. Barbara Yesnosky

Recording Secretary: Ms. Mary Hargiss

Others Present : Ms. Jennifer Adams, Las Positas College
Ms. Natasha Lang, President, Las Positas College Classified
Senate
Ms. Barbara Morrissey, Las Positas College Faculty Senate
Mr. Masi Quorayshi, President, Las Positas College
Associated Students
Ms. Rachel Ugale, President, Chabot College Classified
Senate
Mr. Gordon Watt, Chabot College

PLEDGE TO FLAG

President Gelles opened the meeting and asked Ms. Barbara Morrissey to lead the pledge to the flag.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no Public Comments offered at this meeting.

PRESENTATION: ACCREDITATION

Trustee Gelles reported that the Board feels very positive and blessed with the superb staff-Certificated, Administrative and Classified.

Dr. Kinnamon reported that he, Dr. Barberena and Dr. Pollard will present from their vantage point the recommendations that are relevant to the District Office, Chabot College and Las Positas College. Dr. Kinnamon reported that we recently received our recommendations, and there has already been work afoot at the Colleges to respond to those recommendations. Dr. Kinnamon reported that we are stressing the importance of a thoughtful, collaborative process, so that whenever we do provide responses, that they are recommendations that can actually be implemented and that are helpful and productive for the organization.

District:

Dr. Kinnamon reported that there was a recommendation in the Chabot College report (Recommendation No. 6), which pertains to the District and the Board of Trustees. *The Team recommends that the Board establish and formally adopt a clearly delineated orientation program for new Board Members.* Dr. Kinnamon reported that the Team recognized that the District has a process in place with practices that include several orientation sessions for new Trustees, materials that Trustees study, and also a new Trustee workshop held every year in Sacramento sponsored by the League. So while we do those things, we have never formally in policy articulated that. To respond to this recommendation, the Board of Trustees, working with the Chancellor, will formally adopt a policy that delineates our practices. The policy will include candidate and new Trustee orientations. In addition, the District will review the California Community College League's orientation policy, as well as policies from other districts. The goal is to adopt this formalized policy by August 2010.

Dr. Kinnamon reported that there were two District-wide recommendations that were the same for each college. The first recommendation (Recommendation No. 1), dealt with the functional map, which delineates the roles and responsibilities of the different positions and units within the organization. The functional map also shows if we are overlapping or duplicating roles. The recommendation is: *"To meet the standards, the Team recommends that the District and the College maintain an updated functional map and that the District and the College engage in a program of systematic evaluation to assess both the effectiveness of District and College functional relationships and the effectiveness of services that support the institution."* To respond to this, working with the Colleges, the District will develop a process to evaluate and update the functional maps. An evaluation instrument will be developed to assess user satisfaction of the effectiveness of District and College services. The process developed will be reviewed by the Chancellor's Council (constituency groups leadership) and Chancellor's Cabinet. The District will also identify a manager responsible for coordinating the activities necessary for responding to this recommendation. Dr. Kinnamon will also discuss with the Cabinet the strong consideration for an individual from one of the Colleges to spearhead this on an interim basis. The target date to develop a process is September 2010.

Recommendation No. 2: *"To meet the standards, the team recommends that the District and the College complete the evaluation of the resource allocation process in time for budget development for the 2010-2011 academic year, ensuring transparency and assessing the effectiveness of resource allocations in supporting operations."* Dr. Kinnamon reported that the District Council that is designated over matters related to District-wide budget issues, the District Budget Study Group (DBSG), will respond to this recommendation. The DBSG is a collegial consultation group that recommends budget

development processes to the Chancellor. The DBSG is probably the most knowledgeable group around the Budget Allocation Model, budget building process, resource allocation, and how that is tied to planning. The DBSG will assess the effectiveness of the Budget Allocation Model. The assessment will include a comprehensive fiscal analysis including a minimum of three years of historical and comparative data. Dr. Kinnamon reported that he will ask the DBSG to develop a report with any recommendations by October 1, 2010. He reported it is his hope to adopt recommendations by Spring 2011 for the budget development process of the 2011-2012 budget.

At this time, Dr. Kinnamon entertained questions or comments regarding those three recommendations.

In response to a question raised by Mrs. Dvorsky, Dr. Kinnamon reported that the Accreditation Teams will be returning to the Campuses on October 15, 2010.

Las Positas College:

Dr. Pollard reported that the College received seven recommendations from the Accreditation Commission, two of which related to the District, which the Chancellor addressed in his presentation. She also reported that the College received three commendations. She reported that the first three recommendations are all connected to a key concept, the idea of an integrated planning process for the institution, noting we measure our effectiveness as a College on a systemic basis. Dr. Pollard reviewed the recommendations as follows:

Recommendation No. 1 relates to institutional effectiveness. *“To improve to a level of sustained continuous quality improvement, the team recommends that: A. The College increase its capacity for conducting research, fulfill its planning agenda with respect to institutional research and institutional effectiveness, and integrate institutional effectiveness research into planning through regular systemic evaluation of its progress toward achieving institutional goals; and B. The College develop and implement on-going, systematic, college-wide processes to evaluate the effectiveness of its program review, planning and governance systems.”*

Recommendation No. 2 relates to student learning outcomes. *“To meet the Commission’s 2012 deadline, and to achieve a level of proficiency in the assessment of student learning outcomes, the team recommends that the College fully engage both full-time and adjunct faculty in identifying and assessing Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels, and establish and achieve institutional timelines for completing student learning outcomes assessments for all its courses, programs and services.”*

Emphasis should be placed on encouraging institutional dialog about assessment results, rather than dialog about the student learning outcome assessment process. The institution should focus on the use of assessment results for quality assurance and improvement of educational programming to improve student learning, as well as inform planning and resource allocation decisions.” She highlighted that the emphasis is placed more on action and less emphasis on dialog.

Recommendation No. 3 relates to program review. *“To meet the Commission’s 2012 deadline in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and to achieve a level of proficiency in program review for all efforts, the team recommends that: A. The College fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review and planning; and B. The College fully implement a program review process for all administrative programs and services.”*

Recommendation No. 4 relates to information literacy or competency. *“To meet the standards, the team recommends that the College use campus-wide dialog to develop on-going instruction for users of library and learning support services to ensure students develop skills in Information Competency.”*

Recommendation No. 5 relates to ethics code. *“To meet the standards, the team recommends that the College develop a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.”* Dr. Pollard reported that the faculty has a statement, a Senate Ethics Code as well as a statement of faculty professional responsibilities in the Faculty Contract. Classified Professionals have a similar document and the Administrative Team is in the process of working on this recommendation.

Dr. Pollard highlighted the Commendations received from the Commission as follows:

Commendation No. 1: *“The team commends the College for its commitment to promoting the principles of diversity and equity. Most noteworthy are the numerous activities and contributions of the faculty, staff and administrators that comprise the Campus Change Network who have achieved significant success in fostering campus dialog and in nurturing cultural awareness and competence for students and the greater community.”*

Commendation No. 2: *“The team commends the faculty and staff for maintaining a caring, collegial and supportive environment for students. The College’s investment and maintenance of facilities and educational infrastructure is impressive and students expressed that the faculty and staff are dedicated to supporting learning.”*

Commendation No. 3: *“The team commends the College for its commitment to, and support of, its technology infrastructure to enhance student learning. In particular, the team notes the exemplary service and contributions of the Technology Department that*

was recognized by College faculty and staff with the ‘What is Right About Las Positas College’ award for outstanding customer service and the Innovation Center that received accolades for the quality of the training it provides faculty and students.”

Dr. Pollard reported that she is very proud of the fact that the College’s accreditation was reaffirmed, however, there is a follow-up report that is due by October 15. The report should demonstrate resolution of the recommendations, specifically Recommendations No. 3 and 4. She noted to make progress on and resolution of Recommendation No. 3, they have to make significant progress on Recommendations No. 1 and 2. She assured the Board that they are on track to accomplish this goal.

Dr. Pollard reviewed the College’s Action Plan for beginning the work of meeting the requirements of Recommendations No. 3 and 4. She reported that prior to receiving the Report from the Commission, the College had already begun its work. A “Common Ground” Ad-Hoc Committee was formed and worked on developing models for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning. They reached consensus on the need for and a plan to develop a “common tool” to track all Program Review data, both instructional and non-instructional, and Student Services Program Review. In addition, a mandatory Flex Day will be held March 12 to be used to further Institutional Strategic Planning Process and in particular identify key performance indicators for each institutional strategic goal. She reported that they presented this to the College Community at the February Town Meeting and at that time the College Council reviewed the recommendations and identified a strategy of approach. In particular, the strategy is focused on what needs to be accomplished by October. It is her plan to present the final draft of the Follow-up Report to the Board of Trustees at the September 21 Board Meeting. She reported that there is College “buy-in” on this timeline and Action Plan.

Dr. Pollard reported that in terms of the second part of the recommendation for an integrated program review for administrative services, the College has already begun its work. The College will be piloting this semester a non-instructional program review for four departments. The complete process will be launched in the fall for all administrative programs and services. An update will be provided to College Council in April 2010.

Dr. Pollard reported that for Recommendation No. 4 for information competency, the faculty has already started that process as well. They endorsed and asked the Academic Senate to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to work to address this issue that includes librarians, faculty, counseling faculty, and administration to respond to those two areas. An update will be provided to the College Community in April 2010.

Mrs. Dvorsky commented that the College has very short timelines with a lot of work to accomplish. Dr. Pollard noted that she agrees and suggested that one of the beautiful things about the process is that it creates a sense of urgency for the College that was important and needed. She noted that even though the Accreditation Team came in October and the official report was not received until February, they had seen the “writing on the wall.” As soon as the Team left campus, Dr. Jones had already started on the process. She reported that the Action Plan is the reflection of the work done by the Constituency Group Leaders and Dr. Jones.

Dr. Gin commented that he is amazed how quickly the College got on top of this, noting that he believes the College is “ahead of the curve” to meet the deadline of October 2010. Dr. Pollard reported that this is a unique challenge in that they received the report in February, and the Progress Report is due to the Commission in October. Given that, the report will need to be vetted by the College Community in August and the Board will be asked to approve the report in September. Therefore, the College will need to have the process completed by April or May with the writing done over the summer. They do not want to have anything written in which the College Community has not participated.

Dr. Mitzman commented that he is pleased to see the “team effort” in this tremendous job.

Chabot College:

In Dr. Barberena’s absence, Mr. George Railey presented the Chabot College response to the Accreditation Report. He reported that the College has put its primary focus on Recommendation No. 2. He reported that the College received five additional recommendations as well as the two College/District Recommendations which Dr. Kinnamon spoke to previously in his presentation. These six recommendations will be addressed in the Mid-term Report due in 2012. The next comprehensive report will be due in 2015.

Recommendation No. 2: “The team recommends that the College develop processes that more clearly and effectively combine the results of program review with unit planning, student learning outcomes and assessments, and institutional planning and budgeting.”

Mr. Railey reported that once the Team left in October, the Administration sensed that the College would be getting this recommendation. Therefore, on December 20, 2009, a group was pulled together to address this recommendation and continues to meet weekly. He reported that the recommendation essentially requires unifying the program review processes in a single process, to simplify the process, shorten the duration length of the planning cycle, and incorporate it into the budget allocation process. Mr. Railey reported that Constituency participation has been excellent. Mr. Railey specifically acknowledged the support of Mr. Michael Absher and the Academic Senate, as well as Program Review

Committee Chairs, Institutional Planning and Budget Committee representatives, Curriculum Committee Chairs, Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator, Student Learning Assessment Committee, and Academic Deans.

Mr. Railey reported that the College is not planning to do a total overhaul of Program Review but will take the pieces that work well for everyone and build on the base to improve and streamline what is currently done. He reported that a meeting was held on December 20 and facilitated by Julie Slark of California Community College Brain Trust. From that meeting, they reviewed the program review process and unit planning process, identified areas of potential improvement, and highlighted potential opportunities to align current program review and unit planning processes with meeting the Recommendation No. 2 requirement. Regular weekly meetings have been held to carry forward the work of this meeting.

Mr. Railey reviewed the anticipated outcomes:

- Program review and unit planning will be a single streamlined process;
- Program review cycle will be one year with the two following years for program assessment activities and updates to resource allocation needs as identified by program review assessments and unit plans;
- Program level outcomes will be developed with timelines for assessment;
- Rotational Program review schedule developed;
- Curriculum review of courses will be aligned with discipline program review schedule;
- Improve faculty access to the data they need to conduct program review unit planning.

Mr. Railey reported that a Flex Day will be held on March 19 in which all program groups will be asked to identify at least two program-level student learning outcomes which will help address Recommendation No. 1. He noted that Recommendation No. 1 is to speed up the process of identifying and assessing student learning outcomes.

Mr. Railey reported that they will be improving their Program Review Website so that all the data files for this process will be in one place and can be accessed anywhere by faculty.

Mr. Railey reviewed the timeline for the work plan as follows:

- Complete the draft of revised program review and unit planning process by March 3;
- Present the draft to the Institutional Planning and Budget Committee for review March 10;
- Present draft to Academic Senate March 11;

- Flex Day March 19 to introduce program review unit planning process and begin work to identify program-level outcomes;
- Flex Day April 28 to continue work.

He noted that this work needs to be completed before faculty leave at the end of term; the writing will take place over the summer; and conduct a shared governance process and approval process for submitting the report in October to the Commission. He reported that a request has been made to the Academic Senate for a Follow-up Report writer and editor. The draft of the report is projected to be complete by the end of May and a final review by Shared Governance Committees in August-September.

Mr. Railey reported that the rest of the recommendations will then be reviewed and ready to go by the 2012 Mid-term Report.

Trustee Vecchiarelli, as a long-time teacher, expressed concern that sometimes you focus on these issues and not on what you are doing in the classroom. He reported that years ago this was done and was called Behavioral Objectives. He stressed that the important thing is for a good teacher to know about student learning outcomes and if you follow them, you can monitor the success of the students. He realizes this is a state-directed situation, but it seems to him that it is a lot of work and it takes away from the focus of teaching. He congratulated everyone for their participation in this process.

Trustee Dvorsky reported that program review and student outcomes have been the anchor of accreditation for sometime except that they haven't put the push in it as they have this year. She noted that many of our neighbors are not getting their full accreditation. She noted that Chabot, as well as Las Positas College, has a tremendous job to do. She questioned if the Board will be seeing any of the results or reports before they go to the Commission, to which Mr. Railey responded "absolutely."

Trustee Gin commented that he is most impressed with the Colleges' road maps that have been set forth and its great determination. He was pleased and comforted that there have been many accomplishments made already.

Trustee Gelles noted that the Board is well aware that this is an on-going evaluation and on-going work that the staffs do at both colleges. He noted that this study meeting is not the only time we hear about the work that is being done, that they are constantly made aware of things going on at the Colleges. He reported that at a later date the Board will hold an all-day workshop and they will spend more time on this issue. He noted that he has always considered it busy work with the state and the K-12 system did a similar process. He noted that this year as part of his Presidency, he wants to make sure that staff knows that the Board is aware of and appreciates the hard work being done. He noted that there are a lot of educators on the Board and they take much pride in knowing the positive bright

people we have in our schools. He asked the Chancellor to send letters to the Colleges on behalf of the Board thanking them for the work they have done, the work they are doing, and the work that we will see at a later date.

Dr. Kinnamon thanked the Board for the recognition of staff, noting they do work very hard and there is so much more that is coming. He reported that he lived through an accreditation process one other time in this District, and the recommendations given at that time did not resurface this time. He believes that is one of the reasons we fared positively through this visit. Again, with the spirit in which everybody is embracing this set of recommendations, he feels that there will be the same outcomes. He noted that is what is unique about this organization - that they approach things with a positive feeling and even if they don't agree with all the recommendations or specific pieces of a recommendation, they own it and try to make it something positive for the organization.

Trustee Gelles thanked those in the audience tonight for their attendance. He noted that the computer programs we have developed in the last few years are just "par excellence" and that is why we are going in so many positive directions.

ADJOURNMENT

Trustee Dvorsky made a motion, seconded by Trustee Mitzman, to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

NEXT MEETING

The next Board of Trustees Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 16, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. at the District Office.

Minutes prepared by:

Beverly Bailey

Secretary, Board of Trustees
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District