

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

**MINUTES
September 7, 2010**

PLACE

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

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. Recording Secretary Mary Hargiss called the roll. All Board Members were present at the time of roll. The Board immediately adjourned to a Closed Session, which ended at 6:50 p.m.

The Board readjoined in Open Session at 6:53 p.m. Recording Secretary Mary Hargiss called the roll. All Board Members were present at the time of roll.

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Trustee Arnulfo Cedillo
 Trustee Isobel F. Dvorsky
 Trustee Donald L. "Dobie" Gelles
 Trustee Hal G. Gin
 Trustee Barbara F. Mertes
 Trustee Marshall Mitzman
 Trustee Carlo Vecchiarelli
 Student Trustee Anthony J. Colagross

Members Absent: None

Managers Present: Dr. Joel L. Kinnamon, Chancellor
 Dr. Guy Lease, Interim President, Las Positas College
 Dr. Celia Barberena, President, Chabot College
 Mr. Ken Agustin
 Mr. Jeff Baker
 Ms. Julia Dozier
 Mr. Wyman Fong
 Dr. MaryAnne Gularte
 Dr. Howard Irvin

Mr. Jeffrey Kingston
Mr. Yulian Ligioso
Dr. Pam Luster
Ms. Jeannine Methe
Dr. George Railey
Ms. Laura Weaver

Recording Secretary: Ms. Mary Hargiss

Others Present : Ms. Jennifer Adams, Las Positas College
Ms. Sharon Gach, President, Las Positas College Classified
Senate
Ms. Kathy Kelley, President, Chabot College Academic
Senate
Mr. Julian Lim, Las Positas College Express
Mr. Jim Matthews, Chabot College
Mr. Daniel Nenni, President, Las Positas College Associated
Students
Ms. Sarah Thompson, President, Las Positas College
Academic Senate
Mr. Gordon Watt, President, Chabot College Classified
Senate

PLEDGE TO FLAG

Ms. Sarah Thompson led the pledge to the flag.

REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

Trustee Gelles reported that in Closed Session the Board unanimously approved a contract with Dr. Joel L. Kinnamon, Chancellor. The motion was made by Trustee Mertes and seconded by Trustee Dvorsky.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no Public Comments offered at this meeting.

PRESENTATION: FIRST READING – FOLLOW-UP REPORT FOR ACCREDITATION, CHABOT COLLEGE

Dr. Barberena reported that the Accreditation Team Visit occurred in October, 2009. This Follow-up Report is required by the Accreditation Commission as outlined in their letter of

January, 2010, which reaffirmed the College's Accreditation status. She reported that the Recommendation of the Accrediting Commission is to effectively combine: Program Review with Unit Planning; Student Learning Outcomes with Assessment; and Institutional Planning with Budget. The Follow-up Report is due by October 15. She introduced Dr. George Railey, Accreditation Liaison, and Mr. James Matthews, Faculty Member, who will present the report tonight.

Dr. Railey reported that the report is a culmination of a college-wide work group that met between December, 2009 and May, 2010 to: Review program review processes and cycle; review current unit planning process; and inclusion of SLOs and PLOs in planning and assessment.

Mr. Jim Matthews reported that he was one of the Faculty Co-Chairs of the Accreditation Self-Study and assisted in the Follow-up Report. The goal was to have the very best Follow-up Report possible. He also recognized the assistance of Dr. Gene Groppetti, who was instrumental in editing.

Dr. Railey presented a PowerPoint presentation which reviewed the Process; Program Review Work-Group Recommendations; Program Review Cycle; and Revised Structure of the Planning Review and Budget Council. He also recognized the process participants. The Program Review Work-Group Recommendations are:

- 1) Congratulate the college community for well-deserved program review success at every opportunity.
- 2) Enhance the role of student learning outcomes (SLO).
- 3) Streamline and simplify program review web materials and process documents.
- 4) Refine the program review cycle (3 years) and timelines.
- 5) Sustain strong program review committee participation, leadership and strength so that the committee can fulfill its role in providing structured review and feedback of program review reports.
- 6) Further develop SLO model and integrate that process into program review such that SLO assessment is an ongoing and continuous process.
- 7) Conduct a communication campaign about program review and planning by all college leadership.
- 8) Document administrator/dean role in program.
- 9) Examine program review measures for completeness and consider adding additional components, such as workforce training, staff development, interdisciplinary activities, articulation issues, technology and pedagogical inquiry as part of an ongoing evaluation of our program review process.
- 10) Maintain a group of SLO, program review, and institutional leaders to oversee, refine, and coordinate program review's related structures.

Dr. Railey reported that the College received one recommendation along with the requirement of a Follow-up Report and visit. The visit will occur this Fall and include the Accreditation Team Chair along with another individual appointed by the Commission.

Dr. Railey reported that the Institutional Planning and Budget Council (IPBC) was revised as the Planning Review and Budget Council (PRBC) to insure that there was college-wide representation across the campus. The Shared Governance Chairs sit on this 26 member committee, which includes Classified staff and student government representation. The revised structure was reviewed and approved by the Academic Senate in May, 2010; and College Council reviewed it on September 3, 2010.

Trustee Mertes questioned if the College has Standing Committees where the membership will continue for the entire three-year cycle. Dr. Barberena reported that each discipline or program faculty with the support of their dean will be responsible for looking at their data through the three-year cycle. The Program Review and Budget Council is a review committee to ensure that the process has been followed, that people are submitting their reports, that unit plans are in accord, etc. She noted that it is really a college-wide involvement of faculty and deans at the program review level and a broader committee (PRBC) overseeing the process.

Trustees Gin and Cedillo commended the College on the excellent process.

Student Trustee Colagross requested clarification of the Program Review Work-Group Recommendation No. 2, specifically questioning if the intent is to include student learning outcomes (SLOs) with assessments, to which Dr. Railey responded affirmatively.

Trustee Gelles suggested that both Colleges submit regular status reports (six month intervals) to the Board.

PRESENTATION: FIRST READING – FOLLOW-UP REPORT FOR ACCREDITATION, LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

Dr. Lease introduced Dr. Pam Luster to present the Las Positas College Follow-up Report.

Dr. Luster presented a PowerPoint presentation of Las Positas College's Accreditation Follow-up Report. She reported that the College is in good shape because of all the work done by Dr. Laurel Jones. She reported that the Accrediting Commission made two recommendations to the College; however, Recommendations 3 (Program Review) has two parts. She reviewed the recommendations and actions completed to date as follows:

Recommendation 3: Program Review

To meet the Commission's 2012 deadline in the assessment of students 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.
- b. The College fully implement a program review process for all administrative programs and services.

Recommendation 3a Actions:

The College has completed its integration of student learning outcomes assessment into the Instructional Program Review Model. Results of that integration will be codified through the work of the Instructional Program Review Committee.

Specific achievements include:

1. Formal integration of SLO assessment into the instructional program review model.
2. Approved planning process model, timeline and common tool for program review models used throughout the institution (outcomes from Common Ground; Common Tool; Academic Senate; Student Learning Outcomes Committee; Flex Day; College Council Committee).
3. Formal creation of the oversight Instructional Program Review Committee.
4. Formal approval of the Program Review Coordinator position.
5. Formal approval of the Strategic Planning process.
6. Formal creation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

Recommendation 3b Actions:

The three pilot Administrative Unit Program Reviews have been completed and serve as the evaluated process that began for all administrative unit reviews in Fall 2010. This demonstrates resolution of Recommendation 3b made in the visiting team's 2009 Evaluation Report.

Planning goals and needs from the Administrative Unit Program Reviews take their place alongside the instructional program review plans and goals and the student services program review plans and goals as part of the Institutional Plan 2015 and as part of the demonstrated proficiency level of all program review efforts.

Recommendation 4: Information Competency

To meet the standard the team recommends that the College use campus-wide dialog to develop the ongoing instruction for users of library and learning support services to ensure students develop skills in Information Competency.

Recommendation 4 Actions:

The Recommendation 4 Ad Hoc Committee achieved several things that address and complete the information competency recommendation to use dialogue to develop instruction for users of library and learning support as they develop skills in information competency.

Demonstrated outcomes include:

- Completed dialogue sessions with the college campus;
- Completed web page on Information Competency
- Completed timeline for response through December, 2010;
- Completed Information Competency Statement;
- Completed Information Competency Standards;
- Approved faculty survey for Fall 2010;
- Approved pilot projects for Health 1 and English 1A courses.

Dr. Luster reported that college-wide input was gathered through posting the reports on the “wiki”, an open source system that gathers written comments online. She reported that the Follow-up Report was approved at College Council on August 31, 2010. She recognized and thanked the ad-hoc committees who worked diligently on these recommendations and actions.

Dr. Lease echoed Dr. Luster’s comments and thanks to Dr. Jones for her leadership in this project. He also thanked Dr. Luster for stepping in as Interim Vice President of Academic Services when Dr. Jones left.

Comments:

Student Trustee Colagross commended the College for its use of “wiki”, noting it is very proactive and “new age.” He commended Dr. Luster on a fabulous presentation.

Trustee Cedillo commented that both Colleges did very well in their Accreditation Evaluations, especially considering what is happening with the Commission throughout the State. He commented that we should be very proud of where we are and what we have accomplished. He also recognized the Colleges in the way they responded to the Accreditation Recommendations.

Trustee Gin commented on the high quality of these reports, noting “it is time to take a sigh of relief and move on.” He commented that the process is there to yield success.

Trustee Mertes noted that in both reports, the emphasis in the recommendations was on program review, planning, and governance systems. She questioned Dr. Luster if this will work into that process with activities that will include improving and understanding of how this process works? Dr. Luster responded affirmatively, noting that the College has not only these recommendations but between now and the next Accreditation Self-Study, we will be working towards others. She reported that College Council is the steering committee for accreditation. In addition, they have the newly established Institutional Effectiveness Committee that will be taking the goals and the strategies from the Strategic Plan. She noted that much of what is in the Strategic Plan meets the goals requested by the Accreditation Commission. The College is looking at the Accreditation Recommendations and how we prioritize our Strategic Plan Goals so that they can start to work on those first.

As a follow-up, Trustee Mertes questioned if there is more of an emphasis on instruction, than on student services at this point? Dr. Luster responded affirmatively, noting that the emphasis is “on many things.”

Trustee Dvorsky commented that she believes the Colleges have taken the Commission’s recommendations to heart and have done excellent jobs. She noted that she was upset with the Accreditation Team’s exit comments. She also commented that she believes the Colleges are ready for the next Accreditation Visits.

Trustee Mitzman thanked both Colleges, and noted he is proud to be a part of this organization. He commented that at the exit interviews, it was obvious to see the hard work and the passion that the Colleges feel. He commented that the Colleges have shown in a positive way their response to the Accreditation Evaluations.

Trustee Vecchiarelli congratulated both Colleges on doing a great job. He noted that he measures success at graduation where he sees the results of all the students and where they are going, some going on to four year schools. He is very proud to be a part of this District.

Trustee Gelles commented that this Board is a Board of educators, with hundreds of years of education experience. This Board knows and understands the effort, work, and time it takes to do these reports. He expressed that “we are very proud of our Colleges and very proud to defend them any time someone wants to challenge us on what we do.” “Accolades to all the people involved at both Colleges.” He noted that he looks forward to some of the same as we move on.

Chancellor Kinnamon thanked Dr. Luster, Dr. Railey and Mr. Matthews on their presentations. He expressed that this process is a testimony to both the Colleges, noting the strength and the challenges with collaboration and inclusiveness, “which our constituency leaders here understand as they serve in their roles.” “ However, in taking the time to work together and be collaborative, you can see the product that comes out.” He expressed that he appreciates all the time and effort of all involved because he believes we will be received well by the Commission and will meet the criteria that they have set for us.

GOOD OF THE ORDER

Trustee Cedillo requested an update to the budget. He expressed concern with the students and financial aid. Chancellor Kinnamon reported that we were scheduled to approve the budget this evening as part of the Budget Study Meeting, however, we opted to push that to the next meeting since there has not been a State Budget approved. He reported that the Chancellor’s Office has provided us the latitude to delay the adoption of the budget. He noted that as we get more current information, the budget that is brought to the Board will be more accurate. At that presentation we will be sharing with the Board how we are meeting our unfunded mandates and some of the challenges that we continue to struggle with in the near term (one to three years) and how it impacts our other objects of expenditures. He reported that there are different theories on when a budget will be approved, noting that it is his hope that when we come back to the Board that there will be an approved State Budget. He reported that we have been using the scenarios in the Governor’s proposed budget for our Tentative Budget and potentially our Adopted Budget, if the Legislature continues to be pushed in that direction.

Vice Chancellor Legaspi reported that there has not been much development in terms of the State Budget. He reported that when there is no State Budget, Community College Districts do not receive their apportionment from the State. What many Districts have to do is borrow from outside agencies so that they can meet their payroll, etc. This District is fortunate enough that we have other funds within our District that we can borrow. When we do receive our apportionment, we will pay back those other funds. We will be able to meet our obligations, our warrants, as well as pay warrants even without the State Budget.

Trustee Cedillo questioned how this is affecting student financial aid, to which Dr. Barberena reported that most of our financial aid is from PELL Grants, so it is from federal sources. Trustee Cedillo questioned Cal Grants, to which Dr. Barberena reported that if we don’t get the money from the State, we will be able to fund it to the students as we did last year.

Dr. Kinnamon reported that many Districts will not honor the Cal Grants but we have continued to honor the Cal Grants for our students so that they are still able to attend.

Student Trustee Colagross apologized for his absence at the last Board Meeting, noting that it is good to be back and the school year is going well. He reported that "Las Positas College is as beautiful as ever, if not more beautiful."

ADJOURNMENT

Motion No. 1

Trustee Gin made a motion, seconded by Trustee Dvorsky, to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

NEXT MEETING

The next Board of Trustees Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 21, 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