

MASTER PLANNING – TEAM A

MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 2017

CS 177

Present: Ed Karpp (Chair), Tina Andersen-Wahlberg (Admin), Saodat Aziskhanova (CSEA), Sevada Chamras (Joint Faculty), Keith Conover (Joint Faculty), Troy Davis (Joint Faculty), Daphne Dionisio (Joint Faculty), Mike Dulay (Joint Faculty), Glenn Gardner (Joint Faculty), Lourdes Girardi (Joint Faculty), Nancy Getty (Joint Faculty), Emelyn Judge (Joint Faculty), Zohara Kaye (Guild), Beth Kronbeck (Joint Faculty), Toni Reyes (Admin), Michael Ritterbrown (Admin), Deobrah Robiglio (Joint Faculty), Liz Russell (Joint Faculty), Paul Schlossman (Admin), Rory Schlueter (Joint Faculty), Monette Tiernan (Joint Faculty), Paul Vera (Joint Faculty), Andy Young (Senate), Jan Young (Joint Faculty)

Absent: Emin Azarian (ASGCC), Agnes Eguaras (Administration), , Anthony Culpepper (Admin), Troy Davis (Joint Faculty), Andrineh Dilanchian (CSEA), Marc Drescher (Admin), Shushanik Gabrielyan (ASGCC), Lourdes Girardi (Joint Faculty), Sarkis Ghazarian (Joint Faculty), Jon Gold (Joint Faculty), Peter Green (Joint Faculty), Robert Hill (Admin), Deborah Kinley (Admin), Michelle Mora (Admin), Narbeh Nazari (CSEA), Elmira Nazaryan (Admin), Rick Perez (Admin), Alfred Ramirez (Admin), Peter Stathis (Admin), Pamela Rosas (CSEA), Scott Rubke (Joint Faculty), Jan Swinton (Admin), David Viar (Admin), Teyanna Williams (Admin),

Guest: Connie Lantz, Andra Verstrate, Lisa Brooks

Quorum: 23/47 Voting Members

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Ed Karpp at approximately 1:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes:

- I. The Minutes of December 2, 2016 were reviewed.
 - a. ***It was MSC (Gardner/Schlueter) that the Minutes from December 2, 2016 be approved without corrections. (One Abstention – Getty.)***
- II. The Notes from March 10, 2017 were reviewed.

Old Business:

- III. College Mission Statement
 - a. A revised Mission Statement was previously presented by Dr. Viar in fall 2016.
 - b. A survey went out to the campus via Survey Monkey to collect input on the revised Draft.
 - c. Team B reviewed the input, a lot of which was philosophical and mostly questioned the difference between a Mission and a Vision Statement.

- d. The proposal is to now change the document (BP 1200) to a District Mission, Vision, and Values Statement.
 - e. The current draft was reviewed.
 - f. The Mission Statement is the same as it was in December except for a change that was made to, “primarily serves Adults,” to “primarily serves a diverse population of the greater Los Angeles Region.”
 - i. This change was made to address feedback from different groups which noted that diversity was not mentioned.
 - g. The Vision Statement remains the same.
 - h. Team B also proposes to move out the three bullets from the previous Mission Statement to the Values Statement.
 - i. Two grammatical suggestions were made:
 - i. “A diverse population who are capable,” should be changed to, “a diverse population that is capable.”
 - ii. “The college’s primary focus is to address students’ needs augmented by our commitment to diversity, inclusion, and equity,” should be changed to, “augmented by its commitment to diversity, inclusion, and equity.”
 - j. A question was raised as to whether or not there would be any repercussions by moving the bullets out of the Mission Statement and into the Values Statement.
 - i. For instance, how does this impact Program Review and Resource Requests which are asked to link to the Mission Statement?
 - 1. Part V of the Values Statement starts off as, “As part of its mission,” which therefore can be claimed as part of the mission.
 - ii. What other impact might this move have?
 - iii. Will there now be a checkbox in Program Review to tie it to a Values Statement?
 - 1. Daphne Dionisio will be meeting with Department Chairs to get feedback on how they want the new Database set up.
 - k. If this document is approved it will be sent to the Senate for review. If there are any further changes they will not come back to Team A but go directly to IPCC.
- ***It was MSC (Aziskhanova/Kronbeck) that the draft of the Mission Statement be approved with corrections to grammatical errors.***

IV. Review of Institutional Master Plan (IMP) Development Process

- a. The committee reviewed where we are in the sequence.
 - i. The March 10 meeting discussed internal scanning and a document has been drafted out of the meeting.
 - ii. We are on meeting #2 where we will discuss: Mission Statement and Annual Goals.
 - iii. Team Members have been asked to review documents in Sharepoint Folders.
 - iv. Assignment: Go into the Document Library that most members find most interesting and come to the June 2 meeting with some thoughts on what are opportunities for the college and what are threats the college faces from the outside.

- v. June 2 will be the third meeting where the team will brainstorm the overarching goals for the college.
- vi. Team B will work over summer and draft goals / a concrete document we can react to.
 - 1. The Aim is to have it approved by Board in the spring of 2018.
- b. The Team reviewed the pyramid diagram.
 - i. Mission Statement sits on top and drives our goals.
 - ii. Institutional Goals is the middle layer.
 - iii. Bottom layer is made up of the component plans.

New Business:

- V. Annual Goals for 2017 – 2018
 - a. The Annual Goals from 2016 – 2017 were reviewed.
 - b. Michael Ritterbrown sent out information regarding Guided Pathways with the idea that we should perhaps add something about Guided Pathways to our Annual Goals as that is where our resources will be moving over the next few years.
 - i. It was suggested that we either set our Annual Goals based on the concept of Guided Pathways or at least add an item for Guided Pathways.
 - ii. In reviewing the goals it was noted that Goals 1,2,3 and most of 5 would fit under the pillars of Guided Pathways.
 - iii. There was discussion on how the college needs to spend time building consensus on campus to determine if this is the path we want to go. The changes to our goals should follow the consensus and not lead the consensus.
 - iv. Can we organize the Annual Goals around the principles?
 - v. It was suggested that we perhaps have a goal that is always on the list that would include the concepts of Guided Pathways. This could be something along the lines of, “The college will develop an overarching or integrated plan to promote student success by incorporating the various grants into cohesive educational goals.”
 - c. There was discussion as to whether or not some of the current goals which have past their deadlines have been completed.
 - i. Annual Goal #4 – Is there a sustainability policy?
 - 1. This pertains to Facilities (BP and AR 3110 – Environmental Sustainability)
 - 2. This has been completed.
- ***It was MSC (Young/Dulay) to remove Annual Goal #4 as it has been completed.***
- d. In reviewing Annual Goal #5 it appears that it is an Operating Principle rather than an Annual Goal.

➤ ***It was MSC (Ritterbrown/Young) that Annual Goal #5 be removed and placed as an Operating Principle.***

- e. The Team worked to develop a new goal that would encompass the idea of developing a plan to redesign academic programs, support services, and funding streams to create more clearly structured and educationally coherent program pathways to student end goals.
- i. The goal will be revisited next year.
 - ii. The timeline will list it as spring 2018.
 - iii. What will the measures be and who will be responsible for this?
 1. Michael Ritterbrown will take responsibility for the assessment and calling the agent.
 2. The measure will be that if we develop a plan then it has been accomplished.

➤ ***It was MSC (Dulay/Tiernan) that Annual Goal #4 read:***

The college will work to integrate projects from all available funding sources to design academic programs and support services to provide coherent program pathways that enhance the student experience from recruitment to completion.

- f. The Annual Goal Document was reviewed for any other changes.

➤ ***It was MSC (Young/Andersen-Wahlberg) that the Annual Goal Document be approved with the changes noted above.***

VI. Institution Set-Standards

a. College Level

- i. Senate might change Standard 3 because of significant growth.
- ii. Standard 4 might change as C&I has dropped back but it might need to wait a year or two.
- iii. The Team reviewed the report that has been set by the Senate.
- iv. We report this every year to Accreditation.
- v. If we drop below our standard then we need to address it.
- vi. One important point is that they are set by the Institution and not by the State or Federal Government.

b. Program Level

- i. CTE standards set minimum standards for employment rate.
- ii. This is not perfect data because employment is not necessarily in their field.
- iii. Senate is reviewing the Institution and CTE Standards.

VII. Institutional Effectiveness Goals

- a. These are not required by the Feds or Accrediting Commission.

- b. It is required by the Chancellor's Office.
- c. Similar to Standards but it is regarding the setting of goals.
- d. These are aspirational goals and not minimum standards.
- e. Funding is not currently based on this.
- f. There are no real consequences for not meeting goals.
- g. Report on Institutional Effectiveness Goals 2016-2017 was reviewed.
- h. List of 33 indicators that colleges are given data on. We only have to set goals for a few of them.
- i. Senate has been setting the Academic Goals here. Budget has been setting Fiscal Goals. College Exec will set Accreditation Status Goal.
- j. Remedial Scorecard rate was at 36.5 for short-term and 37 for long-term. We have made significant improvement over the years. Our current is above the long term goal.
- k. Short and long term was changed to 38% and 39%.

Other:

VIII. Guided Pathways

- a. There is a panel at 3:00 p.m. today discussing the future of GUSD.

IX. Task forces

- a. Ed Karpp will email groups of various task forces that Team Members are on.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Next Meeting: June 2, 2017

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui