

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

English Lounge

May 10, 2005

1:30-3:30 p.m.

MEETING NOTES

Members Present:

Phyllis Arias	Patrice Kaska	Eloy Oakley	Janice Tomson
Lou Anne Bynum	E. Jan Kehoe	Irma Ramos	Fred Trapp
Lee Douglas	Pauline Merry	Kevin Ryan	Linda Umbdenstock
Chris Jacobs	David Morse	Sigrid Sexton	

Facilitator(s): Rene Castro; Diane Burbie, NCCJ, Program Specialist

Note taker: Marisa Perez

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes: April 19, 2005

- Minutes approved.

3. Basic Skills

- Janice Tomson distributed the final Basic Skills report. The Academic Senate has accepted the Basic Skills report and has made suggestions to items 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12. Recommendations are highlighted in bold.
- Kevin Ryan made the following corrections to item 12 – added 110 and 130 under Math and moved 883 to Reading.
- Dr. Kehoe asked why item 7 did not include a recommendation to the Student Development Planning Committee (SDPC) since counseling activities fell under this committee.
- It was decided by the group that item 7 should include SDPC.
- Linda Umbdenstock asked how the report would be handled in regards to Planning.
- Dr. Kehoe responded that the entire report should go EMPC for forwarding to the planning committees.
- Phyllis Arias gave an update on the VTEA proposal. The proposal was unofficially awarded \$6,000. The request was for \$26,000.
- Janice Tomson asked what the next steps were. Who makes this happen? Who will organize this grant? She also stated that once the award was made, the group should meet again to discuss this.
- Phyllis Arias stated that it would be helpful to have clear thinking on this and to get the role of the task force in writing.
- Lee Douglas asked who was responsible to inform the task members.
- It was stated a small advisory group was put together at the last meeting including David Morse; PIO; Kevin Ryan; Phyllis Arias; Lee Douglas; and Mike Tuitasi.

- Phyllis Arias asked how the group would be organized, how the grant will work, and commented that the process needs to be detailed,
- Dr. Kehoe responded that the advisory group should tackle item 1 and that the rest should be sent to the Curriculum Committee and EMPC.

4. Accreditation Update

- Linda Umbdenstock passed out 4 handouts related to accreditation, including WASC guidelines on preparation of the midterm report, recommendations from the October 2002 visiting team, the "planning agendas" and the "planning summary" from the Self-Study..
- Linda Umbdenstock stated that the last accreditation report was completed in August 2002; site visit in November 2002; and interim progress report in October 2004. The next accreditation visit will be in October 2005. Linda stated that she and David Morse had met and that we needed to prepare the response to the team recommendations and the response to self-identified "planning agendas".
- Linda Umbdenstock stated that we have reported on recommendations 3, 4, and 5 already. They will collect information/updates on the required items and will distribute a draft report to the college community to be finalized after comments are received.
- Fred Trapp asked when the report needs to be completed.
- Linda Umbdenstock stated that Maria Narvaez has sent people information on each area they need to work on to be returned by the end of the spring term. Planning is compiling this information.
- Pauline Merry asked when the next self-study was scheduled to be completed.
- Linda Umbdenstock stated that we will begin gathering information for the report in the spring of 2007; drafting of the report will done in spring 2008; and a site visit will be completed in fall 2008.
- Dr. Kehoe responded that when we begin writing the new study, we will have to parallel this to the new accreditation standards. This will be a little easier since we are at the end of the new standards period.
- Dr. Kehoe stated that we will need a third accreditation chair – someone from the classified staff. John Tortarolo can recommend someone for this responsibility.

5. Review of Charges from Planning Committees

- Janice Tomson suggested we tackle the hardest charges first.

Student Development Planning Committee (SDPC)

- The current and proposed charge for SDPC was distributed.
- Eloy Oakley asked what the Student Development Plan was.
- Linda Umbdenstock stated that this was a subset of the Educational Master Plan.
- Dr. Kehoe stated that this was the same as the Student Services Master Plan.
- Linda Umbdenstock stated that this plan was a much more holistic approach than a compilation of departmental plans in the area.
- David Morse asked about bullet 5. Is this a new charge? To what end will the SDPC review plans? What exactly is this trying to get at?

- Linda Umbdenstock responded that schools make plans that impact student services and SDPC wants to have some input on this.
- Joyce Black asked if IPC has an executive summary of each plan by each school.
- Lee Douglas responded that IPC hears the plans and discusses the plans.
- Joyce Black stated that there is a need for a synthesis of what comes out of IPC.
- David Morse asked for general trends, general summary.
- Chris Jacobs stated that IPC would forward recommendations to various committees.
- Dr. Kehoe stated that schools deal with formats, which consolidated information at the school level.
- Phyllis Arias asked if department schools plans were not in that category already (ex: student services category).
- David Morse asked how school plans are organized. He stated that we need this information in a short summary, with basic ideas, and an easy to read format, similar to what Joyce Black suggested.
- Linda Umbdenstock stated that we need a concrete vehicle for these groups to use. It also needs to be formalized and the expectations need to be stated clearly.
- The group made changes to the proposed charges for SDPC as noted in the attachment.

Instructional Planning Committee (IPC)

- The current and proposed charge for IPC was distributed.
- Joyce Black began this discussion and stated that IPC reviewed the charges and made the following changes. The only concern was raised by Richard Jennings. He was concerned about the capital outlay bullet 5. The committee does not allocate funding for capital outlay – this is an Academic Affairs responsibility. IPC only monitors this.
- David Morse asked about maintenance and planning projects.
- Phyllis Arias stated that the capital outlay definition was confusing.
- Janice Tomson stated that this bullet is referring to the block grant funds for equipment.
- Chris Jacobs stated that in regards to capital outlay, IPC heard the funding requests from schools and then handed this off to the Vice President.
- Dr. Kehoe stated that the bullet as written has no value. There needs to be priorities. Planning is viewed in long term such as EMPC and Budget and short term such as equipment. The planning process needs to include an analysis of what's necessary to fund your plan, and then this is tied to the budget.
- Lou Anne Bynum asked what's keeping any committee from making recommendations on how funds are distributed.
- Dr. Kehoe stated that the problem is that we have operational funds that everybody wants.
- Eloy Oakley stated that block grant funds ONLY cover 1) instructional equipment; 2) library media; and 3) scheduled maintenance. There needs to be a decision made on how these funds are allocated and who is responsible.
- Joyce Black stated for example, if a department wanted a new writing center, there would need to be an analysis of what staff and facilities are needed. IPC would discuss this and decide what equipment needs would be funded.
- Eloy Oakley stated that there is a 3 to 1 match requirement for the block grant funds. The money can only be used for the three purposes discussed earlier.

- Linda Umbdenstock suggested that we need one more pass at this to make sure it is clear that there are long term and short perspectives that are linked in different parts of the process.
- Dr. Kehoe stated that this was the last meeting of the year and that this needed to be resolved.
- The group made changes to the proposed bullet as noted in the attachment. It was decided that this would be the third bullet in the revised charge.
- Davis Morse asked about the last bullet on the proposed charge, bullet 7. He asked whose role was this. Who will evaluate the committee's role and effectiveness? He suggested that the last bullet be eliminated.
- Lee Douglas stated that IPC was trying to eliminate the duplication of areas among committees.
- After more discussion, the group decided to delete bullet 7, as well as bullet 3.

Academic Quality, Student Equity, Student Success Planning Committee (AQSESS)

- The current and proposed charge for AQSESS was distributed.
- David Morse asked about bullet 3. He asked what this committee would do with this information.
- Janice Tomson discussed the need to talk about the role of AQSESS. Should this be its own committee?
- Dr. Kehoe stated that this needs to be a part of IPC and SDPC. It would not work for it to be its own committee.
- David Morse stated that if AQSESS is supposed to go through IPC, IPC needs to function better.
- Janice Tomson stated that AQSESS is not working in its current form.
- LU commented that the issue was in the lack of clarity in the charge and in the timing of activities by related groups.
- Kevin Ryan asked why IPC was not working.
- Janice Tomson stated that the structure needed to be changed so AQSESS is feeding into IPC and SDPC.
- Kevin suggested that we have one committee with all 3 subcommittees reporting to it. It is not working in its current form, so why not change this.
- Dr. Kehoe stated that this idea has merit and this could help with communications and AQSESS.
- Janice Tomson stated that she was concerned about adding another committee.
- Dr. Kehoe stated that we can consider a restructuring during the summer to possibly unveil in the fall 2005. The group could continue with the AQSESS Charge at a summer meeting.
- The group decided to meet on July 5 from 2:30-3:30 p.m. at Janice Tomson's house.
- Fred Trapp stated that AQSESS was designed to be the problem definer – to bring to light all of the issues related to our students. He also stated that there should be some coordination with grants – where we should be targeting our money. Fred said he would develop this idea for the July 5 meeting.
- The group decided to continue this discussion at the July 5 meeting. They also decided that work was complete on the SDPC and IPC charges.

- Rene Castro stated that this was a very productive meeting. People felt very conformable in sharing their opinions and asking questions. He also commended Kevin Ryan for voicing such an eloquent idea on the committee structure.

Adjournment

Next Academic Council meeting: **Tuesday, July 5, 2005**
 2:30 –4:30 p.m.
 Janice Tomson’s House