



Thursday, October 27, 2011
Griffin Gate
3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

Present: Steve Baker, Michael Barendse, Irene Bauza, Janet Castanos, Carrie Clay, Janet Carter, John Colson, Sunny Cooke, Sheridan Dewolf, Diane Glow, Michael Golden, Sue Gonda, Oralee Holder, Kerry Kilber, Patti Morrison, Jane Nolan, Shirley Pereira, Adelle Schmitt, Cary Willard, Jim Wilsterman, Debbie Yaddow

Absent: Barbara Blanchard, Deb Delaney, Angela Feres, Tim Flood, Chris Hill, Nick Montez, Alba Orr, Will Pines, Jim Spillers

Recorder: Patty Sparks

Meeting Convened: 3:00 p.m.

I. Integrated Planning at Grossmont

Sunny reported that Devon Atchison will be joining this part of the meeting via telephone conference. She stated that many of us are involved in the accreditation writing and/or evidence gathering in preparation for the fall 2013 accreditation visit. She explained ACCJC expects an institution to be reflective about what the institution is doing, how it is doing, and what kinds of things can be done to improve performance. The general principles of accreditation and self-evaluation that we make reference to in this process is: evidence of achieved results; evaluation of the results; and examples of the improvements that are integrated into the institution's planning processes.

Sunny further stated that institutional effectiveness is a big part of Standard I which is related to our institutional mission and effectiveness. She and Corey Manchester are co-chairing Standard I. In improving institutional effectiveness there are several different bullet points outlined by the ACCJC and she explained that the institution collects and uses student achievement and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) data in program review, planning, and resource allocation

ACCJC defines student achievement as what the student walks away with and keeps (credits earned, GPA, degree, pass rates). Whereas, SLOs are those things like skills, knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs that a student can think, learn, and know after they complete a course or program.

We are collecting Student Achievement and SLO data and including it in program review, planning, and resource allocation. We all need to get a sense of how our programs are doing across the college. We are working with the Program Review Committee now and not just the academic side, but student and administrative services side as well to allow for more college-wide forums.

We use a systematic cycle of assessment, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation to improve educational effectiveness and institutional quality. We are doing this

throughout the college in departments, units and divisions, but what we need to enhance is the rich college-wide dialog of what we are doing. Institutional Research has been tracking cohort data from students that came to Grossmont in 2006. Can we broaden and engage more people in the dialog of Grossmont College Student Achievement, what works well and what we might improve?

Devon stated that there was a General Education Institutional SLO Pilot Program Workshop this semester during flex week. We started Institutional SLOs conversations with faculty (13 to 15 divisions attended and participated). We do not have a plan or a follow-up process regarding this workshop and/or its discussions. Additionally, we are participating in the Henrietta Lack's project providing a survey that is handed out at the end of each event associated with our Institutional SLOs. We are in the process of collecting the surveys and the question is, "What do we do with this data". How do we engage more college employees in this work?

Patti Morrison stated that the information from the Institutional Review Committee (IRC) on outcomes regarding who was allocated funds and for what projects is a good way to communicate what is going on throughout the campus. Though the resource allocation from the IRC is just a small portion of our resources, it is still a way to get the word out on college-wide priorities, projects and programs. Sunny stated that the Institutional Excellence Taskforce is the group that looked at college-wide data and achievement and then recommended data for the Leadership Retreat folks to review. There are colleges that have a general culture of town hall meetings, once a month or every couple months. We have tried to have these types of meetings but they were poorly attended.

Michael stated that we have staff development week and believes that there is room for improvement there. He would like to see more data driven workshops regarding students, i.e., why they leave, where did they go, and like questions. Sunny asked Shirley to work with Institutional Research (IR) to retrieve data on the latest student cohort for Grossmont. Shirley stated IR would need to report Grossmont College data as the data coming out of IR is district wide.

The other opportunity is how Institutional SLOs are tied to resources. Devon stated we could gather the data collected over the last year, including the data discussed above and analyze it. The information should be brought back to this Council. Sunny stated we should spend approximately 15 minutes at each future meeting regarding Institutional SLOs, what they are, how we are measuring them, and how we connect them college-wide. We can also do a similar thing with Student Achievement and again with Student Learning.

Oralee stated that one way to get the word out would be to utilize Blackboard once the data has been analyzed. We could post questions maybe two or three to faculty and get their input. Shirley also stated that IR is discussing producing a newsletter. The newsletter would be District focused but the data could be parceled out for the colleges as well. Oralee mentioned that the Summit Newspaper has made some great changes in its appearance and content and something similar to that could be useful. Michael suggested that divisions meet once a month to discuss Institutional SLOs.

Shirley stated that we lose nearly 30% to 40% of our new first year students every year. We are a community college and we serve a multitude of students that are here for different reasons. Diane Glow responded that we are serving students here that are also attending other colleges and we count them as new, but they may never complete from Grossmont College.

The American Association of Community Colleges, which is the National advocacy organization, has put together a voluntary frame work of accountability. They used colleges all over the nation that

have our same populations and they put together a framework of measures that community colleges think are reasonable.

Sunny asked everyone to think about creating a better dialog and send ideas to her and further thanked everyone for their input today.

II. FTES Targets and Process for 2011/12

Colleges throughout California are struggling with managing enrollment wisely. Our district wide process to set FTES targets took a long time and so Grossmont College went out early with round numbers for percentage cuts. Further, our fall numbers came in way higher than anticipated. Last year, we were spot on, however that same model this year just did not work. There are a lot of factors for that and clearly we are going to have to change our model number. Last year we used 3.8 FTES per section and currently we are above that. We are working now to determine the most accurate number.

Shirley Pereira stated she met with IAC and agrees that the model we used last year did not work for this year. Because we strategically added some sections, it appeared some divisions received more. The Enrollment Strategies looked at different measures, like CTE, Transfer, Basic Skills, with that information we added the sections. As a college we will have cut 8% to 9%. Oralee reminded the Council that the majority of the sections added were across the board, but there were sections added strategically as well.

Oralee is requesting a presentation to Chairs and Coordinators regarding the change to our model number when one is established. Shirley stated that one of the contributing factors to us being over in the fall is we added sections that had a class max of 50 but were using a class max of 35 as an average. The Council agreed to draft a clear communication to faculty that there are significant impacts if we go over cap and explain how it affects hiring, adding sections, and it sends the wrong message to Sacramento.

It was further discussed not to give ad codes (or give a small number) for sections because getting a full sheet of ad codes is confusing.

Action taken: A communication to faculty will go out regarding not going over cap. Deans, Sue Gonda and Oralee will also reiterate the message to faculty.

III. Review of the new Tech Plan

Kerry Kilber stated that she will send the draft (30 page) Tech Plan to this Council via email for review and feedback. On Monday Technology for Teaching and Learning Community Committee (TTLC) did approve the Tech Plan to move forward to Academic Senate and to this Council.

Kerry explained that TTLC looked at the following Tech Plans: Grossmont College's (past plans); College of the Canyons; Kingsborough Community College; Southwestern; and Washington State Community and Technical College. With the internal and external information we began to write the plan and received feedback from the TTLC Committee through several meetings, the co-chair of the Planning & Resources at the time (Shirley Pereira), the Academic Senate President and Vice President, and other various folks who were interested. We also ran it by technical areas such as IS, IMS, District IS and recently just sent it to the deans. It was suggested that the plan be seen by IAC and Student Services. The next step is to bring the plan to Academic Senate and then to this Council for feedback and finalization. The College's Vision and Mission Statements need to be included.

Action Taken: Kerry to send the draft Tech Plan to Student Services and IAC for review. Kerry will add the College's Vision and Mission Statement to the Tech Plan.

IV. Committee Updates

- **Faculty Staffing Committee**

Sheridan stated that the Faculty Staffing Committee has met and determined the hiring criteria. Edits are due back by the committee on November 10, by 12 noon. The committee as a whole decided that they will hold to (other than extenuating circumstances) 40% full time to 60% part-time faculty ratio or lower. At best we are looking at one to two faculty positions however that will depend on the allocation of funds available. Retirements need to be in writing prior to any action taken. Since the Faculty Staffing cycle only happens once a year, hires for next year ought to be considered during this cycle. Sheridan stated that the Faculty Staffing Committee will meet on November 18, to hear justifications. Decisions should be made by the end of December.

Sunny reminded the Council that if there is a true emergency hire, we have a system in place with the Senate Officers to hear justifications for those positions and make a decision on whether to move forward even over the holidays or long breaks.

- **Classified Staffing Committee**

Janet Castanos stated that the Committee scheduled their first meeting for November 8. Our first step is to review the scoring matrix. This Committee only takes into consideration new hires for the following year.

V. Other

The Council discussed the meeting date for November. The Council discussed meeting either the week before or the week after. It was decided to meet on Thursday, December 1, 3 – 5 p.m.

Adjourned: 5:00 p.m.