CERRITOS COLLEGE
COORDINATING COMMITTEE MINUTES
October 20, 2008

PRESENT: Bill Farmer
Dr. Marilyn Brock
Dr. Stephen Johnson
Dr. Bryan Reece
Jenine Nolan
Dean Mellas
Dr. Ted Stolze
Lynn Laughon
Schellary Thomas
Julie Mun

ABSENT: Dr. Jim Albanese
Richard Crother
Steve Richardson
Mark Wallace

GUEST(s): Dr. Jane Wright
Mark Fronke
David Young

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER
Mr. Farmer called the meeting to order at 1:08PM.

II. INTRODUCTION OF NEW EMPLOYEES – None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 13, 2008
Dr. Reece made a motion to approve the October 13 minutes; Ms. Nolan seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as presented.

IV. BOARD AGENDA – None

V. ITEMS FROM INSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEES – None

VI. ITEMS FROM FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES – None

VII. STATUS OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service Update #15
Dr. Johnson led the committee in the review of a new board policy, BP 3505 – Emergency Response Plan, which was created to reflect the need for districts to implement a program or plan that complies with National Incident Management System (NIMS) and Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) requirements. Dr. Wright mentioned that a corresponding administrative procedure will be included with the CCLC’s Update #16 in February 2009.

The committee reviewed a new procedure, AP 4228 – Course Repetition - Significant Lapse of Time, which was added to reflect new provisions in Title 5 regulations. After discussion the committee members recommended some language and formatting revisions. The committee also reviewed another new procedure, AP 4229 – Course Repetition - Variable Units, which was added to reflect new provisions in Title 5 related to variable units.

AP 4240 – Academic Renewal is an existing administrative procedure which has been revised to reflect a change in Title 5 Section 55044 which requires that specific courses and/or categories of courses that are exempt from academic renewal must be described.
Mr. O’Rourke led the committee in the review of AP 7212 – Temporary Faculty which was revised to reflect a change in the percentage related to the hours per week that are considered a full-time assignment. Ms. Nolan had questions regarding exemptions for clinical nursing instructors and repetitive language within the procedure. Dr. Wright indicated that she will contact CCLC’s legal counsel regarding the exemptions and also reformat language to avoid repetition. This procedure will be brought to the committee for additional review on October 27.

Revisions to the Shared Governance Document
Mr. Farmer distributed the attached revised committee membership list from the College Committee on Campus Transformation to delete the President/Superintendent as a member and appoint the Vice President of Business Services as the chairperson. Clarification was also recommended for the appointment of representatives from departments without faculty members. Dr. Reece made a motion to approve these revisions and Mr. Mellas seconded the motion. Dr. Johnson stated the official department name for Public Affairs is Public & Governmental Relations. Ms. Laughon requested that CSEA be notified if a classified staff member is appointed as a department representative. Mr. Farmer stated that according to the Education Code, CSEA has the right to appoint classified representatives to all Shared Governance committees including ad hoc committees and task forces and suggested that additional language be added to the committee composition to state that if classified staff are recommended to represent any of the applicable (7) departments, the appointees must be cleared by CSEA. The motion passed with these additional revisions.

Mr. Farmer distributed the attached revised committee membership list from the College Committee on Planning and Budget to delete the President/Superintendent as a member and appoint the Vice President of Business Services as the chairperson. Dr. Johnson made a motion to approve these revisions and Dr. Reece seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Mr. Farmer also proposed that the College Coordinating Committee membership be revised to delete the Director of Public & Governmental Relations and Cerritos College Foundation representatives, and reduce the number of ASCC student representatives from (2) to (1). Dr. Reece made a motion to approve these revisions and Dr. Brock seconded the motion. Dr. Johnson suggested that the wording for the ASCC representatives be revised to state at least (1) member but not more than (2). Mr. Mellas stated that he would like an ASCC representative to personally notify Coordinating Committee of the reduction in their representation before approving this change. Dr. Stolze stated that although he is a faculty representative of this committee through the courtesy of Faculty Senate, he has functioned in a respectful way not only as a faculty member but also as a representative of CCFF and that a CCFF appointed representative should be included in the official membership list. Mr. Farmer stated that this is a matter to be discussed during collective bargaining and Dr. Stolze respectfully disagreed. Mr. Farmer thanked Dr. Stolze for being a valuable member of this committee and acknowledged his many contributions. Mr. Farmer recommended that this motion be held until further communication with ASCC and the committee agreed.

Non-Instructional Program Review
Mr. Farmer reminded the committee of last week’s discussion regarding the structure for non-instructional program review. There is currently a Senate Committee on Instructional Program Review for instructional programs only and no committee to oversee non-instructional program review. He met with Dr. Reece recently and stated options include the
establishment of an institutional committee to overview both instructional and non-instructional programs or the establishment of an institutional committee to handle non-instructional programs separately. Both options could work well and coordination is required to ensure merging of common themes and practices. He also shared a memo from the ACCJC which includes the following expectation: “Institutions and teams should be aware that the Commission expects that institutions be at the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level in Program Review of academic programs (including all educational services). Many institutions have not developed sustained processes for evaluating administrative services, but all should be above the Awareness level in these efforts.” According to the ACCJC’s “Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review”, the college has met the expectation for instructional program review. However, work must be done to ensure that non-instructional program review will be at the “Development” stage or higher by March 2009. He suggested that an interim structure be adopted for the time being and move towards another structure as non-instructional program review reaches the same level of the rubric as instructional program review. He asked the committee for their thoughts and feedback.

Dr. Reece stated that an integrated process would be the most beneficial as there are unique aspects of each type of program review in addition to much overlap. An integrated process would also help ensure that resources for program review are proportionally and efficiently distributed from the Research & Planning department. There has been discussion regarding this issue during Faculty Senate meetings and either option is fine with them as long as campus representation is ensured. Mark Fronke and David Young, members of the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Review, were in attendance to share their thoughts and concerns. Dr. Reece also added that during last week’s meeting he mentioned Santa Monica College’s “joint” standing committee as a possible model to follow but upon further research has found that the structure is the same as our institutional committees.

Mr. Mellas stated that the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Review is doing a great job and by all indications the process seems to continuously improve. His initial reaction is to suggest that they keep their focus on instructional program review to allow the faculty to work on a very important area of the college. Since there are fundamental differences in the ways instructional and non-instructional programs should be reviewed, he recommends that a separate institutional committee for non-instructional program review be initially created to work with the Senate committee. Once the non-instructional program review process is established the two committees may be joined. He would like to avoid a consolidation of power within a “super” committee to oversee all program review and is also concerned with the capacity of resources that the Research and Planning department is able to provide.

Mr. Fronke shared a memorandum that was distributed to the Faculty Senate on October 14 and shared his concerns regarding non-instructional program review. He stated that the Senate Committee on Program Review has not been consulted regarding the non-instructional program review process; they feel that an integrated process is necessary and instructional program review can serve as a model for the development of non-instructional program review. He believes that the college should utilize internal resources from the Research & Planning office for both instructional and non-instructional areas to determine what factors and issues lead to decreased student enrollment and to help students learn and succeed. Separating the two processes would be detrimental to the campus and it is
important for non-instructional areas to implement an established process as soon as possible. Mr. Young added any program review process will not be effective without training, centrality and an effective method of external validation. He agreed completely that an integrated process is required and that there are models at other California colleges who have accomplished this.

Mr. Farmer stated that the administration’s short-term strategy is to make sure that all non-instructional areas carry out program review this year, and then begin work on a long-term strategy to review, improve and standardize the process. The college’s Accreditation report requires that we extend the instructional program review process to other non-instructional areas of the campus with appropriate accommodation to address the nature of each area. After extensive discussion the committee determined that for the time being, focus needs to be placed on communication between the instructional and non-instructional areas with less focus on the development of a committee structure. The college will ensure that documentation of discussion and action regarding our interpretation of this Accreditation recommendation is provided.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBERS – None

IX. PRESIDENT’S REPORT – None

X. ADJOURNMENT
Meeting adjourned at 2:53PM.