CERRITOS COLLEGE
COORDINATING COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 9, 2009

PRESENT: Bill Farmer
Dr. Stephen Johnson
Dr. Marilyn Brock
Dr. Bryan Reece
Francine DeFrance
Dean Mellas
David Fabish
Schellary Thomas
Julie Mun

ABSENT: Dr. Jim Albanese
Dr. Ted Stolze
Lynn Laughon
Richard Crother
Oscar Franco

GUEST(s): Steve Berklite
Dr. Jan Connal
Mark Fronke
Francie Quaas-Berryman

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER
Mr. Farmer called the meeting to order at 1:06PM.

II. INTRODUCTION OF NEW EMPLOYEES – None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 2, 2009
Dr. Reece made a motion to approve the February 2 minutes; Mr. Mellas seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as presented.

IV. BOARD AGENDA – February 18, 2009
Mr. Farmer briefly reviewed the February 18 Board Agenda and invited the committee members to raise any questions and/or comments. The committee members had no questions.

V. ITEMS FROM INSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEES

Developmental Education
Dr. Connal distributed the attached minutes from their January 20 meeting, Developmental Education Program Mission Statement and SLOs, list of Habits of Mind Faculty Inquiry Groups (FIGs), sample student survey, information regarding the Developmental Education Innovation Fund, information regarding the Developmental Education Faculty Certification Program at Mt. San Antonio College, and ideas for the Developmental Education Research Agenda.

She stated that the FIG faculty are using one target class to survey student study habits. A portion of the Cerritos College Developmental Education allocation has been used to initiate an Innovation Fund to expand or develop evidence-based, innovative activities, services and resources that directly and significantly impact students and student achievement. There is $100,000 in this fund that must be expended by May 2010. The committee is currently accepting applications to award grants from this fund.
The committee is reviewing Mt. San Antonio College’s Developmental Education Faculty Certification Program as a model to develop a curriculum to target part-time faculty so that they may earn credit towards salary advancement. They also discussed the performance of Developmental Education students and the expansion of the Habits of Mind campaign.

Mr. Farmer thanked Dr. Connal for her report asked her to express his thanks to the committee for its hard work.

VI. ITEMS FROM FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Instructional Program Review
Mr. Fronke distributed the attached Instructional Program Review Workbook and General Faculty Meeting flyer where he will make a presentation about the revised Program Review process to determine how to revise and improve our current processes. The committee members surveyed California Community Colleges and selected 6 sample colleges to gather information regarding instructional program review processes. They discussed changing the membership structure of the committee and divided the Program Review process into six phases: Planning, Training and Design; Self-Study Design, Methods, and Data Collection; Self-Study Analysis and Report Preparation; Self-Study Presentation; Report to Faculty Senate, Coordinating Committee and Planning and Budget Committee; and the Mid-cycle Update Report. The workbook also includes guidelines for the self-study format, sanctions for non-compliance, various forms to be submitted with the report, and a proposed schedule of programs for review through 2014-2015.

The committee decided to eliminate the validation team report component of the process; instead, all committee members will review each program self-study report to provide input, and each program will be required to make a presentation of the final report at a committee meeting. Mr. Fronke stressed that the goal of program review is to improve instruction and that it is a tool to facilitate and improve programs.

Ms. DeFrance praised the committee for all of the work they have accomplished. She noted that in order to make any revisions to a shared governance committee’s structure the committee must follow the shared governance process and submit the suggested revisions to the Faculty Senate and Coordinating Committee for approval.

Mr. Mellas stated that the committee does not have the authority to implement sanctions for non-compliance as listed in the workbook. He stated that this section needs clarification about the definition of non-compliance and needs to include more information about the process. Mr. Fabish also inquired how sanctions would be put into
Dr. Johnson stated that program review is directly linked to planning, which is linked to resource allocation. Without program review, this connection is broken. Mr. Fronke stated that the intent of this section of the workbook is to serve as a recommendation for sanctions for non-compliant departments. He will revise this section of the workbook and gather input before making his presentation at the General Faculty Meeting on February 26.

Mr. Farmer thanked Mr. Fronke for his report and the other committee members for their diligent work.

VII. STATUS OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

College Committee on Accreditation
There was much discussion regarding possible changes to the purposes, membership, terms of office, responsibilities of the chairperson(s), etc of the College Committee on Accreditation. This information will be forwarded to the current chairpersons, Dr. Linda Rose and Bob Livingston, to discuss with the other committee members for their review. Any proposed recommendations to change the committee description within the shared governance document will be forwarded to the Coordinating Committee for review and approval.

Non-Instructional Program Review Committee
After extensive discussion on October 20, the committee had determined that for the time being, focus needed to be placed on communication between the instructional and non-instructional areas with less focus on the development of a committee structure. This committee may be incorporated with the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Review to form a single Program Review Committee or a separate committee specifically for non-instructional program review may be created within the shared governance structure. The committee discussed these options and recommended that Dr. Johnson and Dr. Albanese work with Mr. Fronke to draft a joint proposal including both options for the Coordinating Committee to review at a future meeting.

Accreditation Recommendation #8 – Decision-Making Processes
Mr. Farmer stated that decision-making roles and processes must be evaluated regularly and invited the committee to provide any input or suggestions as to how this may be accomplished. Dr. Reece suggested that a survey could be sent to members of all 21 shared governance committees, as participants in the decision-making process, to gather their input.

VIII. REPORTS FROM COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBERS – None

IX. PRESIDENT’S REPORT – None

X. ADJOURNMENT
Meeting adjourned at 2:52PM.