



**College Council
Meeting Minutes**

November 18, 2016

9:00a – 11:00a

Manzanita Conference Room

Members Present: Brian Sanders, Marnie Shively, Jerad Moss, Errin Bass, Erin Naegle, Amy Nilson, Kimberly Francis, Wendy Griffiths-Bender, Lahna VonEpps, Doreen Bass

Guests:

Absent: Angela Fairchilds, Trevor Stewart, Blair Eversley (ASCC Representative), Shane Riaski (ASCC Representative), Tim Elizondo

Agenda

Available on the College Council SharePoint site <https://sp-portal.yosemite.edu/CC/ccouncil/default.aspx>

Recommended for Vote

Approval of the Record of Meeting for the October 21, 2016 College Council

It was moved, seconded (Nilson, Shively) and approved to accept the record of meeting with no corrections.

Minutes		
TOPIC: Institution Set Standards – Update from ACCJC		
<p>Discussion: Brian provided a handout to the committee titled “Institution and Team Guidance for ACCJC Standard I.B.6.” He received the document from the ALO Training meeting he attended on November 4. The document was designed for the accreditation teams that are visiting institutions. Brian reviewed key points from the document, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documenting and disaggregating learning outcomes can be regarded in the ACCJC region as an emerging practice. • The process of setting its standards should represent evidence that the institution, through extensive internal conversations, has envisioned making achievable improvements in these key measures. Making these measures broadly available to both internal and external constituencies, as required by the Standard, will help to focus institutional efforts to achieve them. • The process for setting institutional standards will include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. An annual evaluation of the degree to which the institution has achieved them. b. A determination in advance of the degree of substandard performance that will trigger specific planning to close the achievement gap. c. A formal structure for focusing ongoing efforts to meet and exceed the institution's achievement standards. • In reviewing the institution under Standard I.B.3, teams will appraise the process by which the standards have been set, the appropriateness of the standards themselves in terms of the considerations noted above, the availability of the set standards to institutional constituencies, initiatives that have been put in place by the annual review of achievement data achievable improvements planned by the institution to increase its performance (exceed achievement standards) in areas where standards are met. 		
Conclusions:		
Action items:	Person Responsible:	Deadline
TOPIC: Strategic Planning Cycle – Program Review and SLO Assessment		
<p>Discussion: Wendy shared that the Academic Senate approved the draft Program Review 4-yr cycle. In response to the Academic Senate’s question concerning the definition of “a program” as it applies to Program Review, Brian provided a draft document regarding the “Definition of a Program at Columbia College” to the committee for review. Brian took notes based on feedback provided by the committee and will send the revised draft to College Council for constituent feedback.</p>		
Conclusions:		
College Council approved the Program Review 4-yr cycle on November 18, 2016.		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
Constituent Leaders will take back the revised “Definition of Program at Columbia College” to their constituent groups for feedback and report out at the next College Council meeting.		
TOPIC: Vision Statement and Core Values – Constituency Feedback		
<p>Discussion: Based on constituent feedback the college’s “Vision Statement” was approved by College Council on November 18, 2016. Doreen reported that the Classified Senate approved the Core Values draft language. Wendy said that she will send out the Core Values draft language to faculty for feedback and will provide feedback at the next College Council meeting.</p>		
Conclusions:		
College Council approved the college’s “Vision Statement” on November 18, 2016.		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
Wendy will share Academic Senate feedback regarding the college’s Core Values draft language at the next College Council meeting.		
TOPIC: Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) Priority Funding Recommendations		

<p>Discussion: Brian reviewed with the committee the 2016-17 resource requests to be funded by IELM. Doreen provided a handout of physics equipment needs to the committee. Brian assured Doreen that the requests made will be funded. The committee recommends the 2016-17 resource requests to the college President for approval.</p>		
<p>Conclusions: The committee recommends the 2016-17 resource requests to the college President for approval.</p>		
<p>Action items:</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>	<p>Deadline:</p>
<p>TOPIC: Evaluation for Governance Processes (College Council and Academic Senate)</p>		
<p>Discussion: As part of ACCJC Standard IV – Leadership and Governance, Brian shared that various committees on campus, such as, College Council, Enrollment Management, and Student Success & Equity, should be evaluated on an annual basis. The committee was provided with a sample of a “committee self-evaluation tool.” The committee agreed that this would be good practice. Brian solicited committee members to work on the evaluation tool and will assemble a workgroup to review and provide suggestions. Brian, Lahna, and Doreen will serve on the workgroup. Brian will invite Diana Sunday and Adrienne Seegers to participate in the workgroup. Brian will bring suggested changes to College Council in the spring for feedback.</p>		
<p>Conclusions:</p>		
<p>Action items: Brian, Lahna, and Doreen will serve on the “committee self-evaluation tool” workgroup. Brian will invite Diana Sunday and Adrienne Seegers to participate in the workgroup. Brian will bring suggested changes to College Council in the spring for feedback.</p>	<p>Person responsible:</p>	<p>Deadline:</p>
<p>TOPIC: Other Item(s)</p>		
<p>Discussion: Brian commended Lahna and Joe Manlove for their work on “Path to Stats,” which will help students progress through statistics.</p> <p>Brian shared information regarding the Strong Workforce Program and that YCCD was allocated 2.6 million in funding to support the Strong Workforce Program. This program was established for expanding the availability of quality community college career technical education and workforce development courses, programs, pathways, credentials, certificates, and degrees. Possible areas of growth for Columbia College may include, medical support in the way of staff, clerks, assistants, and health technology.</p> <p>Kimberly reported that the “little free library” outdoor project has been completed. The library is housed by the Child Development Center. If you have books for children, you can bring them by the Foundation Office. Osher scholarships are being scored – 62 students applied. The Foundation Office is working toward a new scholarship program called the “Columbia College Promise Scholarship” which may be rolled out by the college’s 50th anniversary. The Oral History project is up and running.</p>		
<p>Conclusions:</p>		
<p>Action items:</p>	<p>Person responsible:</p>	<p>Deadline:</p>
<p>TOPIC: Name Badges</p>		
<p>Discussion: The Classified Senate completed a survey monkey regarding employees wearing name badges. There was an overwhelming “yes” response. The LTAC group was in support as well, but did not want to make wearing name badges mandated. Jerad will provide a prototype at the next College Council meeting. Folks will have the option to include their first name and/or first name and last name.</p>		
<p>Conclusions:</p>		

Action items: Jerad will provide a prototype at the next College Council meeting.	Person responsible:	Deadline:
TOPIC: Accreditation Brian Sanders		
Discussion: Brian shared that the next Accreditation Steering Committee meeting is in two weeks.		
Conclusions:		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
TOPIC: Enrollment Management Update Brian Sanders		
Discussion: No update.		
Conclusions:		
Action items: Brian will send a campus update next week.	Person responsible:	Deadline:
TOPIC: Budget Update Trevor Stewart		
Discussion: No update. Trevor was absent.		
Conclusions:		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
TOPIC: Technology Committee Trevor Stewart		
Discussion: No update. Trevor was absent.		
Conclusions:		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
TOPIC: Facilities / Safety Trevor Stewart		
Discussion: Brian met with Ron Martin this week. Ron informed him that Pinyon and the lower Manzanita remodel is on schedule.		
Conclusions:		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
TOPIC: District Council		
Discussion: No Update.		

Conclusions:		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
TOPIC: Constituent Reports/Updates		
<p>Discussion: Student Senate – No report. Errin left the meeting early. Classified Senate - Doreen provided a handout to the committee regarding the Classified Senate “Hiring Prioritization Recommendations” and shared that the recommendations were forwarded to the President and Administrative Team. Positions are in Program Review. CSEA – Kimberly reported that CSEA voted on a MOU to reduce the Classification review window to a later date and that Debbie Partridge has been invited back to the White House. Academic Senate – Wendy reported that the Senate Council has back-to-back meetings today. LTAC - Amy reported that the LTAC representative election is underway. LTAC members must vote by November 18. YFA – No report. Tim was absent. Administrative Team – No report.</p>		
Conclusions:		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Record of meeting respectfully submitted by Cari Craven, Executive Assistant