SBVC Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
April 17, 2019
AD/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	• Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m. • Roll call via sign-in sheet [see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet].	
2. Public Comments	• J. Notarangelo [see attachment: Comments regarding funding requests for AB 705, the Writing Center, and SI Programs]	
3. Senate President's Report C. Huston	• **ASCCC Papers:** There were several papers adopted. • **ASCCC CTE Leadership Committee:** Brought a model for GE Equivalency entitled *Career Education Minimum Qualifications Toolkit* as a recommendation for us to look at. They put up an example of an equivalency that they turned down. It was for Diesel and it was one that's come through our equivalency. We had to turn them down despite the person having years of education and experience and qualifications, but it didn't work out according to our AP. I did volunteer us for a regional meeting. If we're lucky we'll have a presentation on the *Toolkit*. We can consider working to adopt it through collegial processes. If a regional meeting doesn't work out in our area, we should work with professional development and Crafton to invite ASCCC here. • **ASCCC Elections:** J. Stanskas was reelected as ASCCC President. He will be the ASCCC President for another year. The Area D representative is L. Parker. • **Keynote Presentations:** Available on the ASCCC website. The one that was really interesting was the faculty diversification shared that the Board of Governors requested a taskforce to propose a 7th statewide goal relating to statewide diversity. • **Senate Rostrum:** The February and April issues available. There's a lot of valuable information. If you want some for faculty in your areas, you can pick them up from my office. • **Save the Dates:** Upcoming conference dates. • **Senate Meeting Dates for Fall 2019 and Spring 2020** • **Upcoming topics:** We'll get an update Student Equity Plan today and the plan itself on May 1st. We're going to develop language for an Outstanding Adjunct Faculty award. We're going to finish out our by-laws. On the 15th S. Stark will come talk about the budget and how the funding model plays in; he'll also probably take questions on the bookstore.	

Topic	Discussion	Action

4. SBVC President's Report D. Rodriguez	• Registration started for the next term.
	• Promise program update: as of Friday we have 950 students who have taken advantage of the program, which is pretty awesome. We thought we could get students to fill out the interest form and the CCC Apply application. We were uncertain of how many would fill out the FAFSA because we all know how daunting that can be. To date 950 students have filled out all 3 of those forms. Kudos to all of you who have been talking about it and sharing it with people.
	• Senior Day is this Friday. I think we have over 400 students signed up to participate. One of the new aspects of Senior Day this year is we have all aspects of the campus participating in this: Student Services, CTE, and non-CTE programs will all be out there. We thought it would be important for students to talk to faculty who will be teaching in those areas. I think it's going to be a great day for those students.
	• On May 10th, I think folks have received their invitation to talk about the paradigm shift that we're trying to create in terms of student success. If you haven't seen this, please check your emails.
	  o A. Avelar: Where is that located?
	  o D. Rodriguez: I it's still pending because more and more people are interested. Check your emails for that. The email is coming from sbvcinformation@valleycollege.edu.
	• The golf tournament is this Friday. There is still some room for foursomes if you're a golfer.
	• I want to share some words of appreciation for the English Department. As J. Notarangelo stated, they came to talk to me about the impact that AB 705 is having on their specific department and on students as a whole. They did request additional funding and I should say that it is in their program review documents so they are following procedures. They didn't come to me with just the viewpoint of the English department, they're thinking of the impact on the entire college. I truly appreciate that the group brought that perspective. We are looking for funding to meet those needs. I can't promise that we can come up with all of that was requested, but we will try to come up with some.	

5. Committee Reports	**a. Personnel Policy** [J. Notarangelo]
	  • I'm going to announce the advancements in rank. [see attachment: Advancement in Rank]
	    o **Motion 1**
	    o [applause]
	b. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]
	  • We have been working on the grade appeal process. Knowing there is a BP and AP, we will be in consultation with Crafton Hills. There are 2 forms that the campuses are using. The content and some of the procedures that are being followed are also different. It
		Motion 1: Move to accept the Personnel Policy Committee's recommendations for advancement in rank.
		1st: A. Avelar

Topic	Discussion	Action

5. Committee Reports, continued	doesn't look like we'll be able to have that done by the end of this semester. One recommendation we pointed out is the student needs to provide evidence of fraud, etc. that are detailed in Title V. We are also looking into the possibility of extending some of the days for the formal and informal filing because the student really has to have some compelling reasons to move forward in the process. Hopefully it can be resolved at the most informal process, between the student and faculty, but there may be a need for a formal hearing. We are looking into every step of the way with some kind of rigor.
	• T. Allen: We looked at some forms for other schools in the area: Mt. SAC, Chaffey, and RCC. Many of them streamlined the process; our process seemed a bit lengthy. We are looking at using some of their models. We're going to meet again and maybe take a look at the forms. We'll also consult Crafton because we want to be on the same page as them. We'll keep you posted.
	c. CTE [K. Melancon]
	• No report
	d. EEO [R. Hamdy]
	• No report.
	e. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]
	• On April 24th, Professional Development partnered with Student Health Services. There's a group called Art for Impact. They're doing kind of a certification from 10 – 12 p.m. for faculty who want to get certified in this Movies for Mental Health training that they have. Once you're trained you'll get access to all these resources on how to have conversations with your students to overcome the stigma of mental health. There are movies that go along with that that faculty can show in the classroom. Coming to the training gives you access to all kinds of resources.
	• On May 31st, I sent out an email to see if anyone would be interested in a STRS workshop after the semester is over. They're coming to campus to do a 2 or 3-hour retirement workshop. This is open for all educators, so friends, spouses, etc. working in the education system can come as well. I'll send a link in the email.
	• Flex Day went really well. The STEM workshop went phenomenally. We had a good turnout.
	• Please submit, not save, your flex hours. You can also do those in good faith. I need to get the report into the state in June. Please get those in.
	• **Questions/Comments:**
	  o C. Huston: What time is the STRS workshop?
	  o R. Hamdy: I think we set it from 10 – 12 p.m.
		2nd: C. Huston
		Discussion: None
		Approved: Unanimously
		Abstentions: None

Topic	Discussion	Action

5. Committee Reports, continued	**f. Elections** [D. Burns-Peters]
	• Remember to please get your vote in for outstanding professor. We have 4 nominees. If you have trouble with submitting use a different browser.
	g. Curriculum [M. Copeland]
	• No report.
	h. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]
	• We have a lot of efficacies we're going through. There's a lot of full efficacies, CTEs, and conditional/probationary from previous years. Those should be done by the last meeting for us to report on.
	• There are 2 other things that the committee needs to work on. We may not get to them until the fall. First, which we don't need guidance on, is we don't have a process for putting programs on or taking them off the 4-year efficacy rotation. Right now VPs and deans have put them on in their areas. That might be what works, but we've never really looked at that. Depending on what program you put on, certain programs are being put under more scrutiny. We want equity. For example, the Puente Program. They're on a 4-year efficacy rotation, but it's also looked at through Counseling and through English.
	• The other one is there's no process for programs coming off. The issue I'm thinking of was with the Bookstore. It was part of Program Review, but it came off because we're outsourcing it. The issue is that there's mention of some kind of evaluation, but there's nothing specific. With efficacy everything is tied to those strategic initiatives. They don't have to do anything for program review efficacy. The issue is as we move further, we are going to have more outsourced. The bookstore impacts students, faculty, and staff. Do we want to pursue some kind of process or move forward in researching what we can do in terms of accountability, efficacy, etc.? Do we just say okay and go with whatever evaluation process they choose?
	• **Questions/Comments:**
	  ○ D. Smith: I was on the committee that listened to the pitches coming in. There were 2 offers that came in and their promises were substantial. We would want to know if they're living up to the full sum of those promises. There should be a process in place to check that.
	  ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: There was a brief line about evaluation that I saw in their contract. If something is important enough to be on the cycle, then how do we proceed with this?
	  ○ D. Burns-Peters: How long is the contract?
	  ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: 4 or 5 years?
	  ○ R. Hamdy: They're a District entity since the District contracts them to serve both	

Topic	Discussion	Action
5. Committee Reports, continued	campuses. How would that work? o P. Ferri-Milligan: I happened to be talking to the Senate President at Crafton. He was also concerned. o C. Huston: We were also talking about this at Senate Exec. o P. Ferri-Milligan: This is going to be a lot of work so I don't want Program Review to move forward with it unless we know this is something Senate wants. o D. Smith: If the contract is in place, what's the process for renewal? Is there a built-in evaluation process there? o P. Ferri-Milligan: There's no specifics in the contract so I'm not sure. How are we determining things like faculty satisfaction? o A. Avelar: You don't want to wait until the end of the contract. You want to evaluate them in the middle so they can improve. Since this is at the District level maybe there can be a joint committee with representatives from Crafton and Valley. o C. Huston: What is Program Review looking for? Are you looking for a recommendation? Do you want it on the agenda? o P. Ferri-Milligan: I would like to know if we move forward with this and research it that we have your blessing or if we're moving in the wrong direction. If you're thinking it's outsourced and we don't care, then we can stop. This is going to be a lot of work and I don't think we'll be able to get into it until next semester. o C. Huston: I would say we definitely care so please bring the research and bring it back. o P. Ferri-Milligan: Okay I can contact Crafton. The thing is the culture at District is different so I'd like to see this from the campuses first and then take it to the o Direct committee to research outsourced bookstore, or any outsourced service. Amy 1st, Davena 2nd. ■ **Motion 2** i. **Accreditation & SLOs** [C. Huston] • We did a lot of work with Institution Set Standards, which I'm going to share with you later. • We started our interviews with key people for each standard yesterday. We had a few people show up and we were able to have some good conversation. We are trying to get a rough draft together. j. **Non-Credit:** [A. Ababat] • Today we were able to finalize the guidelines we need for funding we discussed a few weeks ago. That funding is $50k. Next year there might be another funding. • Those of you who would like to submit noncredit courses the deadline is May 15 so we can have enough time to work on and properly address all issues.	**Motion 2**: **Move to direct the Program Review Committee to research avenues for evaluation of any outsourced service and bring that recommendation back to the Senate in cooperation with Crafton Hills.** 1st: A. Avelar 2nd: D. Burns-Peters **Discussion:** None **Approved:** Unanimously **Abstentions:** None

Topic	Discussion	Action

5. Committee Reports, continued	• From our meeting workgroup we discussed four steps:
	   1. Our faculty needs to check market labor for a particular program they want to develop.
	   2. They need to set the hours for that.
	   3. The committee or workgroup will review that.
	   4. The manager will be the one to finalize and approve.
	• C. Huston: And any final curriculum will go through the Curriculum Committee.
	• M. Copeland: your process is for them to get the funding to work on it, correct?
	• A. Ababat: Yes, if you have questions, please let us know. We'll be sending an email next week.
	k. Ed Policy [vacant]
	  • No report
	l. Legislative [vacant]
	  • No report
	m. Financial Policy [vacant]
	  • No report	

6. Additional Reports	**a. SBCCD-CTA** [A. Avelar] • Our lead negotiator is P. Menchaca from CHC. She hasn't sent out the email to the body yet, but I can give you highlights. She'll send out the updated email soon. Thank you to those who were able to come out to support negotiations Friday. • With learning communities, we have a date of trying to get to some point by the end of the semester; it might need to carry over into next semester. • Wages: There is a TA in place, but there is a clarification MOU because it's a big change going from one rate to several different rates. • Oracle purchases: We have one Oracle MOU in place right now in regards to reimbursement and travel. We have a delegate that will take care of that. We have to make sure that delegate. For the purchasing one, no MOU was signed to support faculty through purchasing or supplies because that is not faculty work. Any faculty who makes recommendations to purchase supplies, they will submit the recommendations to their immediate supervisor. For many of us that's the dean. The immediate supervisor is responsible to delegate that to the classified staff. The immediate supervisor will be responsible to ensure that the ordering and tracking is completed by someone other than a faculty member. • Health and welfare benefits: Open enrollment is coming up very soon. Everyone should get the email from the District. There's 2 no cost options for faculty. One is TRIO and the	

Topic	Discussion	Action

6. Additional Reports, continued	other is Kaiser. I'm also on the Benefits Committee. They recommend where the District should look into. The Union does not negotiation the quality of the plan. It's the Benefits Committee. That's made up of faculty, managers, and staff. That committee works with CEBA. We make sure to not have any plan changes. For example, one wanted to charge $100 for an ultrasound. No. the benefits committee recommended that we look at Kaiser differently. They were able to get their direct quote that's similar to TRIO. There's going to be a $10, and $30 instead of $20 and $40 for Kaiser. So that gives us 2 low-cost options.
	• **Questions/Comments:**
	  o R. Hamdy: So the other one, the all access plan…
	  o A. Avelar: The difference is the TRIO has a lower selection of doctors but the co-pays are identical. All-access is going up, I think it's a movement out of control of the District. It's insurance company issues. That one is going to cost approximately $300/month.
	• The other thing is part of our contract says the District will provide some kind of plan for our part-time faculty members. That's in the works. We are supposed to hopefully get something in the next set of negotiations before the end of the semester.
	• Evaluations: The District passed their first proposal. We're going to look at that.
	• We also signed an overall TA. You'll vote for the whole package.
	• Elections are taking place for the Executive Board.
	b. District Assembly [C. Huston]
	• No report	

7. Consent Agenda, continued	**a. Minutes** • **4/3/19** o **Motion 3**	**Motion 3: Move to approve the consent agenda.** 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: D. Smith **Discussion:** None **Approved:** Unanimously **Abstentions:** T. Vasquez
8. Old Business	**a. ASCCC Spring Plenary Resolutions** [C. Huston] • I wanted to bring some resolutions to you attention. Two are 5.01 and 5.02. • We switched from supporting AB 130 to opposing AB 130. They want to form the Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability had no ASCCC faculty represented. • 15.01 passed 56/54.	

Topic	Discussion	Action

9. Old Business, continued	• 15.02 passed 65/42. I didn't expect this one to be as controversial.
	• There are many other resolutions and you can find them on the ASCCC website.
	• **Questions/Comments:**
	  ○ A. Avelar: Can I ask what was the opposition?
	  ○ C. Huston: The unit load. They were worried it would delay their graduation because it's another class.
	• There was one I wanted to share, 7.03 requested the Board of Governors to go through collegiality and confidentiality training. J. Stanskas ceded to the Vice President, stood in line at the pro-mic, and said there were a lot of new members of the Board of Governors who asked for guidance. Nobody from the con-mic spoke after that.
	b. CTE Online Pathways [D. Burns-Peters]
	• D. Burns-Peters: Can we actually table this?
	  ○ **Motion 4**
		Motion 4: Move to table CTE Online Pathways.
		1st: R. Hamdy
		2nd: A. Avelar
		Discussion: None
		Approved: Unanimously
		Abstentions: None

9. New Business	**a. Election of Vice President and Secretary** [C. Huston]
	• We usually do this at the last meeting.
	• Are there nominations for Vice President?
	  ○ B. Tasaka: I nominate R. Hamdy.
	  ○ C. Huston: Do you accept?
	  ○ R. Hamdy: Yes.
	  ○ C. Huston: Are there other nominations? [none]
	    ▪ **Motion 5**
	• Are there nominations for Secretary?
	  ○ R. Hamdy: I nominate B. Tasaka.
	  ○ C. Huston: Do you accept?
	  ○ B. Tasaka: Yes.
	  ○ C. Huston: Are there other nominations? [none]
	    ▪ **Motion 6**
	• C. Huston: We'll bring the rest of the Executive Senate positions for approval at the meeting on May 15th.
		Motion 5: Move to instate R. Hamdy as the Senate Vice President for the 2109-2020 academic year.
		1st: B. Tasaka
		2nd: M. Jacobo
		Discussion: None
		Approved: Unanimously
		Abstentions: None
		
		Motion 6: Move to instate B. Tasaka as the Senate Secretary for the 2109-2020 academic year.
		1st: R. Hamdy
		2nd: J. Bjerke
		Discussion: None

Topic	Discussion	Action
9. New Business, continued	**b.Institution Set-Standards** [C. Huston] • This is coming as a recommendation of the ASLO Committee. The reason we wanted to change our institution Set-Standards was because of new recommendations coming out of the ASCCC. The recommendation was made to a school with a 6-year average. Ours is a 7-year average. We figured we should fix it now before we get a recommendation. We looked at many models and at our last meeting we agreed on setting each of the following: o Floor of more than 1 standard deviation below the 3-year average. o Goal: 1 standard deviation above the 3-year average. o Stretch Goal: Greater than or equal to 1.5 standard deviation above the 3-year average. • We agreed on these as a committee to make these the Institution Set-Standards. • **Questions/Comments:** o A. Avelar: This is in reference to our degrees and certificates to see that our students are earning them and we are seeing growth. o C. Huston: And there are some areas that are required to have institution set standards. ▪ **Motion 7** **c. BP/AP 3570 Smoking Policy** [Celia Huston] • I pulled out the proposed language. • **Questions/Comments:** o P. Ferri-Milligan: I was one who said this is not an academic matter. However, I told that to J. Lamore and he said it is. He said, "You have to take into consideration the student population at Crafton and the student population here. We have more smokers here. We are already asking students who may be uncomfortable with college to be here, and we are adding another barrier. I'm a former smoker. I know smoking does reduce stress." So it will provide just another barrier. o J. Milligan: In Applied Technology we have a lot of students who smoke. I personally think they'll just go across the street to the residential areas and smoke there. What image will it give to us? o J. Bjerke: I read that millennials almost had cigarettes kicked until e-cigarettes came out. They're doing it more and it might push them away a little bit if we issue tickets. o M. Jacobo: I like that we have designated areas if they're enforced. o C. Huston: When I get to District Assembly I'm going to ask what in our policy says Crafton isn't allowed to enforce *no* designated smoking areas. o T. Vasquez: From a health perspective, not smoking is healthier for our students. I do understand your point of view, but we can also decide to make them healthier. o M. Jacobo: They'll still smoke.	**Approved:** Unanimously **Abstentions:** None **Motion 7: Move to support the Institution Set-Standards and to move it forward to College Council.** 1st: M. Copeland 2nd: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr **Discussion:** • S. Lewis: I assume that Institutional Research had a say in this? • C. Huston: Oh, yes. J. Smith led this conversation. • D. Smith: The standard deviation is attainable? • C. Huston: The real penalty comes from falling under the floor. It's nice to reach goals, but we don't' get in trouble for not

Topic	Discussion	Action
9. New Business, continued	o T. Vasquez: There are other campuses that have this policy. Can we look at other colleges with the same policies and how it affects them? o M. Jacobo: We still have vending machines and that can be worse. o P. Ferri-Milligan: I think if we vote a non-smoking campus I would go across the street. But if it's an issue, people are adults. We can move if it's a big issue for second-hand smoke. They can be moved to the peripheral. I'm not their mother. o R. Hamdy: I think the general consensus is we pretty much are non-smoking campus as it is. There's laws that you have to be so far away from campus anyway. For Valley much of the campus is non-smoking already. This wouldn't be a huge benefit. o A. Pave: My concern is primarily second-hand smoke. From a selfish standpoint I don't want to smell smoke. I think if we respect the rights of smokers and non-smokers. If they're allowed to smoke on campus, then they should be allowed to smoke not near parking lots and not near buildings. o C. Huston: Are they in the designated smoking areas? o A. Pave: No, they're not. Maybe the rule needs to be enforced. Take the smoking areas out of the way of parking lots. One of the things in many places is there is a glass box where people can smoke. o A. Avelar: I want to make sure it's clear that Crafton as a whole is not in agreement. The Crafton student body wants to make their campus smoke-free. There was an immediate outcry because faculty and staff weren't consulted. I know that Crafton's Senate is looking at it. Crafton itself has lots of dry brush around. I want to make sure we know Crafton's student body is the only one bringing this forward. Did we reach out to the student body here on campus? o C. Huston: G. Evans-Perry is doing that. o A. Avelar: We need to look into the consequences. People will sneak around and we will find butts all over campus and the surrounding neighborhoods. o R. Hamdy: All those shared bathrooms too. It will be like high school. o J. Milligan: Is there a way to look into enforcing the current policy before creating a new policy? o C. Huston: One thing is the current policy would put a fine on students. It's a $50 fine. o R. Hamdy: We have designated areas. They need to be more visible. o M. Copeland: Maybe they can issue a warning first. o T. Allen: After the first $50 we won't have many repeat offenders. o M. Copeland: I think we always talk about putting students first and I Joel's argument is very strong. Sure it's not healthy, but they do lots of things that aren't healthy. We don't	reaching them. **Approved:** Unanimously **Abstentions:** None

Topic	Discussion	Action
9. New Business, continued	want to add barriers. ○ D. Rodriguez: Do we have to do what Crafton says? ○ C. Huston: Right now the current District policy says, "unless a tobaccos use area has been designated." So I read this and say Crafton can decide not to designate any smoking areas. There are processes through college council and facilities and safety where we can look at this. ○ M. Jacobo: It's important to recognize this isn't just students. ○ C. Huston: We'll also talk to S. Stark about enforcement and signage. ○ T. Vaquez: I can do that. ▪ **Motion 8** **c. Student Equity Plan** [S. Thayer] • [see attachment: table starting with "AGE" at the top] • Each page has a different indicator on top: age, ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, etc. The thing they have in common is the baseline data. • The plan by-law is 3 years in length. A lot has been happening in California with Student Success Initiatives: AB 705, Guided Pathways, etc. We've been working on those plans on campus. The state has done a lot of work to consolidate programs. There's a new plan called the Student Equity and Achievement Plan (SEA Plan). This is bringing together SSSP, Student Equity, and Basic Skills. With this new legislation, these are being brought together. That's a new program we'll have to report on. The caveat is they never changed the law on the student equity plan. The law says every 3 years the plan has to be approved through your Board of Trustees and the date is June 30th. They're changing the way they want us to leverage initiatives. • Student equity is at the core of everything we do. We're now putting forward and updating the plan. We have a workgroup called the Enrollment Management Student Equity Committee that is working to consolidate all the activities. In the far right column you'll see activities in support of. I mentioned for 3 years we've been doing things, so we're putting that together and trying to fill in where it fits for disproportionate impact. • **Questions/Comments:** ○ R. Hamdy: Where is the list because I know that's how funding gets distributed. For example, we're trying to start a Safe Spaces coalition, so if they're not on the list… ○ A. Avelar: They are on the LGBTQ list, 2nd from the last page. ○ S. Thayer: Each page represents a different group. • S. Thayer: The state was giving us data. Historically we would be running the report. The data they gave us 5 weeks ago was bad. Then the data from 4 weeks ago was bad. So	**Motion 8: Move that the District Assembly representatives vote "No" on this AP.** 1st: P. Ferri-Milligan 2nd: M. Copeland **Discussion:** None **Approved:** By all other voting members. **Opposed:** A. Pave, T. Vasquez **Abstentions:** None

Topic	Discussion	Action

9. New Business, continued	about 3 weeks ago our research office finally got data they able to make sense of. That's another argument we've been having. Before we were running the analyses internally. We do know we have disproportionately impacted groups, we have programs in place to support those students, and now we have this new information that's pretty much valid.
	• **Questions/Comments:**
	  ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: As you move forward I know it's been incoming that Basic Skills would have to be put together into one. So that is happening?
	  ○ S. Thayer: Right now it's still three separate. This right here is for equity to meet our obligation.
	  ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: But that's included with Basic Skills?
	  ○ S. Thayer: Not this equity plan.
	  ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: I guess that I'm concerned that as we move forward with AB 705 we remember basic skills students. We'll always have basic skulls students regardless of us having basic skills classes.
	  ○ S. Thayer: Oh, yeah. Basically right now we're trying to meet the deadline to comply. With everything that's happening now we're basically leveraging resources. Each group is already allocated funds; they've been allocated for years. A lot of it is in staffing. If you recall people have been working in those positions already. FYE is an example- staff, counselors, administrators who have been running that. They're working to close the achievement gap. Ultimately with disproportionate impact, we want to identify students who are achieving at a level less than the baseline group and target activities and looking at those metrics to make sure they're supported.
	  ○ R. Hamdy: Are these activities to support the goal to be decided on part of the goal? If there is a group that can help a group like this, I'll use J. Bjerke in the ZTC group or D. Burns-Peters with Safe Spaces, look to get folded into those groups? How does this get decided and what's the process?
	  ○ S. Thayer: We're compiling. A lot of these things were covered in the existing plan. This workgroup is trying to centralize it to see exactly what's a priority.
	  ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Is the workgroup made up of instructional faculty, student services faculty, etc.?
	  ○ S. Thayer: It's a workgroup of the larger Enrollment Management Committee.
	  ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: With program review we have a lot of different areas. Is that true of this group too?
	  ○ S. Thayer: I would say that Enrollment Management has pretty broad representation on the full committee.	

Topic	Discussion	Action
9. New Business, continued	o P. Ferri-Milligan: Maybe bring in an ad hoc committee. I know sometimes we have to add to get different perspectives. o S. Thayer: That is true. Our challenge has been the data. o P. Ferri-Milligan: How do we define "our"? o S. Thayer: It's more about the data we've been given and trying to make sense of it. I was thinking more of us as an institution vs the state. • [see second handout: Goal 1] • S. Thayer: We have this plan that's existing, so we were trying to put it in a place that makes sense. Hopefully it makes a little more sense. Last year we filled out a form on a website. There's still a website. We have to plug in what we're doing. We're working towards a deadline. This is the beginning of work that was started 4 years ago. The new date is going to be leveraging resources like these in Student Success. This is a living document that will change and be adaptable. • **Questions/Comments:** o S. Lewis: Can I just ask a question? o C. Huston: You have 5 minutes. o S. Lewis: When I look at this my assumption is that for both columns it goes from fall to spring, right? I can just pick any of them. Or is it just one? Is this number the number of students that in total? Is this who actually earned the high school diploma? What do the denominator and numerator represent? o S. Thayer: The denominator is the total number of students in that group. o S. Lewis: For? The fall? o S. Thayer: The numerator is the breakout. o S. Lewis: Okay right, but for the fall or spring? Are you getting an average of fall and spring? Because I ran the numbers, so you tell me. o Scott: This is the work of the research office. The denominator is total number of students. This was the question we had with the three renditions of data we already had. o S. Lewis: I see that. o C. Huston: So could the report that we get have more information and definitions? It would probably help. o S. Lewis: Well it would be helpful. o S. Thayer: Just so you know this is the conversation we've had with the state about the data we get. J. Smith has a grasp on these numbers. o S. Lewis: I get it. I understand what the column is; it's an average of those 2. That's fine	

Topic	Discussion	Action
9. New Business, continued	When you compare the two columns there's a huge difference. That's why is it by semester? ○ S. Thayer: The baseline is by the year. ○ C. Huston: When we get the report, we'll get it in full for our next meeting for a first read and we can keep asking questions. ○ J. Bjerke: I have a lot of questions, but really quickly why is the current baseline data the same for each page? ○ S. Thayer: It's the baseline data we got from the state. ○ J. Bjerke: Not for that group, but for all. ○ S. Thayer: Every page if you took the top off it would be the same. ○ C. Huston: But not the numerator or denominator. ○ R. Hamdy: I know you're coming back. If I can urge you, with the committee, to create some kind of transparent process. I know much of the funding is already allocated, but for the other stuff I think what the campus needs is a transparent process to access equity money. We have a lot of faculty who go to conferences, etc. and they hear other campuses say to tap into your equity money because this is an equity issue. We don't have a process to tap into that money and it's not all allocated. Please come up with a process. It's a big need on this campus and it should be student services working hand-in-hand with instruction. ○ S. Thayer: I think with the new SEA program I think we'll see an integration of a lot of those programs together. ○ R. Hamdy: Right and how do faculty wo have these ideas get funding to support those ideas to support students? We just need a process for that. ○ A. Avelar: Just an idea, we have program review. I know we have need assessment. Are equity funds ever looked at to fund needs in the needs assessment process? ○ R. Hamdy: With needs assessment it's department based. It's rare for a cross-disciplinary kind of thing. ○ C. Huston: We'll look forward to having you back for a first read. By the 15th I need you to let me know if you want me to sign his report.	
10. Announcements	• C. Huston: Remember to look at the rostrums.	
11. Adjournment	• Meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m. • Next meeting: May 1, 2019, at 3:00 p.m. in AD/SS 207.	