**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING DRAFT MINUTES**

*October 10 – 13, 2014*

*Lake Tahoe, California*

1. **ORDER OF BUSINESS**
   1. **Roll Call**

President Morse called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and welcomed members and guests.

Members present: J. Adams, K. Braden, J. Bruno, P. Crawford, D. Crump, D. Davison, J. Freitas, D. Klein, M. Grimes-Hillman, W. North, C. Rico, C. Rutan, J. Stanskas, and J. Todd.

Liaisons: Deborah Dahl-Shanks, CPFA Liaison; Richard Hansen, CCCI; Patrick Perry, Chancellor’s Office; Joe Stanton, Student Senate CCC; Shaaron Vogel, FACCC; and Pam Walker, Chancellor’s Office.

Guests: Bruce Armbrust, Lake Tahoe CC; and Sara Pierce, Lake Tahoe CC;

Staff: Linda Schlager-Butler, Senior Administrative Assistant

* 1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved by consensus.

* 1. **Public Comment**No public comment.
  2. **Calendar**

No comments.

* 1. **Dinner Arrangements**

Members were provided with the location for dinner.

1. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Consent items C, D, F, and G were pulled from the Consent Calendar.

**MSC (North/Davison) to approve Consent Calendar Items A, B, & E.**

* 1. **Executive Committee September 12 – 13, 2014 Meeting Minutes**Approved by consent.
  2. **Committee Resolution Assignments and Priorities**Approved by consent.
  3. **Legislative and Governmental Relations Committee Name Change**This item was pulled from the consent calendar to discuss whether or not the name change to “Legislative and Advocacy Committee” appropriately described the charge of the committee. The chair of the committee provided additional information about why committee members felt that the new name is reflective of the work of the committee and should be changed.   
       
     **MSC (North/Braden) to approve changing the Legislative and Governmental Relations Committee name to Legislative and Advocacy Committee.   
       
     Action:**Staff will update the website and other written materials with this change.

* 1. **Revision of Online Education Committee Charge**This item was pulled from the consent calendar to discuss the charge of this committee. The committee felt that the existing charge needed to be revised to reflect the intended purpose of the committee which includes educational technology and not just educational policy and practice. A question was raised regarding whether or not this committee replaces the Technology Committee currently on hiatus. It was clarified that this item only renames the Distance Education Task Force to the Online Education Committee and does not replace the Technology Committee.

**MSC (Davison/North) to approve the revised committee charge as noted below:**

The Online Education Committee informs and makes recommendations to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the faculty regarding policies and practices in online education and educational technology. The Committee supports quality online education and the effective use of educational technology by researching issues, writing background and position papers, and making presentations at plenary sessions and other events as needed. When appropriate, the Committee interacts with Senate standing committees, advocates for policies, and proposes resolutions.

**Action:**Staff will update the website and other written materials with this change.

* 1. **Transfer and Articulation Name Change**Approved by consent.
  2. **Resolution Handbook**This item was pulled to discuss the senator emeritus language, and the Disciplines List Revisions motions. It was noted that Standards and Practices is suggesting in the Bylaws revision that the criteria for the Senator Emeritus be moved from the Bylaws to guidelines. It was suggested that the language in the handbook be modified to address this possible change so that the Resolution Handbook would not have to be modified later, particularly since it might be an adopted paper at that point. Members discussed whether or not a Discipline List Revision motion could be withdrawn by the author. Currently, the Senate Rules only allows these types of motions to be voted up or down. Several members felt that if the author receives more information in a hearing, the author should be able to withdraw the motion similar to how other motions are withdrawn. Other language details were discussed and minor revisions were suggested.

**MSC (North/Rutan) with changes as discussed.**

**Action**

Freitas will update the Resolution Handbook with these changes and include it in the Area packet for possible adoption at the Fall Plenary Session.

* 1. **Status of Referred resolution from Spring 2014 Plenary**

This item was pulled to discuss the appropriateness of declaring a referred resolution moot. Resolution 1.06 S14 calls for the Senate mission to be revised. The Resolutions Committee felt that the resolution is moot given the fact that we have begun the strategic planning process, which includes a review and possible revision of the mission statement. Members felt that since the body referred this resolution to the Executive Committee to clarify the intent and return to the body, the Executive Committee cannot deem the resolution moot or completed. Instead, it was suggested that discussion about this resolution be included in the Fall 2014 breakout on the Senate Bylaws and Strategic Planning, which would meet the intent of the body when it referred the resolution.

**Action**

The facilitators for the breakouts on the Bylaws and Strategic Planning will include this resolution in discussions with attendees and report back to the Executive Committee.

1. **REPORTS** 
   1. President’s Report, Morse   
      President Morse thanked members for the abundance of *Rostrum* articles and provided members with a report of his activities:

* He has had conversations with CSU faculty at ICAS regarding the Bachelor’s degree legislation. Our CSU colleagues have asked that the CCC include both CSU and UC in discussions about a CCC bachelor degree.
* Consultation Council had a conversation about the system’s legislative package and a Council group will be meeting later in October to finalize the packet. Included in this package, CCLC had requested a change regarding the auditing fee for which the Senate has a position in support.
* The Student Success Center Advisory Board meeting has been delayed because all representatives have not been appointed. However, Paul Steenhausen, Executive Director, has mentioned that he will be calling a meeting of this group soon.
* Theresa Tena, Vice Chancellor of the Institutional Effectiveness at the Chancellor’s Office, is forming a group to assist her in guiding the work of her division. She has assured us that the Academic Senate will be a participant on this group. Recently a grant has been released to assist this division with its work and we have been in discussions with several colleges regarding the possibility that the Senate would support their applications.
* Morse informed members that he had a discussion with ACCJC leadership about sponsoring the Senate’s Accreditation Institute. Next year the ACCJC will be holding its own event at the encouragement of the CEOs so they will not be partnering with us. They did, however, invite us to participate in the planning of their event.
* Morse concluded his remarks by noting that he has discussed with Deputy Vice Chancellor Skinner the idea of us making a presentation to the Board of Governors to help new members understand the role of the Senate in statewide governance. He reminded members that last year’s ASCCC president had requested a standing item on the Board agenda but Chancellor Harris was concerned about the level of interest during standing reports; instead he would like us to provide specific reports on relevant topics to the Board. The first topics might include what the Senate is doing in professional development. Vice Chancellor Walker may be presenting with us at a future meeting of the Board of Governors.
  1. **Executive Director’s Report**

Adams reported on the administrative and operational activities since the last Executive Committee meeting. The administrative activities included working with faculty leads and committee chairs on preparing agendas and attending meetings, CTE grant proposal, RP and CCCAOE presentations, and CTE Curriculum Academy program, as well as numerous communications with Chancellor’s Office staff and faculty. Her operational activities included discussions about the C-ID system including transiting the technology to Butte CCD, finalized Vocational Leadership final grant report, provided overall management of the SCP grant, completed the Senate audit, prepared for the office moving (technology, copiers, cabinets, desks, phone systems, packing, etc.), developed and maintained the Senate’s Facebook page, and finally trained and checked in with Executive Committee members regarding their current workload and projects.

* 1. **Foundation President’s Report**

Foundation President Bruno reported on Foundation activities and provided the financial position of the Foundation for 2013-14. The Foundation will have fundraising activities during the Fall 2014 Plenary Session. These activities include the sale of t-shirts, raffle tickets, and an area competition.

* 1. **Legislative Activities**The Executive Committee was briefed about current legislative activities with highlights noted from the report in the agenda including those bills which have been chaptered. Information about upcoming Chancellor’s Office and Council of Faculty Organizations (CoFO) meetings to discuss the upcoming legislative year was also presented.
  2. **Chancellor’s Office Liaison Reports**   
     Vice Chancellor Walker thanked the Executive Committee for including the Chancellor’s Office staff in the Senate’s Regional Curriculum meetings and thanked President Morse for his efforts in getting more faculty involved in AB86. She then updated members on the following Chancellor’s Office activities:
     + ADTs—only 14 colleges potentially are not going to make the 100%. Their college presidents have been notified. A couple of colleges said they would drop local degrees in lieu of producing ADTs, but Chancellor’s Office advised against such action. Chancellor’s Office Staff provided possible strategies for colleges to meet the 100%.
     + Staff – there are several changes in Academic Affairs including the addition of another specialist position in basic skills.
     + Curricunet – the Chancellor’s Office is working on making it more robust
     + Prison education – the Board of Governors has taken an interest in making education more available to prisoners. She suggested that the Senate needs to be involved in this discussion.
* Bachelor Degree – Next steps in the process for establishing a bachelor’s degree program was introduced at the Consultation Council. Career technical educators will need to have significant conversations as this will likely be the area where the primary needs will stem from. She assured members that any process to establish a bachelor’s degree will go through the Consultation Council first.

Members of the Executive Committee asked how to get responses to some very critical questions related to ADTs answered by the Chancellor’s Office. The Senate representatives have inquired on numerous occasions for clarification on a number of issues colleges are having related to the ADT. Is there a way that Walker can facilitate the conversations? She agreed to bring the Executive Committee’s questions to staff to assist in providing information to the field.

* 1. **Liaison Oral Reports**

Hansen reported on CCCIs upcoming event in CCCI in Manhattan Beach that will include a negotiations workshop. He then noted that in today’s campus climate, bargaining is getting much more difficult and there are concerns with Student Success & Support Plans, particularly related to counseling and COLA increases. This topic might be something that the unions and senates can work together on. CCCI is also wrestling with academic advisors and their role in counseling students.

Vogel had to leave the meeting prior to the FACCC report so Hansen reported on FACCC activities in her stead. He updated members on the FACCC conference and events including the January meeting. This meeting is their regular advocacy event, which will have a panel discussion on accreditation, 75/25, equity and access. He concluded with a note that FACCC is also concerned with the implementation of SB850 – CCC Bachelor Degree.

CPFA Liaison Shanks briefly discussed part-time faculty and noted that when too many part-time faculty are hired in lieu of full-time faculty, the result is an inequity of access since students need equal access to their faculty regardless of whether or not they are full or part-time. Shanks mentioned that CPFA would like to work with the Senate to get more part-time faculty involved in participatory governance on their local campus and asked how this might be accomplished. Members noted that the Senate has encouraged local senates to include part-time faculty members in their activities including as voting members or in professional development activities. Members will consider other ways to ensure that local senates include part-time faculty in governance activities.

Stanton reported that the SSCCC is looking at its mission, taking action of repealing proposition 13, and considering options regarding exam-based credit. The SSCCC is also interested in working with the Senate about how to work with student advisors on colleges.

1. **ACTION ITEMS** 
   1. **C-ID Future**

Morse provided an overview of the C-ID history and shared current conversations with Chancellor’s Office staff regarding C-ID’s future. The Chancellor’s Office has expressed a need to have a district take a greater responsibility in oversight of C-ID given the system’s current reliance on the C-ID data, particularly as a foundation for the three technology initiatives. Members were presented a proposal drafted by the Chancellor’s Office for discussion. The Senate leadership has been assured that the Senate will continue to be responsible for the curricular aspects of C-ID. However, verbal assurances do not guarantee that the current relationships will remain the same. Hence, the Senate leadership has requested a more formal agreement on the Senate’s role in C-ID. As of today, there is no formal agreement. Instead the Chancellor’s Office has suggested that any agreement should be made with the district awarded the grant as funding through Proposition 98 must be awarded to a district. Members discussed the proposal and the Senate’s role in the C-ID System. Major concerns raised were as follows:

* Ensuring a stable atmosphere and structure of the C-ID system as it is a foundation for much curricular work by faculty across the state.
* The role of the Senate should be formalized in writing.
* The Senate should be able to prioritize the work of C-ID and not be driven by other initiatives or groups (e.g., CAI needs vs. C-ID users or EWD regional requests vs. discipline faculty needs). In other words, C-ID should not be handcuffed by other groups but must be able to respond quickly to faculty needs statewide.
* The recent examples of districts winning proposals without seeking input from the Senate in areas under the Senate’s purview (i.e., Saddleback professional development CAI grant) does not provide confidence in the process.
* The Steering Committee makeup as suggested in the CO proposal – only one Senate representative on a group of 15 – does not reflect a group who has the primary responsibility for curricular issues.
* The Senate should not have to re-negotiate for funding C-ID every time the C-ID System grant comes up for renewal. The system needs to be built into the structure of the community college system.
* The C-ID System (a statewide project) operating under a district is problematic given that colleges have a different culture which could potentially change the C-ID system to be more college focused and not provide a statewide perspective.
* The proposal states that the district’s operations director and the ASCCC curriculum director would work “collaboratively to accomplish the grant objectives.” Collaboratively should instead be “mutually agree” or “rely primarily” on the advice of the ASCCC curriculum director as informed by the ASCCC Executive Committee to reflect the role of faculty in curricular matters.
* The faculty participation might diminish if C-ID is moved to a district, which is problematic given that there is some disagreement in the field about the relationship between college curricular processes and C-ID. In addition, CSU might resist participation in C-ID if a district has a greater role and the ASCCC’s role is lessened. Colleges are very suspicious about losing local control and this could undermine C-ID and provide colleges with reasons to not participate in C-ID.

In reading the proposal, members questioned the need to move the operations and other responsibilities from the Senate to a district. The proposal even acknowledges the work of the Senate in successfully developing the C-ID System to what it is today. The current relationship with Los Rios CCD had been effective as it has allowed the Senate to grow the C-ID System with oversight but also flexibility to ensure that C-ID met the needs of the state and not only Los Rios.

Members asked why after seven years, the Chancellor’s Office felt the need to have a district take on a greater role. It was explained that the Chancellor’s Office would like to ensure a stable atmosphere and structure as many system processes are dependent on C-ID and the transient nature of Senate leadership could cause instability. It was noted, however, that the same challenges occur in the Chancellor’s Office with staff replacements. Several suggestions were made to strengthen the Senate’s structure to provide the Chancellor’s Office with assurances that the C-ID governance is stable.

By consensus, members felt that the Senate should continue to be the driving force of C-ID, which requires the Senate to be at the center of C-ID decision making process. Members strongly recommended that the Senate provide all colleges who sent in an intent to apply for the C-ID System grant a packet expressing the Senate’s integral role in C-ID.

**MSU (Stanskas/North) to direct the Executive Director to develop a packet to distribute to all districts that are interested in applying for CID grant, clearly outlining the role of the Senate.**

**MSU (North/Bruno) to work with the Chancellor’s Office to provide for short- and long-term fiscal stability of C-ID.**

**Action**

* Adams to develop a grant packet to send to all colleges who submitted a Request for Interest providing what the Senate is willing to provide in support of the C-ID System.
* Senate leadership to work with the Chancellor’s Office to provide for short- and long-term fiscal stability of C-ID.

* 1. **C-ID Report: Bruno**

Members received an update on activities related to C-ID including TMC development and ICW conversations and CB-21. Resolution 9.03 F13 asked us to review the CB21 data collection processes for accuracy in CB21 coding. The Senate held two meetings to review the CB21 rubric, to consider creating basic skills descriptors using C-ID descriptors for English composition and statistics as examples, and to review the knowledge, skills, abilities, and competencies related to the Common Assessment Initiative. The question was raised whether or not the changes to the CB 21 rubrics would need to go to the delegates for approval since the initial rubrics were adopted by the body. Members felt that the changes were clarifying modifications and did not change the intent of the rubrics, which would suggest that the changes did not need to go forward to the body for discussion and possible adoption. By consensus, the CB21 rubrics will be modified to reflect the discussion at the CB21 meetings.

**MSC (North/Braden) to modify the CB21 rubrics.**

Concern was raised regarding the Chancellor’s Office decisions on posting TMC templates including the revision dates. Some templates were not posted or posted with incorrect dates. In addition, there seems to be some communication issues with the Chancellor’s Office reporting out to colleges about requirements or deadlines. The Executive Committee raised a number of questions which will be provide to the Chancellor’s Office for response.

**Action**

The CB21 rubrics will be modified, posted to the website, and circulated to interested individuals.

* 1. **Accreditation Institute**

The Executive Committee discussed the proposed program for the Accreditation Institute and provided feedback regarding keynote presentations and breakouts.

**MSC (North/Davison) to approve the Accreditation Institute program as discussed.**

**Action**

The Accreditation Program will return to the January Executive Committee meeting for final approval.

* 1. **Academic Academy Draft Program Outline**The Executive Committee discussed the proposed outline for the Academic Academy Institute and provided feedback regarding the structure, keynote presentations, and breakouts. Members considered the idea of a process for calling for proposals rather than our usual practice of contacting possible presenters. The institute coordinators suggested that a call for proposals might provide the Senate with a larger pool of presentations versus the current use of limited “word of mouth” suggestions.

**MSC (Rutan/Stanskas) to approve the outline of the Academic Academy as discussed and the call for proposal process.**

**Action**

The program will return to the January meeting for discussion and possible approval.

* 1. **Proposed Outline for the revision of the document: *Empowering Local Senates—Local Senates Handbook: Braden***

The chair of the Relations with Local Senates Committee reminded members that this committee was charged with revising the 2007 document *Empowering Local Senates—Local Senates Handbook.* The committee developed a proposed outline for consideration by the Executive Committee. Members were asked to provide feedback regarding the outline, particularly considering any gaps or updates of the current version. The outline was discussed and several suggestions were provided.   
  
**MSC (North/Todd) to approve the outline of *Empowering Local Senates Handbook* as presented.**

**Action**

This item will return to a future agenda for consideration for approval of the publication.

* 1. **Officers Meeting Action Items**

At its August meeting, the Executive Committee assigned the following two tasks to the officers: develop guidelines for the scope of the Officers’ committee meeting and propose a revised structure for the evaluation of the executive director. The officers met and provided the following recommendations for consideration by the Executive Committee.

Guidelines for Officer Meeting: The officers will meet monthly or on an as needed basis for the following reasons:

* To assist the president in preparing the Executive Committee Agendas;
* To be a sounding board for decisions that must be made prior to the next Executive Committee meeting;
* To provide advice regarding the functions of the Executive Committee; and
* To discuss other tasks as assigned by the Executive Committee.

Executive Director Evaluation Process:

* Setting goals
  + The president, vice president, and executive director will mutually agree on the annual goals for consideration by the Executive Committee.
* Evaluation
* The elected officers and one Executive Committee member (elected by the Executive Committee) will serve as the evaluation team.
* All Executive Committee members will provide input via an evaluation instrument.
* The Evaluation Team will synthesize the feedback from the Executive Committee and provide the Executive Committee with a summary report and make a recommendation to the Executive Committee – either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
* The Executive Committee will decide whether or not to accept the recommendation of the Evaluation Team. If they decide not to accept the recommendation, they will provide a detailed report of their decision.

**MSC (Freitas/Rutan) to approve the guidelines for the officers meetings.**

**MSC (Crawford/Davison) to approve the executive director evaluation process.**

* 1. **Local Senate Survey**

The Relations with Local Senates Committee chair presented a draft survey developed by the committee to measure the field’s impressions on our current division of areas. This survey was developed in response to Resolution1.05 S14, which asked the Academic Senate to evaluate the representative positions of the ASCCC. Members questioned whether or not the survey would result in the information needed to respond to the resolution’s intent. A number of concerns and suggestions were provided to inform the chair about how best to revise the survey.

**MSC (Braden/Bruno) to develop two questions with the Area Representatives and the executive director to inform how best to respond to this resolution.**

* 1. **Current (Recency) Survey from Standards and Practices Committee**

The Executive Committee discussed a survey developed by the Standards and Practices Committee to gather information about the feasibility of adding a recency requirement to the Disciplines List and are colleges currently requiring recency. Members raised a number of questions including whether or not adding a recency requirement to all disciplines was legal, whether this is a Senate issue versus a union issue, and the necessity of the survey.

**Action**

Rutan will follow up with the Chancellor’s Office to determine whether or not adding recency is legal and bring this item back to the Executive Committee for further discussion.

* 1. **Accreditation Paper Outline**The Accreditation and Assessment Committee chair presented two draft outlines of the Accreditation Paper for consideration by the Executive Committee. The resolution passed by the delegates (2.01 S12) was unclear about the intent of the paper. In one way the resolution appears to ask for a “how to” document that provided specific processes in writing of the institutional self evaluation (option 2). On the other hand, the committee felt that the best way to improve accreditation outcomes is to weave the standards into the life of the institution, which would require a paper that focuses on faculty participation in institutional processes (option 1). The committee presented two options to address the resolution. Members felt that option 1 – a paper focusing on faculty participation in institutional processes was the best option.

**MSC (Rico/Bruno) to accept option 1 as noted above.**

**Action**

A draft paper will be presented at a future Executive Committee meeting for discussion.

* 1. **Fall Plenary Session**

The Executive Committee discussed changes to the preliminary 2014 Fall Plenary Session Program and were updated on keynote presentations.

* 1. **ASCCC Certification**The Executive Committee discussed the idea of developing an ASCCC certification program. In a recent survey of professional societies (501)(c)(6) by the American Society of Association Executives, research found that there is a strong perception that credentials provide both a direct and indirect value to associations. Many of the benefits described in the survey results could apply to the Senate and its membership. For example, benefits to the organization include: reinforced values of the association; increased legitimacy as voice of members to government; increased involvement of members; and increased visibility of the association to the public to name a few. Some of the benefits to members include: defined a common body of knowledge; elevated reputation of credential holders; or built connections and community among credential holders.

**MSC (Bruno/Braden) to approve the exploration of creating a credentialing program for the Senate.**

**Action**

Adams, in collaboration with Professional Development Committee Chair Davison, to explore developing a credentialing program for consideration by the Executive Committee.

* 1. **Committee Communication**The Executive Committee discussed ways to improve committee practices for communicating meeting information to the field. Last year, it became apparent that the delegates and faculty in general wanted greater transparency of the work of the Senate including the committees. This item shared information about the Senate’s improved processes this year including holding Executive Committee meetings on a local campus, making the Executive Committee agendas available online at least 10 days prior to the meeting, sending emails to senate presidents informing them of the meeting locations and online availability of the agenda, and finally the development of a Facebook page to push out information to faculty.

The Executive Committee has current policies and practices for communicating its work with the field. One area the Executive Committee might consider including in its practices is how to inform the field about the work of the committees, task forces, and ad hoc groups. Currently, agendas and minutes are posted on the Senate website under the committees tab. Members agreed that a guidelines document might be developed with such good practices as posting the committee agenda in a timely manner to allow access to the field if they would like to observe a meeting or pushing information out via Facebook announcing that a meeting will happen on the date and at the location. However, members felt strongly that urgent items and discussions still need to be allowed or the work of the Senate committees might be hindered.

**Action**

Adams will work on revising the policies and drafting some guidelines for consideration by the Executive Committee at a future meeting.

* 1. **Executive Committee Resolutions**

The Executive Committee discussed resolutions to forward to pre-session Area Meetings for discussion.

**MSC (Rico/Davison) to approve the Executive Committee resolutions to forward to the area meetings.**

**Action**

Adams and Freitas will finalize the resolutions to send to the Area meetings for discussion.

* 1. **Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) Draft Paper**

The Executive Committee considered delaying the second reading of the paper. Members were informed that the authors of the paper believe that the following unanswered questions are significant enough to delay the progress of the paper if it is to be useful to local senates:

What is the consequence of not achieving the college’s stated Board of Governors (BoG) Goals for ADT development? Can a college change its BoG goals? And, if so, how does one do so?

Does a college have to remove its existing degree if it has a transfer degree in the TOP Code and is not able to create an ADT?

Does the existence of a degree with a career technical education goal in a Transfer Model Curriculum TOP Code have a degree-creation obligation?

Do we need C-ID approval by June 30, 2015 for ALL courses on an ADT that have a C-ID designator or just courses that appear in the CORE and LIST A? (NOTE: efforts are underway to obtain clarification on this issue.)

Given that a C-ID determination of “Conditional Approval” or “Not Approved” can be made at any time and, potentially, just before the June 30 deadline for approval, will the Chancellor’s Office hold harmless colleges that have acted in good faith and permit them additional time to obtain C-ID approval?

What is the consequence of not creating an ADT as required by SB440?

What is the process for modification of an existing ADT?

Members agreed that the paper would be incomplete without the answers to these questions.

**MSC (Davison/Freitas) to postpone the ADT paper until the above questions are answered by the Chancellor’s Office.**

**Action**

* The Senate leadership team will work with the Chancellor’s Office to obtain answers to the questions above.
* Once the questions are answered, the authors of the ADT paper will bring this item back to the Executive Committee for discussion and possible approval.

1. **DISCUSSION** 
   1. **Board of Governors/Consultation Council: Morse/Bruno**

Morse previewed the upcoming Consultation council Meeting. The Consultation Council was scheduled to discuss AB86 and recent interim reports submitted by the AB86 consortia. The Cabinet (three CCC and three CDE representatives) hired Hanover Research to prepare a summary of these reports identifying key trends and commonly-mentioned gaps in the current provisions of education to adult students. They noted fours findings: 1) concerns of the consortia about creating and communicating educational pathways; 2) the need to adequately prepare students for work, coupled with the fact that many students are not currently seeking higher education; 3) lack of professional educators needed to achieve the goals; and 4) students, teachers, counselors, and other staff encountering personal barriers and gaps. The Hanover Research Summary is available on the Consultation Council Agenda webpage: <http://extranet.cccco.edu/SystemOperations/ConsultationCouncil/AgendasandSummaries/October2014.aspx>.

The Consultation Council would also discuss the Board of Governors Legislative package. This year there are four proposals: class auditing fee, concurrent enrollment, CalWORKs, and specialized public safety training.

The Council would also discuss the process to take the ACCJC name out of Title 5 language related to accreditation and the obligatory item on implementation of the Fall 2015 Faculty Obligation Number.

At its September meeting, the Board of Governors discussed the Legislative report on Accreditation and ACCJC, the Career Technical Education Task Force, Equity Funding, and the Budget Change Proposals. The full agenda for the Board of Governors Meeting can be found on their website at <http://extranet.cccco.edu/SystemOperations/BoardofGovernors/Meetings.aspx>.

* 1. **AB 86 Report**The Noncredit Committee chair updated the Executive Committee on the Senate’s survey results on the participation of faculty in the AB86 local planning and on the regional AB86 summits across the state. The study completion rate was high with 83/112 or 74% response rate. In response to the question on their extent of involvement 67% said they were involved in the process. However, 33% were not involved at all in the process. The response to the quality of involvement varied with some heavily involved in the process to those who were just invited to be part of the consortia. Some survey participants noted the reason why they were not involved were the original set-up of consortia excluded faculty, no compensation, no time or no invitation to participate.

Members were updated on the AB86 Summit. Each consortia sent two faculty and two non-faculty members to the summit. Chancellor Harris opened the summit and thanked participants for standing up and delivering a product. He noted that this is an unprecedented opportunity for two systems to work together to create better pathways for students and better access for historically underserved students. He introduced the AB 86 cabinet and workgroup. A legislative panel comprised of Assembly member Joan Buchanan, Principal Consultant, Senate Education Committee Kathleen Chavira, and Principal Consultant, Assembly Committee on Higher Education Jeanice Warden-Washington addressed the participants. This panel suggested that while this is a great opportunity, consortia as experts should ask for more time to complete the planning. After the panel discussion, attendees participated in several group activities.

Members considered how the Executive Committee could help this conversation statewide including

* holding regionals related to AB86 and adult education.
* creating a sub-committee which overlaps with Adult Education.
* Exploring the line between credit and non-credit.
  1. **Student Success Initiative Implementation – System Goals (Goals for the California Community College System)**The Executive Committee heard a report from Executive Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry on the system goals approved by the Board of Governors. Perry provided the legislative impetus and process for the development of the system goals. He noted that there are nine metrics in the following five areas:
     1. Student Success,
        + overall completion rates of any degree or certificate within 6-years
        + remedial math attainment rates
        + remedial English attainment rates
        + CTE degree or certificate attainment rates
        + volume of ADTs earned by the system
     2. Equity Index measuring success outcomes by race and ethnicity.
     3. Student Services, measuring the percentage of students with educational plans.
     4. Efficiency, measured by the total FTES generated by the 6-year cohort divided by the total number of outcomes.
     5. Participation Rates and Access, measured by the overall percentage of 18-24 year old Californians enrolled in the system and participation rates for various student populations.

These goals are aligned with Scorecard, Student Success Task Force recommendations, SB195, and draft budget language. A very significant difference in success outcomes was apparent when the cohort was divided between prepared and unprepared students. Perry explained the metrics and their relationship to the five areas. The Board of Governors goal for the Scorecard is to show a 1% increase for a 13/14 cohort, and a 2.5% increase for Scorecard student success metrics. Members engaged with Perry on the data and the implications for all colleges. There will be an annual review and summary of the system goals.

* 1. **Strategic Planning**

The Executive Committee continued planning in preparation for Fall Plenary Session.

**VI. REPORTS**

1. **Committee Reports**
   1. Accreditation and Assessment Committee, Stanskas
   2. Curriculum committee, Grimes-Hillman
   3. Educational Policies Committee, Freitas
   4. Legislation and Governmental Relations Committee, Bruno
   5. Professional Development Committee, Davison
   6. Standards and practices Committee, Rutan
   7. Transfer and Articulation committee, Rico
2. **Task Force Reports**
   1. Distance Education Paper Task Force, Freitas
   2. Online Education Task Force, Freitas
   3. Part-time Paper Task Force, Davison
3. **Liaison Reports**
   1. Common Assessment Initiative, Rutan
   2. CCC Chief Instructional Officers, Grimes-Hillman
   3. Educational Planning Initiative, Rico
   4. Professional Development Clearinghouse, Davison
   5. System Advisory Committee on Curriculum, Grimes-Hillman
4. **Senate Grant and Project Reports**
   1. Fullerton, Freitas/Grimes-Hillman
   2. Pasadena, Grimes-Hillman

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

President D. Morse adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m. on Sunday, October 12, 2014.

Respectfully submitted by

Linda Schlager-Butler, Senior Administrative Assistant

Julie Adams, Executive Director

John Stanskas, Secretary