![Academic Senate for California Community Colleges — LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.]

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
June 1 – 2, 2017 Minutes
Monterey Plaza Hotel and Spa, Monterey

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

A. Roll Call

President Bruno called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m. and welcomed members and guests.

J. Adams, C. Aschenbach, R. Beach, D. Davison, A. Foster, S. Foster, J. Freitas, G. May, C. McKay, C. Rutan, C. Smith, L. Slattery-Farrell, and J. Stanskas.

Liaisons Present: Pam Walker, Chancellor's Office.

Guests Present: Rebecca Eikey, incoming Area C Representative (College of the Canyons), LaTonya Parker, incoming At-large Representative (Moreno Valley College), and Carrie Roberson, incoming North Representative (Butte College).

B. Approval of the Agenda

C. Public Comment
This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Executive Committee on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

D. Calendar

E. Action Tracking

II. CONSENT CALENDAR (Smith/Davison)
A. April 19, 2017, Meeting Minutes, Davison
B. Curriculum Institute 2017 Final Draft Program, Davison
E. Accreditation Liaison Officer (LAO), Rutan
G. OER Task Force Charge, Adams
K. Exemplary Award Theme, Freitas

   Item II. C. Academic Senate Foundation Directors
   A representative from Area B was not included on the agenda item. President Bruno recommended that the additional director be Conan McKay since he is from Area B.

   MSC (Slattery-Farrell/John Freitas) to approve the following Foundation Directors:

Craig Rutan, Foundation President
John Freitas, Foundation Secretary
Cheryl Aschenbach, Foundation Treasurer
Conan McKay, Director

Action
The Foundation website will be updated.

Item II. D. A^{2}MEND
The Executive Committee discussed a partnership with A^{2}Mend. The partnership is to:
- coordinate a faculty track for the conference via Equity Diversity Action Committee (EDAC) including call for proposals, selection of presenters, and facilitation of sessions;
- assist with promoting the event;
- allow use of the ASCCC name and reputation to advertise the conference; and
- provide scholarships for faculty to attend the event, if funding is available.

MSC (A. Foster/S. Foster) to partner with A^{2}mend for their 2018 conference.

Action
EDAC will bring back a recommendation about how to partner with A^{2}Mend in the future.

Item II. F. Periodic Review Report Recommendations
A question was raised about action on page 3, under Professional Integrity, in response to a recommendation that the ASCCC create and delineate a clear process for addressing grievances, complaints, lawsuits, or related issues. The action was to add a question to the self-study that addresses the recommendation. A member asked whether or not this action was sufficient to address the recommendation. It was noted that in a breakout with members of the Periodic Review Committee (PRC), this is the action they suggested would address this recommendation. The interest of the PRC was that they wanted to ensure that members were aware of grievances, complaints, lawsuits, and other related issues, which could be identified through the survey.

MSC (Slattery-Farrell/Freitas) to approve the actions in response to the Periodic Review.

Action
The Executive Director will either implement or facilitate the actions as noted by the PRC.

Item II. H. 2017 Spring Session Resolution Assignments
The Executive Committee discussed Resolution 9.01 S17 and its assignment to
the Accreditation Committee. The resolution asks the ASCCC to update the SLO
Glossary and to create a paper on student learning outcomes. It was suggested
that a task force, comprised of members of the Accreditation and Curriculum
Committees, be formed to address Resolution 9.01.

**MSC (Freitas/Slattery-Farrell) to keep the assignment as the Accreditation
Committee for tracking the resolution progress.**

Action
A taskforce will be formed to address Resolution 9.01 S17. Both the
Accreditation and Curriculum Committee chairs will solicit members to serve on
this taskforce.

Item II. I. Resolution Handbook
The Executive Committee discussed the Resolution Handbook, particularly
whether or not the handbook should go to the body for adoption. It was noted that
the handbook was taken to the body the first time because it pulled together many
different processes and policies into one place. It may not be necessary to take it
to the body at this time because the vice president asks the body to adopt the rules
and procedures, which includes this handbook, every plenary. One reason this
handbook might need to go to the delegates is because of the change to the
mandatory breakout on resolutions, which is new.

MSC (May/McKay) to approve the handbook changes.

Action
When asking the body to adopt the procedures and rules, the vice president will
announce that it is important for those who write resolutions to attend the
breakout session.

Item II. J. Executive Committee Policies
The Executive Committee discussed policies on stipends for members and dues.
Concern was raised regarding the policy on dues and the possible implications of
the policy. A suggestion was made to change the word "fails" to "chooses not" in
the fourth paragraph, first sentence. This change clarifies that there is a difference
between having financial difficulty in paying the dues versus refusing to pay the
membership dues. It was also noted that this policy is permissive. The Executive
Committee has the final decision in whether or not to remove the privileges of a
member senate and would not take this decision lightly. Another suggestion was
to include in this policy how a college becomes a member senate. Then the policy
is not just about if a member senate does not pay its dues but more about
becoming a member senate and the obligations of being a member senate.

MSC (Smith/S. Foster) to approve the policies to 50.0 and 70.0, with the understanding that how to become a member senate will be brought back to a future meeting.

<u>**Action**</u>
Adams and Freitas will draft a policy for how to become a member senate.

III.   **REPORTS**

A. **President's/Executive Director's Report – 40 mins., Bruno/Adams**
    Bruno updated members of the IEPI Executive and Advisory Committee meetings. IEPI will be developing Applied Solution Kits (ASKs) for guided pathways and change management leadership. IEPI will develop the guided pathways ASK. Implementation of guided pathways might require the restructuring of how community colleges currently operate, which could affect institutional effectiveness. The IEPI Indicators Advisory Committee will assist in developing key indicators and data collection.

    The Institutional Effectiveness division is overseeing the implementation of the Guided Pathways Award Program noted in the Governor's budget trailer bill. The plan is to enter into a contract with an outside vendor to coordinate the work of Guided Pathways Award Program. The Academic Senate has been approached to participate in the work, which will come with resources to support faculty involvement. The Career Ladders Project and Research and Planning (RP) group will also partner in this effort. Currently, work has begun on the application process, and setting goals or benchmarks. IEPI is using the experience of the Strong Workforce Program to inform planning.

    The ASCCC Advocacy Day was very productive. Advocacy for predictable funding of the C-ID system resulted in $1 million one-time funds for C-ID in the 2017-2018 budget as well as trailer bill language stating the Chancellor's Office can directly contract with the ASCCC rather than sending funds through a district, which is frequently complicated and inefficient.

    Chancellor Oakley has begun a strategic visioning project for the system. He is asking the California community college community to provide information through interviews and virtual town hall meetings. It is anticipated that the vision report will guide the work of the system for the next few years. The report will be presented to the Board of Governors at the July meeting.

    Bruno informed members that she was asked to serve on the ACCJC Nominations Committee, which detemines qualified candidates for seats on the commission. Unfortunately, the commission currently allows non-faculty to serve in academic positions. Traditionally, only faculty were qualified to serve as academic representatives until the commission revised its policy regarding the definition of "academic" to allow administrators to serve in the positions. As a result, Bruno stated that she went on the record as not supporting some candidates seeking

academic positions because they were not faculty. Some positions were appointed by groups such as WASC. Rich Hansen (past president of CCCI and math faculty at De Anza College) is running as an at large candidate. However, some of the group questioned whether Hansen is faculty since he will retire and become part-time faculty. ACCJC has begun a search for a new president.

Bruno provided an update on Accreditation including the continuing efforts of Workgroup I to make recommendations to ACCJC on improving accreditation policies and processes. Some recommendations have been accepted, some were rejected, and some are still outstanding. This group has completed a status report, which will be presented to the Board of Governors. The chair of the workgroup sent a letter to the ACCJC chair on items particularly problematic such as the academic (faculty) representative issue. Workgroup II has determined that the CEOs will use their annual meeting to consider making a recommendation on a model to move forward in pursuing a single accreditor.

Bruno updated members on a meeting with Adams and the newly appointed Board of Governors member Man Phan. Additionally, she provided an update on the success of the Noncredit Summit and CTE Leadership Institute as well as her visit to San Bernardino CCD and participation in the Leadership Summit in Bakersfield.

Adams and Stanskas attended a meeting with UC faculty on developing associate degrees in chemistry and physics based on the UC Transfer Pathway that would include C-ID courses. The UC faculty were very supportive of the partnership and agreed to create a pilot project. As part of the pilot project, UC will explore options to guarantee admission to a UC campus for students that have completed the preparation as delineated in UC transfer pathways.

Adams and Bruno met with the Chancellor's Office and the governor's staff on the progress of the ADTs. As part of the conversation on transfer, they were able to share with the governor's staff the news about the work with UC on the UC Transfer Pathways.

Adams and Freitas attended the meeting of the California Apprenticeship Council (CAC) meeting to hear the discussion on the Apprenticeship minimum qualifications. It was an interesting conversation and clearly demonstrated the differences in the ASCCC position and the CAC recommendations. Adams and Freitas also facilitated the ASCCC hearing on the changes to the Apprenticeship minimum qualifications. There were about 30 people present and most were opposed to our recommended change and supportive of the CAC recommendation.

The C-ID System technology will be ready for user testing very soon. The new technology will be streamlined and provide more tools to facilitate the work. The website will also have a new look and feel.

Adams noted that she and Bruno attended the meetings on Guided Pathways and Math 110, as well as the ASCCC Foundation meeting.

Adams informed members that the Tax Office (the external accounting firm used by the ASCCC) has undergone significant changes. As a result, she will be determining what action is needed to ensure that the ASCCC has the appropriate services. The September 8 -9 meeting will begin a day early so that succession planning can occur and Adams has contacted a consultant to assist the board with the succession planning. Finally, Adams noted that she has begun interviewing for a new executive assistant.

B. **Foundation President's Report**
The Foundation met on May 18 at the ASCCC Office. At that meeting, it was announced that the ASCCC President would be bringing forward a recommendation for the new officers for the Foundation Board at the Executive Committee meeting. The board updated the Foundation Strategic Plan and removed the PDC as the ASCCC would be responsible for the content development. The directors reviewed the Foundation budget and noted that the fundraising goal of $40,000 was surpassed; however, the Foundation expenses exceeded the amount raised, which is not sustainable.

May reminded members that in the past the Foundation meeting and other costs were absorbed by the ASCCC. However, the Executive Committee requested that the Foundation request a budget allocation from the ASCCC in an effort to control costs. The Foundation will be requesting $10,000 for the 2017-18 year.

The recent Spring Fling was well attended and a lot of fun. However, based on feedback from session attendees, the Foundation would benefit from making the event more inclusive. Next spring, the Spring Fling will be a dance event and open to all attendees at the plenary session.

May noted that later on the agenda, the future of the Foundation will be discussed. The directors are suggesting that the Foundation focus move to funding research projects through grants and not relying on donations from faculty. The Foundation is recommending several research projects including effective practices for recruiting, hiring, and retaining faculty from diverse backgrounds and life experiences, multiple measures effective practices, STEM interventions for CCC and K-12 Teachers. Currently, Adams and Prasad are preparing a letter to send to grantors seeking funds for research proposals.

C. **Liaison Oral Reports** *(please keep report to 5 mins., each)*
Liaisons from the following organizations are invited to provide the Executive Committee with updates related to their organization: AAUP, CCA, CCCI, CFT, FACCC, and the Student Senate.

No liaison reports were made.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Legislative Update
The Executive Committee was updated on recent legislative activities.

B. Ensuring Effective Practices for Online Education
The Executive Committee discussed the draft *Ensuring Practices for Online Education* paper. The paper will come back to another meeting for a first reading.

C. Noncredit Summit
The Executive Committee discussed whether or not to assume the coordination of the Noncredit Summit. Aschenbach reminded members that the ASCCC originally agreed to hold regional meetings on the topic of noncredit. However, after discussion with ACCE, the two organizations determined that it might be better to hold a noncredit summit (which was approved by the Executive Committee) and approached the Chancellor's Office with the proposal. The Chancellor's Office liked the idea and pulled in 3CSN and IEPI to assist with the planning of the event.

In working with IEPI, however, the planning group was frustrated with the coordination. When IEPI assumed the program coordination, it branded the event as an IEPI event, which did not acknowledge the partner organizations – ASCCC, ACCE, and 3CSN – as the content expertise. In addition, there were challenges with the coordination process including program development and execution. IEPI did not have staff resources similar to what the ASCCC staff provide such as coordination of program and logistics, which require the planning group (particularly the ASCCC lead) to assume more of an administrative role. While IEPI provided an opportunity to hold the event at a reduced price, Aschenbach recommends that the ASCCC consider coordinating the event with the same partners and others as appropriate and explore ways to reduce the cost for attendees, if possible.

MSC (Smith/May) to take over the coordination of the event in partnership with ACCE and others regardless of whether IEPI can facilitate the event in 2018.

<u>**Action**</u>
Next year, ASCCC will coordinate the event with the same partners and others as appropriate and explore ways to reduce the cost for attendees.

D. Regional Meetings
The Executive Committee discussed the fall and spring regional. The following topics were suggested: accreditation, civil discourse, CTE, curriculum, and noncredit.

MSC (Slattery-Farrell/Freitas) to approve the dates in the agenda except for 10/6 – 7, as well as topics listed above with more topics to come at a later point.

Action
In fall, the ASCCC Standing Committees will discuss whether or not to hold a regional meeting in topics to be determined.

E. C-ID Math 110 Descriptor and ICW
The Executive Committee discussed a decision by ICW to include language requiring intermediate algebra competency in eight Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs). The math FDRG modified the Math 110 Descriptor to address CSUs decision to extend the Statway pilot project. After vetting the Math 110 descriptor several times, the descriptor was modified to include a the pre-requisite of either intermediate algebra or any CSU accepted statistics pathway curriculum. The C-ID System staff conducted a survey of the 14 majors that included Math 110 in their TMC to gauge the impact of the Math 110 prerequisite change on the major. The results of the survey resulted in two TMCs that would be impacted by the change—business and economics. Subsequently, it was determined that economics does not need to include the intermediate algebra competency because the major requires higher math—calculus. This information was provided to ICW.

During the ICW meeting, however, CSU presented another seven majors which would require intermediate algebra as preparation for upper division and suggested that if these majors did not include language indicating the need for the competency in intermediate algebra, then CSU might have to re-evaluate whether or not the TMCs were similar to the CSU majors. Thus, ICW accommodated the request and approved the language be added to the eight TMCs.

Since this decision, there has been political pressure on CCC and CSU to justify why the requirement should be added to these eight majors. There have been letters from social justice organizations sent to both the CCC and CSU Chancellors expressing concern. The two Chancellors have responded as well as had conversations about this issue.

Last week, representatives from the CCC Chancellor's Office, ASCCC, and California Acceleration Project met to discuss the decision and possible solutions. The group determined that a meeting with CSU would be beneficial to determine how CSU identified the additional eight disciplines. The same group will meet with CSU on June 8th to consider next steps on this issue. The Business FDRG has developed a content review detailing why the competency statement should be included in the Business TMC. The Executive Committee will be kept informed about this issue.

F. Leadership Survey

The Executive Committee discussed a survey for new senate leaders to be distributed at the Leadership Institute.

MSC (Freitas/Smith) to approve the Leadership Survey as amended, to be distributed at the Faculty Leadership Institute.

<u>**Action**</u>

Leadership Survey to be distributed to new senate leaders at the Faculty Leadership Institute and subsequently to the field in September.

G. UC Transfer Pathway Associate Degree Pilot

Stanskas shared with members background discussions with UC regarding C-ID and the UC Transfer Pathways as well as the history of the development of UC Transfer Pathways. UC is interested in improving transfer to UC as well as participating in C-ID and invited CCC faculty to meet with UC faculty in chemistry and physics to determine how best the two segments could work together. The majors of chemistry and physics were selected because the CCC are having difficulty in creating ADTs in these majors. CCCs either cannot get the units to fit within the 60 units mandated by the legislation or faculty are dissatisfied with the content and do not believe that the rigor is at the level appropriate for upper division work. It also makes sense to begin with these two majors because there are few chemistry or physic majors. With a small pool of transfers, UC could do their tracking to see how these students do to achieve UC's goals of diversifying their student population as well as performance.

The idea is for CCCs to create an degree modeled on the UC Transfer Pathways in the discipline. The faculty discussed an intersegmental agreement that includes guaranteed admission to the UC system for students who are awarded the degree and meet a minimum GPA. Although faculty in both systems are in agreement, there are some challenges in implementing the guarantee. UC is flexible with the general education and most of their science students take GE in their final two years. However, CCC are required to have at least 18 units of GE in order to award a degree. After some discussion, faculty determined that IGETC for STEM could be modified to defer 12 units of GE until after transfer, which would leave 24 units in GE for CCC to require. The next step is to work with the system offices to determine how the guarantee would work as well as other details to implement the pilot program.

MSC (A. Foster/S. Foster) to support the UC Transfer Pilot Program.

H. Strategic Plan Update and Priorities for 2017 – 18

The Executive Committee reviewed the 2016 – 17 ASCCC Strategic Plan and the strategic priorities for 2017 – 18. The Budget and Finance Committee met to develop the budget for 2017 – 18. In their discussions, they identified the goals and priorities for 2017 – 18 and aligned funding to accomplish the goals.

Members briefly discussed the 2017 – 18 priorities and made several suggestions.

MSC (Smith/McKay) to approve the priorities as amended.

I. **ASCCC 2017 – 18 Budget**
The Executive Committee reviewed the ASCCC Budget development process, the 2016 – 17 budget performance, and discussed the ASCCC budget for the 2017 – 18 fiscal year as recommended by the officers. Members discussed the budget and budget process.

MSC (Rutan/Smith) to tentatively approve the budget to cover operations during the summer.

Action
The 2017 – 18 budget will return to the August Executive Committee meeting for approval.

J. **Part-time Faculty Leadership Institute**
Adams noted that the Part-time Leadership Institute already has over 150 registrants. She asked for members to send an email to her if they are willing to volunteer to assist with the event including participating in breakout sessions. The Executive Committee reviewed and provided feedback on the 2017 Part-time Faculty Summer Institute draft program.

MSC (Aschenbach/Davison) to approve the program with the understanding that the president will have the final approval.

K. **Annual Committee Reports**
Adams requested that the committee chairs review the committee resolutions and committee priorities, located in the Executive Committee binder, to inform the ASCCC strategic planning report provided to the field in fall as well as the work of the committee next year. During orientation on Sunday, chairs will have the opportunity to discuss the status of the committee work as well as provide feedback on the direction of the committee. She then reminded chairs that they will need to send to her their committee reports by July 7th and be sure to connect the work of the committee to the strategic plan goals and activities. No action taken.

Action:
Committee chairs will send to Adams the committee reports to inform the strategic planning annual report.

L. **ASCCC Professional Development**
The Executive Committee discussed the ASCCC current professional development activities. Adams noted that the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) makes recommendations to the Executive Committee on future activities

and requested that the incoming chair agendize the topic on the first FDC agenda. Members discussed feedback from a breakout session at the Spring Plenary Session, particularly how the ASCCC can provide professional development activities in a number of modalities to serve the diverse needs of the faculty.

Members discussed the Academic Academy including the timeline, coordinating body, and other details related to hold this event.

By consensus, the ASCCC institutes originally approved by the Executive Committee will be held on the approved dates except for the Academic Academy. Those that are planning an event will ensure that counseling and library science faculty issues are acknowledged and addressed through the program content. The Executive Committee will re-evaluate the Academic Academy date as well as the modality in which it will be held and the audience it is intended to serve. FDC is tasked with developing recommendations for holding ASCCC events in different modalities including webinar series, podcasts, YouTube videos, etc.

Action
- The FDC will discuss at its first meeting topics for the PDC, review the Professional Development Plan, and make recommendations for future professional development activities.
- Committees holding an event will discuss possible options for offering pre-sessions prior to events.
- The Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee will bring forward a recommendation to the Executive Committee in August on the Academic Academy dates, modality, and audience.

MSC (Smith/Freitas) approved to have FDC make recommendations regarding future PD activities, and to have TASCC bring forward suggestion regarding Academic Academy focus and dates.

M. Executive Committee Participation at Events

Bruno informed members that the Executive Committee has moved away from a past practice that served the organization well and she would like to shift members back to honoring that practice. In the past, committees would brainstorm ideas and presenters in developing the program. The committee would bring to the Executive Committee an outline of topics and presenters and request feedback. In making decisions about presenters, each general and breakout session must have a committee or executive committee member to ensure that the ASCCC positions are represented. The president has the final approval of the presenters, particularly the executive committee and external individuals. In reviewing the presenters, the president, in collaboration with the executive director, tries to balance the content experts, creates opportunities to build leadership of members from the field, and considers the workload of executive committee members as well as considers development for executive committee members for future assignments.

Bruno asked members to consider codifying a policy for executive committee participation at ASCCC events. She recommended that those committees who are responsible for an event would bring to the executive committee for first reading an outline of the event topics for feedback from members. For the second reading, the program should include more details including descriptions, committee members, and presenters other than the executive committee. The president, in collaboration with the committee chair and executive director, would discuss the presenters including possible executive committee members, which the president would ultimately approve. Members suggested that the timelines for events be more aggressive to allow better planning of the event as well as early identification of presenters including executive committee members.

Bruno noted that while executive committee members are experts in the content areas and are a valuable resource, participation of executive committee members is an issue as their participation is supported by the ASCCC. Additionally, member participation takes up a slot where someone from the field could attend since many of our events have limited space and also removes the opportunity for the ASCCC to provide leadership and resource development for those in the field. Bruno suggested that members practice nonattachment to participating and attending ASCCC events. The executive committee members might not be the expert in the topic so we need to be open to bringing in experts from the field. Additionally, members should not have the expectation that they would be the only person to present at events.

Bruno informed members that in the past only the president was the person who communicated with the Chancellor's Office staff and not the officers or the executive committee members. In the current environment with significant increase in work and participation, this communication process is not sustainable. She acknowledged that many executive committee members are communicating with Chancellor's Office staff and making decisions and she trusts members to do so. However, she would like to shift the past understanding from our external partners that the president is the only person who can represent the ASCCC. There are five officers – president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, and executive director – and executive committee members who are all in strong leadership positions. As we think about a policy for attendance at events, how can we demonstrate to those in attendance that the presence of any officer or executive committee member shows our commitment to the event and that the fact that the president is not present does not diminish the value of the event or the participants. By consensus the president and/or vice president will be in attendance at the following ASCCC signature events: plenary sessions, faculty leadership institute, and curriculum institutes under the discretion of the president.

<u>Action</u>
A policy will be brought back to a future meeting for consideration for approval.

V.   DISCUSSION

A. Chancellor's Office Liaison Report

Pam Walker updated members on system-wide issues and projects. The Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory (COCI) migration is taking place. The migration is coordinated by the 5C and colleges and is currently being tested for bugs. The new system will be integral to moving curriculum to local control and streamlining the curriculum processes. Once the migration is fully implemented, the curriculum will be cleaned. COCI is also coordinating with C-ID to reduce any duplication.

The CIOs, CSSOs, and CBOs are currently reviewing their regional structures. It is anticipated that the alignment of the regions for each organization will assist with any miscommunication that is occurring when these individuals attend regional meetings and hear different information.

The Chancellor's Office would like the ASCCC to re-consider the urgency condition in the minimum qualifications language for apprenticeship. There should be an opportunity to hire someone immediately. Freitas clarified that the ASCCC language has built into the language an emergency clause by including the 12-unit addition. The ASCCC feels that this is flexible enough to hire on an emergency basis. Additionally, colleges are expanding apprenticeship into transfer areas such as child development and allied health. If the emergency clause recommended by the California Apprenticeship Council is approved, these programs might be affected, which would potentially jeopardize our relationship with the four-year universities as well as affect compliance with accreditation standards.

The Chancellor's Office initial review of CAI has been completed; however, the Chancellor's Office believes that 30 to 90 days will be needed to explore even further into the operations of CAI. It is not that people did not work really hard to complete the CAI work but instead some connections within the test were missing. For example, questions in the testlets are not ordered in a manner that moves the student to another level when they respond to a question, successfully or not. Thus, someone now needs to make these connections. Accuplacer has come back and wants their test to be considered as a replacement to CAI. Walker acknowledged that there are rumors that Chancellor Oakley is not supportive of assessment tests; however, Walker clarified that he is supportive. He just believes that assessment can be one of the multiple measures used by our colleges. The Chancellor's Office is hiring a project manager to oversee CAI and get it back on the right path. Connick and Walker plan to send a message to the field describing a status of CAI.

Walker briefly updated members on other projects including inmate education, Umoja project, student success integration, and Chancellor's Office changes.

B. **Board of Governors/Consultation Council**
   Bruno and Stanskas updated members on the Board of Governors and Consultation Council meetings. At the Board of Governors meeting, Chancellor Oakley shared Governor Brown's letter asking him to establish a 114th community college that is all online.

   The Board approved the ASCCC grant in the amount of $768,000. Members of the Board discussed grants in general including the inefficiencies requiring Proposition 98 funds to go through districts.

   Title 5 regulation changes for streamlining curriculum had its first reading and will return to another meeting after 45 days of public comment.

   San Mateo did not meet their 50% obligation but they are a basic aid district and receive no apportionment funding so there is not much that the board can do. In subsequent years, normally apportionment would be reduced if they do not meet the 50% but since they do not get apportionment there is no "stick".

   Other items on the agenda included the 2017 classified staff awards, the rebranding of CTE that included the decision to drop "technical" in the marketing campaign, and an update on the CTE minimum qualifications.

   The Consultation Council meeting had many of the same topics as on the Board agenda.

C. **Executive Director Emergency Transition Plan**
   Adams presented the Executive Director Emergency Transition Plan. She noted that she consulted with an expert in this area to provide advice to develop the transition plan and felt that the plan was comprehensive. Members acknowledged the detail provided in the plan and suggested that it be included on the August agenda as a consent item.

   Action
   Transition plan to be brought back to the August meeting.

D. **Update on OEI, EPI, IEPI**
   Members serving on the initiatives update members on the current work of the initiatives.

E. **Foundation Future**
   Foundation President May informed members that the Foundation directors have been seeking out research opportunities while continuing to hold fundraising events. However, the fundraising activities have not been lucrative. While the Foundation did reach its fundraising goals, it spent the funds on holding the fundraising events. The Foundation decided to next year focus on grants to see if the grants provide an opportunity to stabilize the foundation finances. At the end

of the year, the Foundation directors will recommend to the Executive Committee whether or not the Foundation should continue to exist. Currently the Foundation has approved three research projects – faculty diversity, multi measures effective practices, and STEM interventions for community college and K-12 education preparation. If the Executive Committee determines that the Foundation should be dissolved, then the funds would need to be donated to another 501(3).

VI. **REPORTS** *(If time permits, additional Executive Committee announcements and reports may be provided)*

A. Standing Committee and Task Force Minutes
  i. Curriculum Minutes, Davison
  ii. Equity and Diversity Action Committee, Beach
  iii. History Project, Morse
  iv. Open Education Resources Report, Dillon
  v. Standards and Practices, Freitas

B. Liaison Reports
  i. 5C Meeting, Davison
  ii. Educational Planning Initiative, Dumont
  iii. FACCC, Freitas
  iv. IEPI Integrated Planning ASK, North
  v. IEPI P3 Meeting, Stanskas
  vi. IEPI Enrollment Management, Patton
  vii. Noncredit SSSP, Ninh
  viii. Student Services Portal, Jamshidnejad
  ix. TTAC, Freitas

C. Senate and Grant Reports
  i. C-ID, Adams
  ii. ICW, Adams

VII. **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned 12:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted by

Julie Adams, Executive Director
Dolores Davison, Secretary