

College Council Meeting Minutes
February 5, 2016 - 1:00 p.m.
Library Meeting Room

F. Cambon, K. Coghill, J. Cummings, Z. Ginder, C. Hopkins, P. Kersey, J. Kevari, S. Nelson, D. Norton, D. Pieper, M. Plummer, A. Riesgo, and R. Smith

- I. Approval of minutes.
Minutes were accepted as presented.

- II. Agenda Items

- a. Institution Set Standards and Targets (J. Cummings/J. Kevari) Mr. Cummings reported that Mr. Kevari has agreed to contract with CMC in order to help with our institutional effectiveness reporting. Mr. Kevari will assist in maintaining our cycle and continuation of Institution Set Standards and Targets. Mr. Cummings thanked Mr. Kevari for agreeing to provide this service. Mr. Kevari reported that the information provided in his Standards and Targets handout shows one and six year targets. He added that looking forward through the next six years is his recommendation. Increasing Standards by reviewing each one year target would work and if we fall below it, we must call attention to it. The need for this information to be established before June 15, 2016 was stressed and Mr. Kevari added that he is open to suggestions. Some discussion was held regarding being too aspirational and that a 100% success rate may not be realistic. Mr. Kevari noted that other measurements need to be added. Persistence and completion of 30 units are good indicators, but then the students are gone. Mr. Kevari recommended reviewing the Student Education plan and find out what the blocks are. He noted average of cohorts with 10% increase is the manner in which he arrived at these increases. A suggestion was made to look at the percentage and use it as the six year projection, backing down from there. Dr. Norton pointed out 164 graduating seniors from local high schools with at least one remedial course including reading, writing, or math. Graduation rates are high; however, students are not coming prepared. Mr. Cummings pointed out the resolution of 100% student success may not correlate directly but is making a commitment on each student being successful. What number is acceptable? We need to be philosophically consistent within the organization. Actual student numbers are helpful. How many do we need to get to 95% in six years? We will need data to back up whether the goals were reached or not. If students get a job, at least we know that is why they left after completing 30 units. Program review can then be examined as to how we can move these numbers. Six years is a generous number of years. Mr. Cummings mentioned this will be topic of discussion in Academic Senate. He fully supports trying to achieve what 100% student success looks like with consistency between this

and discussion on campus. It helps to prioritize decision making on campus. Data correlates to the decision to improve our student success. Mr. Kevari plans to attend the next Academic Senate meeting. He mentioned this document is a result of the lessons learned from information he put together last year. It appears that this is important as gaps continue to be reviewed on a regular basis. Mr. Cummings mentioned that the goal is to finalize on March 31 at the joint workshop with the Board of Trustees. This will solidify the decision on behalf of the institution. The number of students who transfer to four year institution is blank as the information is not yet available. The Scorecard will be available in March. Data will be reviewed when it is out so we don't have to go back and make changes. Mr. Kevari assured the group that he will keep us informed.

b. Student Tech. Survey 2015 (Z. Ginder)

Mr. Ginder reported that he conducted the survey and received 259 responses. This information is substantial and is from a variety of different areas. He added that the results surprised the committee, and brought this information forward to share what students say technology needs are including software. It was noted that significant improvements have been made in the library and students would like to have it open on Saturday. This was considered to be extremely positive and students are very satisfied. Wi-Fi and tablets are consistent needs in the comments. It is interesting to see the difference from the perspective of faculty and staff. Mr. Ginder pointed out that students may not know about the high tech classroom. Faculty is most unhappy about technology in classroom.

c. AP 6750 Parking Lot Signage (M. Plummer/J. Phipps)

Ms. Plummer reviewed the changes in May 2014. The Phoenix Group is now the company utilized for parking tickets and the procedure has changed. She requested a 45 day constituent group review for this item.

d. Christine Proudfoot Student Activity Center General Rules and Regulations (M. Plummer)

Ms. Plummer requested these rules and regulations go out for constituent group review. Mr. Pieper commented that the Academic Senate asked that Item #3 be reviewed and pointed out it is up to ASCMC as far as the majority of change is concerned. ASCMC will be the driving force in making changes. They write rules and own them so it is not something that has come from administration. Discussion was held that we do not wish to expose ASCMC to a level of liability. Guidelines and consistency was a concern as well for both the Student Activity Center and the Veterans Center. Academic freedom was mentioned unless it is something that would incite violence. Mr. Smith commented that he has always worked closely with Ms. Alpin and plans to review at Region IX. He also emailed an inquiry from the last meeting, adding that leading Veterans Centers in the state are looking for answers. Mr. Smith

expressed concern about next semester. Ms. Plummer requested to meet with student group presidents in an effort to work through some kind of guidelines and rules. It was mentioned that learning is a controversial environment and that should be understood. Academics are ok, otherwise, no. There was a recommendation to keep away from advertising. Ms. Plummer will work with marketing committee and Ms. Alpin regarding what falls in line and will work well for our students.

e. Accreditation Midterm Report Constituent Group Feedback

Mr. Cummings reported that this report is going to the Board for a first reading next week. Dr. Kersey mentioned she had received feedback from two people. The report went to the Academic Senate and they will vote in two weeks. It has been widely distributed and the group was reminded not to wait until the last moment. Page numbers throughout document were requested.

f. Associate Dean and Vice President Job Descriptions (A. Riesgo)

Ms. Riesgo reported that feedback has been received regarding the Associate Dean job descriptions. This is the one final review and will go to Board of Trustees in March. The position has been posted; however, small changes can still be made. Final review and feedback were requested. Ms. Riesgo reported the Vice President job description is first review and needs feedback. One item that has been noted was to include supervision of Associate Deans.

g. BP 4250 Probation (D. Norton)

Dr. Norton reported that this is the final draft including minor edits. It was noted that the Academic Senate did not review this document yesterday; however, it will move forward with the intention of approval by the Board of Trustees in March.

h. Board Policy Revisions (Chief Officers)

Mr. Cummings noted that this was a placeholder for policies coming forward and he mentioned that it has been agreed that policies from Chief Officers will come forward once monthly to College Council.

i. BP 1100 – The Copper Mountain Community College District
(J. Cummings)

A suggestion was made to add the statement with permission of the board or board designee and move this policy forward.

j. BP 1200 – District Mission (J. Cummings)

Mr. Cummings recommended that we table this policy as it is premature to have this discussion until the Mission Statement is discussed and revised at the end of March. Ms. Hopkins mentioned that a subcommittee has worked on a revision that is a more-lengthy version than what currently exists. This item was on the Academic Senate agenda and it will be reviewed at the next

meeting. Mr. Cummings stated that it is comprehensive and says what we do.

k. Safety Committee Description Page (J. Cummings)

Ms. Cambon reported that the Safety Committee established these roles and gave direction as noted in the document as a result of the shared governance document guidelines. She added that it is helpful for all committees to have a mission, role, and guidelines. The District is consistent with contracts and it was determined that this is appropriate wording. The need to ensure the college is covered on OSHA was noted. Mr. Cummings requested Ms. Cambon ask the committee if it will be beneficial to have another joint meeting. A semi-annual meeting with management was mentioned. Discussion was held regarding this being a contractual committee as a result of an inquiry about a student representative. Ms. Riesgo explained that this is a working condition committee as opposed to shared governance. If ASCMC is interested in having someone on the committee, this can be discussed. ASCMC is always welcome to bring concerns to managers through other committees and they will be addressed. ASCMC "by request or invitation" was suggested as a possible wording option. Mr. Cummings added that through marketing and website revision, we will have a page dedicated to each committee. He thanked Ms. Cambon for her work on this document. It was ready to bring to College Council and concerns can go through the associations. Mr. Phipps will bring plans forward or through Ms. Plummer. The need to seek approval of these plans was mentioned. Ms. Cambon reported that a tracking chart for the Safety Committee will prove beneficial, and this is the clean copy based upon changes to be sent out for review.

l. SG College Council (J. Cummings)

Discussion was held regarding keeping the Accreditation Liaison Officer on this committee. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness (DIE) was mentioned as having a more consistent role in communicating to ensure we are on target. Understanding the planning process and where we are going in relationship to policies, procedures, job descriptions, etc. are important. Mr. Cummings mentioned level of participation and advisory members as options for certain positions and they don't necessarily attend all meetings; however, they are in the feedback loop. A comment was made that College Council is dominated by management and voices of employees and students get lost. Concern was expressed that voicing contrary opinion if the supervisor is sitting in the room, there is the intimidation factor. Mr. Cummings stressed equality as we move forward and removing personalities from functions. Base Coordinator was not listed and is an isolated program; however, we must maintain communication. Discussion took place regarding the makeup of this group and the reason for their attendance in the meeting. Mr. Cummings requested that everyone take this back to their groups with recommendation that ALO, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Coordinator of Base Programs play advisory/non-voting role on this committee. It was noted that the mission was

different formerly and that the role is now in the Director of Institutional Effectiveness job description. It was further noted that CSEA should have a designee as not all have a designee. The Shared Governance structure is to ensure policies going to the board are an open and pure opportunity for constituent feedback. That is the foundation of Shared Governance. Additional discussion took place regarding the procedure to ensure other mid-managers are informed through staff meetings, increasing communication, and Management Group. The need to ensure effective communication across the campus was mentioned.

m. Education Master Plan Draft Outline (J. Cummings)

Mr. Cummings took the surveys and other input, read through them and developed the list with input from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Concern was expressed that something put in here received a low score, and how to resolve when feedback is inconsistent. Mr. Cummings mentioned that this is the next conversation. He added that interest has been expressed in a Cultural Center. Does it gain institutional support as it was mentioned a number of times, is it more of a cultural diversity commitment? What fits and what does not? If it doesn't have institutional support where does it go? Some discussion took place regarding video conferencing. Desert Studies is another topic that will need to be in this document. Mr. Cummings asked for recommendations as to how we move forward. Dialogue from the institution with groups to discuss specifics. A suggestion was made to start discussion with existing committees. During the next 60-90 days Mr. Cummings will work with committees and dependents and go through these items. If something is missing, it can be discussed and added. Under facilities a suggestion was made to add renovation. Prioritize specific vision for the institution five years from now. Ms. Hopkins mentioned that this item was on Academic Senate agenda; however, they did not quite get to it.

III. Other

IV. Tracking Chart Review

Next Meeting: February 19, 2016

kc
CCMM 2-5-16