

Planning Committee Meeting

April 3, 2023, 3:00 - 5:00 pm

Via Zoom

MINUTES

Members/Alternates Present: Pamela Mery (Chair), Kit Dai, Meg Hudson, Craig Kleinman, Lily Lum, William Mosley, Judy Seto, Michael Snider, Enrique Velez, Cherisa Yarkin

Members/Alternates Absent: Susan Boeckmann, Melissa McPeters, Silvia Urrutia

Guests Present: tbd

No.	Item	Discussion/Outcome	Follow Up
1.	Welcome and Introductions	Quorum achieved.	
2.	Approval of Minutes	Approval of Minutes for 3/6 moved by Judy Seto, seconded by Kit Dai. Minutes approved as drafted.	
3.	Updates on Planning Committee action items and recommendations since last meeting (Standing Agenda Item) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• AP 2.18 and BP 2.18 on Institutional Planning	The Chancellor will bring AP 2.18 forward as informational to the Board. At that time, the Board may engage in some discussion about BP 2.18. In advance of that, the Planning Committee reviewed the list of plans that is currently listed in BP 2.18. The Office of Research & Planning will prepare some talking points regarding the list, including sharing some of the evolution of the Student Equity & Achievement program which now includes what was previously separated into three areas, i.e., Basic Skills, Student Equity, and the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP). While Title 5 remains the same (for now), these plans have effectively been combined. It was noted that the Technology Plan is not legislated, but it's part of accreditation requirements. Some of the program-specific plans cited in Title 5 may no longer be solicited by CCCC. For example the Cooperative Work Experience Plan, also known as CWEE, may no longer be required. The "Transfer Center Plan" is specific to the Transfer Center and has generally been more like a report.	Board consideration of BP 2.18 is pending

<p>4.</p>	<p>Annual Report to ACCJC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institution-Set Standards • Stretch Goals 	<p>The ACCJC Annual Report requires colleges to submit actual performance for several specific measures of student achievement, along with Institution-Set Standards (ISS) and stretch goals for each. The ISS figures are meant to be a “floor” and it’s a matter of considerable concern if colleges fall below the floor that they set for themselves. Stretch goals are meant to be aspirational.</p> <p>Course completion, i.e., passing courses with C or above has generally been in keeping with the College’s Institution-Set Standards (ISS) and stretch goals (SG). The Planning Committee discussed whether they could/should be reconsidered in a DEI framework, without triggering grade inflation. The Student Equity Strategies Committee previously looked at “bottleneck courses” (high enrollment, low pass rates, with opportunity gaps).</p> <p>There is a lag in the availability of transfer figures; those will be shared at an upcoming meeting.</p> <p>For certificates, actual completions have been far above the stretch goal for several years. For example, in 2020-21, the aspirational goal was 818 while 1,584 students received certificates. Previously the Planning Committee and Academic Senate were cautious about revising stretch goals in light of enrollment declines, but the data demonstrate that a steady number of students continue to earn certificates despite enrollment declines, attributable to several factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departments have created new certificates and converted existing certificates from local “certificates of accomplishment” to state-recognized “certificates of achievement.” • With the establishment of the Completion Center, there have been more concerted efforts toward certificate completion including coordination with Admissions & Records to streamline the process via auto-petition and implementation of Degree Works. • It was noted that noncredit certificates cannot be included in the ACCJC Annual Report nor are they funded directly through the Student-Centered Funding Formula at this time; however, courses towards those certificates are funded at a higher level (known as Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP)) due to being part of a sequence leading to a noncredit certificate. <p>While degree attainment hasn’t outstripped its associated stretch goal as much as certificates have, the College has been meeting its aspirations for degrees for some time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degrees differ from certificates due to added requirements for general education courses. 	<p>This item will be brought back for further discussion at the next Planning Committee meeting</p>
-----------	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily for reasons related to financial aid complexities, degrees are not the focus of the Completion Center’s autopetition efforts. <p>That said, should the College be doing more to encourage degree completion? Are associate degrees (particularly “local” AA and AS degrees) connected to workforce value? Or are degrees mostly seen as valuable for transfer (perhaps especially ADTs)? A concern for students transferring without a degree is noncompletion of a BA/BS, leaving them with no credential if they haven’t earned an associate degree or certificate. What is the student-centered answer? How should/can the College promote student interest in certificates when they are degree-oriented or interest in degrees when they are transfer-oriented? Is there something to be discerned in departments with successful program redesign including where units have been reduced? The Curriculum Committee will be discussing certificates at their 5/3/23 meeting.</p> <p>Factors discussed as potential data elements to review in considering revising the ISS and SG include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> programs showing most growth in certificate completion, CTE certificates earned in context of labor market information (LMI), equity efforts have been focused on identified areas of disproportionate impact (DI) such as the DI observed for African American students in certificate attainment. <p>In addition to these factors, related to achievement outcomes, the Enrollment Management Committees is working to develop a culturally responsive strategic enrollment framework and the Professional Development Committee’s Flex strands continue to emphasize improving the student experience and institutionalizing equity as well as improving communication, all of which are aimed at better serving our students to support increased levels of student success and completion.</p>	
--	--	--	--

5.	<p>Communications Check-in (Standing Agenda Item)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chancellor's Report dated 3/23/2023 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chancellor's Report dated 3/23/2023 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Funding decisions for full time faculty positions based on Fall 2022 CPRs. ○ Funding decisions for \$750k Supplemental U-funds based on Fall 2022 CPRs. ● Accreditation additional evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Several items of Planning Committee interest related to Standards 1A/1B were requested by the Peer Review Team. These requests do not necessarily indicate areas of concerns, they may simply be for clarification purposes. ○ For example, the College's ISER was completed and submitted in mid-December, prior to completion of Fall 2022 Comprehensive Program Review (CPR). One of the requests was for CPR examples which are now available, and three were provided per the Peer Review Team's request. ○ Other examples included evidence that was provided at length and responsiveness to the request entailed pointing more directly to the relevant subsection within the larger document, e.g., specific graphics within the Roles, Responsibilities, and Processes (RRP) Handbook. 	
6.	Future Agenda Items	Continue conversation about Institution-Set Standards and Stretch Goals.	