

**CONTRA COSTA COLLEGE**  
**Planning Committee Minutes**

**Date:** Friday, December 1, 2017

**Time:** 12:30 – 2:30 p.m.

**Location:** SAB-211

**Present:** Wayne Organ, Monica Rodriguez, Mayra Padilla, Evan Decker, Jason Berner, Cody Poehnelt, Katie Krolikowski, Aireus Robinson, Trung Nguyen, Randy Watkins, Ghada Al-Masri, Esmeralda Topete

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
1. Call to Order with Introduction of Guests and identification of Committee Members	Meeting called to order at 12:42 p.m.	
2. Approval of today's Agenda	Jason Berner moved to correct spelling of presenter name, Katie Krolikowski and to move item #8 to up to #7. Katie Krolikowski seconded the motion. The amended agenda was unanimously approved.	The agenda was amended
3. Approval of the Minutes from October 6 and November 3, 2017 Meetings	<p>The October 6, 2017 minutes are not available to review.</p> <p>Jason Berner moved to approve the November 3, 2017 minutes. Cody Poehnelt seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.</p>	No action item
4. Review of the Minutes from the Enrollment Management Committee	The committee reviewed the minutes.	No action item
5. Presentation from Public	No public presentations.	No action item
6. Update form the Validation Teams	<p>Student representative Esmeralda Topete will join the validation team to review APEX, HHS and BIO programs.</p> <p>Each validation team member provided the committee with an update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wayne Organ: Drama continues to follow the report timeline</li> </ul>	Share the Planning Committee's feedback regarding the lack of data explanation to District Research Office (Mayra Padilla)

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Katie Krolkowski - Art continues to work on their report. However, they have not provided a draft report</li> <li>• Monica Rodriguez - Bookstore and BIO have completed the 1<sup>st</sup> draft. The validation team met and provided preliminary feedback. There was a brief discussion regarding whether BIO and BIOTECH should have separate program reviews. Per Katie Krolkowski, the programs were placed together by mistake. The BIOTECH goals should be removed from BIO. Also, BIOTECH is only a two-year update review. The programs cannot be separated in WEPR at this time</li> <li>• Jason Berner - In contact with foreign languages; they are working on report</li> <li>• Evan Decker – No student life report update at this time</li> </ul> <p>Wayne Organ reminded the validation teams to send the PDF comment document to the student representatives in order to submit their comments. Also, the PDF does not contain a link to the data, the link must be copied and pasted to the browser.</p> <p>Mayra Padilla shared with the committee that the SQL reports used by faculty, provide dynamic data. The data populated in WEPR is static. This is what is causing the data discrepancies on the reports.</p> <p>The committee discussed that the lack of knowledge of where the WEPR data comes from, makes it difficult to find out how or why the numbers may be inaccurate. This makes it difficult for the programs to explain the report data. Mayra Padilla will share the committee's feedback with the District Research Office</p>	
7. Ongoing Discussion: “Understanding Decreasing/Stable/Increasing” in the Program Review Template	Katie Krolkowski lead the committee in the discussion on how the data on the program shells is interpreted differently by each program, as well as the validation teams. Programs are asked to comment on the data, without context about whether their program is “decreasing/stable/increasing”. This led to the	Ask DVC the reason(s) for the trend chosen and the guidance given to faculty (Wayne Organ)

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>committee exploring a way for all programs to do the same comparison; no interpretations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify the tracking period; 4-year period?</li> <li>• define a trend by doing a chart(s) – control, regression line, comparative chart, etc.</li> <li>• specifications – trend or variation</li> <li>• absolute value? Cost of running a program? Enrollment?</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations proposed to clarify answering the data questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• change wording from decreasing/increasing to decreased/increased</li> <li>• ask DVC why those trends were chosen, what was the intent. Based on response, the committee could discuss if the trends are right for CCC. Wayne Organ will follow-up with DVC and report back</li> <li>• create a manual to guide the program review experience</li> </ul>	<p>Find out if WEPR has an electronic signature feature (Wayne Organ)</p> <p>Future agenda item: Discuss creating a clear process after validation team has reviewed the reports (All)</p>
<p>8. Changes to Validation Timeline</p>	<p>Jason Berner asked the committee to review the validation timeline and provide feedback at the next meeting. There are important date that correlate with the budget allocation due date.</p> <p>Recommendations to improve the program review process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• remove WEPR access once the report has been submitted to prevent additional edits. Wayne Organ will be responsible for removing access to WEPR once the report has been completed</li> <li>• if possible enable electronic signature feature</li> <li>• discuss providing a clear process once the validation team has completed the review. This will be a future agenda item</li> </ul>	<p>Future agenda item: Validation Timeline feedback (All)</p> <p>Future agenda item: Discuss creating a clear process after validation team has reviewed the reports (All)</p>
<p>9. Strategic Focus</p>	<p>Mayra Padilla lead the conversation to identify the top 5 strategic plan goals to focus institution wide.</p>	<p>No action item</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>The top 3 strategic goals all the constituencies agreed on were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.1 Improve the steps for the completion of certificates, degrees and for transfer readiness to increase the number of student earning certificates, degrees and who are transfer ready</li> <li>• 2.1 Develop a strong and positive image of Contra Costa College in the community</li> <li>• 3.4 Utilize institutional set standards for student learning and achievement to enhance continual institutional effectiveness.</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed to have 1.2 and 1.3 as the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> goals.</p>	
10. Open Discussion, Topics for Next Meeting	Mayra Padilla asked for the equity discussion to continue, specifically, what kind of equity training should be provided? How to promote equity in program review?	Future agenda item: Equity training and incorporating equity in validation/program review (Mayra Padilla)
11. Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm	
12. Next Meeting: March 2, 2018		