CC Executive Approved Minutes
May 30, 2013
3:00 PM – PCR

Attending: Gabriel Brown, Adrienne Foster, Fran Leonard, Olga Shewfelt, Bob Sprague, Sheila Jeter-Williams

1. **Confirmation of the Agenda** – the agenda was confirmed and the meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. **Minutes of May 2, 2013** – the minutes were approved with the following corrections:
   “Richard’s specific objection was that he didn’t think the college responded to the second part of Recommendation 13 on the issue of increasing trust which, in his opinion, is an ongoing issue. Faculty leaders and others on the Council disagreed, maintaining that progress continues to be made in developing and cultivating trust, and cited as evidence the numbers of faculty serving on college and Senate committees as well as strong participation in college activities, such as the Semester Kick-Off, Welcome week, the poster showcase. In addition, committee chairs and co-chairs of the Academic Senate, the Faculty Guild and standing committees make a concerted effort to bring accurate, complete and timely information to meetings on agenda items of interest, for discussion and possible action, according to best practices.”
   Building trust will be an item for training and future meeting agendas: What is trust; how is progress with regard to trust measured? The Council commits again to continuing the work of building and promoting trust throughout the college.

3. **Summer Meeting Schedule and Goals**
   Committee members discussed meeting schedule for the summer and
   The following dates were discussed: June 20, July 18, and July 25.
   Confirmation of dates will be finalized shortly.

4. **Discussion / Action**
   *After discussion, the College Council Executive Committee recommends by consensus the recommendation of the Facilities Committee to abandon Option1 and move forward with the concept of Option2 that will be implemented based on the following principles:
   A. A clear budget for what may be possible to build with all the concepts currently included in this option.
   B. A clear process by which all college constituencies, and particularly Those Academic Divisions impacted by the changes to the current Option1 and the concepts in Option 2, will be able to fully participate in the planning phase of the new option.
   C. A program construction plan that illustrates what may be built and where, as well as a listing and placement of programs/services that...*
are displaced and where they may be relocated.

4.B. Following discussion, the CC Exec recommends by consensus the following as recommended by the Accreditation Steering Committee: that the College Council fully support Student Service Council’s commitment to assess the years’ service level outcomes by June 30, 2013.

Services are a part of student success. Next year, service learning outcomes will be in synch under the to-be-developed Educational Master Plan.

4.C. Committee members discussed and recommends by consensus the proposal from the Global Studies Stakeholders Group to develop a plan that will support the college in institutionalizing all things global. In particular, as a resource request, this Spring 2013, the new classified position proposed in the Student Service Division’s International Students Program Review is the highest priority. A plan that will include additional expenditures and projected income will follow.

Adrienne Foster stated that we ask the Resource Development Committee to bring back the kinds of guiding principles that would include items like courses and advanced classes as examples. There was discussion about the new classified position proposed in the Student Services Division’s International Students Program Review. The college’s prioritized list doesn’t include this specific position. Only Program 100 funded positions are in the prioritized list. This request is to be supported from outside Program 100 and would provide additional services for international students. International students generated $800,000 to the college so far and this has gone into the Program 100 general fund. All students will benefit from international student funds including the STEM program, resources, and additional advanced classes for students.

Currently, there is only one classified employee who is serving and processing all international students and does an excellent job. To process the additional, increasing number of applications and to serve all international students, another employee is needed.

The College Council Executive Committee also recommends that the Resource Development Committee develop and bring to the Council guiding principles applicable to allocation of all revenue outside of Program 100. The college needs to decide whether there will be two different systems of prioritization.

Technology Committee recommendation of May 21, 2013:
Bob Sprague shared the recommendation from the Technology Committee meeting of May 21, 2013: The Technology Committee commits to review and assess its current technology plan to identify the framework for developing and completing a new technology plan by 2015.
Bob addressed the revenue enhancement initiative. He wants to take a look at the amount being generated by the revenue enhancement initiative and how it is being spent. It can be added to Program 100, or dispersed with caveats with priorities attached to them or to offload costs from Program 100 that might go unspent. Grants generate $1.8 M, 10% of which goes into the college’s general fund.

5. Co-Chairs for Standing Committees
The issue of having co-chairs on standing committees is moving forward with the P.I.E. Committee recently selecting a faculty co-chair and the Budget Committee prepared to do so also. Adrienne Foster advocated selecting faculty as co-chairs as a guiding principle, part of AB1725’s 10+1, “rely primarily on” the Academic Senate. A classified rep can be a co-chair if elected by the committee. The college does not have an established process for co-chairs, but past practice suggests that the faculty co-chairs be selected from members of the committee. Consider staggered terms for committee co-chairs. Bob stated that for most committees at the college people are assigned terms for three years which matches the elections.

Standing committees to select co-chairs: Accreditation (to formalize), Budget, Enrollment Management, Resource Development.

6. Process for Leases – including for Pacific Oaks
The committee confirmed that they are unfamiliar with the current process for leases at the college and that this should be reported at the next College Council Executive Committee meeting. Bob Sprague asked that we ask for guiding principles from Facilities or Administrative Services. What are the benefits to the college and fit the mission, goals and objectives of the college? Partnerships tend to be benefit the college as opposed to the income from leases which can be lower over a period of two years and may be cumbersome.

7. Announcement
Bob Sprague announced that Celena Alcala will serve as acting dean in Academic Affairs for about three + months. Her assignment starts Monday, June 10 and recruitment will start June 10.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.