

# **COLUMBIA COLLEGE COUNCIL RECORD OF PLANNING RETREAT May 16, 2013, Manzanita Conference Room**

Committee Members Present: Luisa Adams, Leslie Buckalew, Nancy Bull, Elissa Creighton, Matt Christman (ASCC Vice President), Brian DeMoss, Doralyn Foletti, Craig Johnston, John Leamy, Kimberly Morris (ASCC Representative), Melissa Raby, Gary Whitfield, Gene Womble (attended the work session part of the meeting)

Committee Members Not Present: Ted Hamilton

Guest(s): Cathy Brown, Coni Chavez (recorder), Aiko Gonzalez (ASCC Representative), Raelene Juarez, Caira McFarland (ASCC Representative), Diana Sunday

## **Recommended for Vote**

### **1. Approval of Minutes for the May 16, 2013 Meeting of the College Council**

It was moved, seconded (John Leamy/Nancy Bull), and approved to accept the record of meeting for the April 5, 2013 meeting of the Columbia College Council, as submitted.

## **Discussion Items**

### **2. Welcome**

Each College Council member and guest provided a self-introduction.

### **3. Introduction & Overview of Data**

Attendees were sent a DRAFT of the *Columbia College Institutional Effectiveness Report* (IER), dated spring 2013, and results of a student survey dated May 8, 2013, titled *Columbia College Student Feedback - Institutional Effectiveness*. Diana Sunday provided an overview to these documents and the data contained therein. Additionally, she replaced the IER with a copy reflecting minor updates.

### **4. Work Session**

Attendees were divided into five groups, as noted below, to review the data within the DRAFT of the *Columbia College Institutional Effectiveness Report* (IER) and identify whether they pertain to, and are relevant for, the goal/objective.

Goal 1: Brian DeMoss  
Luisa Adams      Matt Christman

Goal 4: Diana Sunday      Gene Womble  
Doralyn Foletti      Caira McFarland

Goal 2: Melissa Raby      John Leamy  
Nancy Bull

Goal 5: Leslie Buckalew      Raelene Juarez  
Cathy Brown      Aiko Gonzalez

Goal 3: Gary Whitfield      Craig Johnston  
Elissa Creighton      Kim Morris

Groups were provided the following guiding questions to begin their discussions.

If the data are relevant, go to Q1 and Q2. If they are not, go to Q3 and Q4.

- Q 1) Assuming the data provide sufficient information to evaluate the goal, which data could be used in subsequent reports for ongoing evaluations and trend analyses?
- Q2) Assuming the data are sufficient – can we use them to set benchmarks or standards for the college? If so, can we arrive at what is acceptable for the college? For example in terms of the level of success; or how many of awards should be earned annually; or what level of student satisfaction is acceptable?

OR; If data are not sufficient:

- Q3) Do we need more information? If so, what else is needed to inform us for evaluating the goal/objective? Can we arrive at a standard?
- Q4) Should the goal/objective be revised?

## **5. Report out on Work Session**

Each of the five groups reported out regarding their dialogue as it pertained to the goal in which they were assigned. Listed below are informal, general comments and suggestions made by group members and Council members during the work session report out. For context, please refer to the DRAFT of the *Columbia College Institutional Effectiveness Report* (IER), dated spring 2013. Also, Diana Sunday committed to making appropriate edits to the IER and providing a status update to the College Council at their June meeting.

Goal 1, Objective 1: Meeting objective; but, spring is not included therefore 29% is not accurately reflective. Need additional data to establish a baseline for next year. Rename full-time students in appendix 9 to FTES.

Goal 1, Objective 2: Trend that they are increasing. Need one more year to get a baseline—only two years recorded.

Goal 1, Objective 3: Add a column in appendix 11 and 12 to show 2012-13 numbers.

Goal 1, Objective 4: Does show increase; “time” to complete is still unknown with so many variables. Need data to help show why/how the increase is occurring. Add by student “goals” so that we can address time to completion for certificate vs. degree. Appendix 9, table 1, want term % not average %. Distance education alumni survey may be helpful to know if this helping to propel students to completion.

Goal 1, Objective 5:

Goal 2: Appears to be process based vs. outcome based. Perhaps add a 5<sup>th</sup> objective speaking to how students do after leaving Columbia (ie., wage tracker). Student survey questions 17, 21, and 23 refer to student services.

Goal 2, Objective 1: Evidence is there, benchmark should be 100%.

Goal 2, Objective 2: Bullet 3, need minutes where this occurs at the division and college levels as evidence.

Goal 2, Objective 3: There should be 100%. Bullet 4, College Council minutes should serve as evidence.

Goal 2, Objective 4: Documented in curriculum office.

Goal 3, Objective 1: There is enough data.

Goal 3, Objective 2: Documents online are difficult to find. Much of this goal is contingent upon institutional planning and evaluation cycle that is currently under discussion (agenda item #6 of this planning retreat).

Goal 3, Objective 2a: Bullet 1 needs clarification. Program review section 2.7 asks for types of dialogue. Reword bullet 1 to say Program Review and documents can be added. Bullet 2, user/individual should be changed. Add IER and College Council minutes are available to the public.

Goal 3, Objective 3: It was noted that the program review tool had been updated for instruction and is expected to be updated summer 2013 for administrative and student services areas.

Goal 3, Objective 4: New program review process, unit planning tool will go away; some liked having history stored for review. The revised program review form, section 3.X is below. Bullet 2, include where this coming from. Bullet 3, remove.

Goal 4, Objective 1: “To increase broad participant” was difficult. Data could be inservice workshop to address objectives, etc. Economy of scale came up—change “increase” to quality. Find a term that reflects participation by all constituents “encourage.”

Goal 4, Objective 2: Tracking mass emails/Facebook likes’ college hour; track attempts to schedule events/activities.

Goal 4, Objective 3: Bullet 3, replace experiences with student goals.

Goal 5, Objective 1: Evidence could be meetings with Larry Cope regarding economic development, an alumni survey, needs assessment for local businesses (ie., hospital), and monthly meetings with the Tuolumne County Office of Education administration as well as Calaveras County Office of Education administration.

Goal 5, Objective 2: Add Arts & Science’s events such as Mad About Science and Dinner with a Scientist. Also talk to individuals in the community regarding their needs.

Goal 5, Objective 3: Athletics...advertise in community locations such as the fair and round-up. Some items under objective 2 can serve in objective 3. Outreach to art, music, and STEM areas could be increased—invite community representative on campus.

Goal 5, Objective 4: Get civic engagement activities back on track and include things such as student government activities and Kognitos training. As students, “how have you been stimulated to be involved?” Data can be gathered to inform program student learning outcomes. Revise listed items within objective 4 to lower case.

## **6. Institutional Planning & Evaluation Cycle**

Raelene Juarez and Gary Whitfield presented a document titled, *Columbia College Integrated Planning Process and Cycle of Evaluation*, dated May 16, 2013 and grid as a snapshot for the proposed timeline discussed therein. Discussion was held with Council members recommending few revisions. This topic will be brought back for further discussion at the June 2013 meeting of the Columbia College Council.

## **7. Retreat Wrap-up and College Updates**

- a. Title III Collaborative Grants: Dr. Leslie Buckalew, Acting President, reported that the Federal Government was not making grant funding available for collaborative grants this year. Therefore, the college will not be submitting the Title III collaborative grant with Tahoe Community College. Furthermore, the college will be finalizing its current Title III grant, rather than extending it another year.
- b. CC Safety Measures: Dr. Leslie Buckalew, Acting President, reported that the YCCD has engaged a consultant to perform a security analysis over the summer months for the District and will be making recommendations for improvements. A Council member suggested looking into possible grant funding to cover costs associated with such improvements.
- c. Accreditation Follow-Up Report: College Council members were provided with a DRAFT copy of the two college recommendation responses (recommendation #1, dated 5/15/13 and recommendation #1, dated 4/29/13) in advance of the meeting. They were asked to review and consider if the committee substantively responded to the recommendation. Council members were instructed to forward comments to Dr. Buckalew, Gary Whitfield and Chris Vitelli.
- d. Student Success and the Academic Achievement Center (AAC): Dr. Melissa Raby briefly updated the group regarding the efforts of the Student Success Taskforce which led to the Student Success Initiative. The initiative has a number of components, including student services and basic skills initiative pieces. Dr. Leslie Buckalew, Acting President, reported that in the coming fall semester the college will have inclusive dialogue regarding the Academic Achievement Center (AAC), as framed by student success, and how we may improve service to students.