

LOS MEDANOS  
COLLEGE

**Shared Governance Council**

**MINUTES**

March 13, 2013

2:00 - 4:00 p.m., Room CO-420

ATTENDEES: Anderson, Cea, Horan, Huffman, Kohler, Kratochvil, Lecky, Martinez, Perfumo, Richards, Rust, Schmidt, Villegas, Breza (guest), Adams (support).

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Topic/Activity</i>	<i>Follow-Up</i>
<b>STANDING ITEMS:</b>		
<b>1.</b>	<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Approve:</b> Agenda for March 13, 2013 The agenda was approved as-is.</p> <p><b>Review:</b> Minutes from February 27, 2013 The Council reviewed and approved the minutes from the last meeting, with the addition of language under item #5 (Associated Students update) that reflects Sherrie Anderson’s request for a report of lottery fund use; <i>MSC: Schmidt/Villegas.</i></p>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Old Business</b>	
3a.	<p><b>Preparing for RAP – “Norming” Session</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judy Breza distributed copies of a 2011-12 RAP request for the SGC members to review, discuss, and use for a “practice run.” The group went through rating sheet (criteria, points, etc...) and the role of SGC in this process; Several members conveyed that SGC’s intent is to evaluate the merit of the proposal and determine/rate if it’s “good” for (in the best interest of) LMC; it’s then up to College management/leadership to identify and allocate funds to support it.</li> <li>• This year, there were 35 “Program Improvement/Development” requests and 15 “Classified Staffing” requests. The Council discussed the logistics of RAP, including: when they’ll receive packets from Business Office, the amount of time allocated for each proposal (manager presentation and Q&amp;A), and the total meeting time required. It was agreed that SGC will meet 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on March 27 (location TBD), and then continue the RAP review on April 10 (2:00 – 4:00 p.m.).</li> <li>• Judy Breza then reviewed the criteria for rating Classified Staffing requests, along with a sample proposal from 2011-12.; these proposals are rated 1-10 overall (rather than allocating points for each criteria category).</li> <li>• Following the presentations on March 27 and April 10, SGC rankings will be due to the Business Office on April 16. The members will then review/agree on the final rankings at the SGC meeting on April 24.</li> <li>• Staff/faculty/manager packets will be placed in mailboxes; student packets will be mailed to their homes.</li> </ul>	Managers will be scheduled in advance to present RAP requests.

3b.	<p><b>Accreditation</b></p> <p><b>ACCJC Annual Report</b> (see below; discussion combined with item on “Standards for Student Achievement Data”)</p> <p><b>Standards for Student Achievement Data</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• President Kratochvil led the discussion of item that ALO Kiran Kamath had placed on the agenda. The group reviewed copies of the ACCJC Annual Report template that he distributed. For the ACCJC annual report, colleges are being asked for first time to develop/establish college standards related to student achievement data (questions 14a, 15a, 16a, 17a, and 18a); President Kratochvil displayed relevant student data (provided by the District Office) and three student data standards “scenarios” outlined by ALO Kamath.</li> <li>• Several faculty members shared some of the dialogue (and concerns) from the Academic Senate, who addressed this at their meeting on Monday. There was some discussion of using a “standard” instead of a “goal,” as well as reasons for selecting the median versus the average (because of fluctuation in the data); there were also some concerns that, with degree audit software, that numbers for 16A (in the three scenarios) might be artificially high. The Academic Senate didn’t vote, as they wanted to have more info and discussion; the following day, the Department Chairs recommended using the median.</li> <li>• It was noted that the median is more “robust” and less subject to impact by high/low swings; the average is typically less representative. It was also suggested that ARCC and peer group data be reviewed and considered for these student achievement “standards”; the group then looked online at ARCC data.</li> <li>• Based on the three scenarios, SGC felt the median scenario was the best option presented.</li> </ul> <p><b>Items of Interest to SGC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• President Kratochvil shared some items that have emerged from the work of Standard committee and that are relevant to SGC, such as: SGC assessment, which hasn’t been conducted in several years; SGC communication to/with campus community on actions, decisions, and issues; SGC membership and voting; and representation/participation from the Brentwood Center on committees.</li> <li>• On a related note, the Academic Senate has recommended that LMC establish a College Budget Committee. This item will be on a future SGC agenda, and the Council will need to have discussion/agreement on the process for creating any new committees.</li> </ul>	The ACCJC Annual Report is due at the end of March; SGC members can send any additional comments to ALO Kamath.
4.	<b>New Business (no items)</b>	
5.	<p><b>Updates &amp; Announcements/Constituency Reports:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• President Kratochvil reported that, as part of the Foundation’s campaign to raise funds to support LMC’s student veterans, the Board heard from a student veteran who shared his story, talked about areas of need, and expressed his appreciation for the support he’s received from Student Services.</li> <li>• Classified Senate: Linda Kohler stated that the Senate had a successful chili cook-off, with 15 entries (and a student winner). At the last meeting, Leetha and Thais talked about the Foundation’s Vets campaign; the Senate approved a \$500 contribution.</li> <li>• Academic Senate: Ginny Richards shared that the Senate approved to contribute \$500 toward the Foundations’ Vets campaign; at their last meeting, the Senate discussed some of the issues covered here today (e.g., student achievement data); lastly, she stated that it has been challenging to find faculty able to step into leadership roles (President &amp; VP).</li> <li>• Associated Students: Sherrie Anderson talked about LMCAS participation in March-in-March and shared a YouTube video from the event; plans are in full swing to prepare for the upcoming Cancer Awareness conference, and Student Trustee van Eckhardt suggested having/dedicating a memorial bench on campus for cancer victims; student elections are coming up.</li> <li>• Curriculum Committee: Laurie Huffman reminded the group that Curriculum meets on first Wednesday of each month; her vision would be to incorporate more credit-by-exam and challenge exams for students, with the possibility of faculty making that available during Flex.</li> </ul>	

**NEXT MEETING:** Wednesday, March 27, 2013 ~ 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. in Room CO-420