

Attending:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joumana McGowan (Co-Chair)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Michelle Sampat (Co-Chair)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Kristina Allende	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Barbara McNeice-Stallard
<input type="checkbox"/>	Meghan Chen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gary Enke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Grace Hanson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Emily Woolery
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	John Barkman for Annel Medina Tagarao	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kate Morales	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	L.E. Foisia	<input type="checkbox"/>	Calvin Tran, Student Rep
<input type="checkbox"/>	Alexis Carter (Guest)	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Joan Sholars (Budget Liaison)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rosa Royce (Budget Liaison)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pedro Suarez (Guest)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lisa E. Jackson (Recorder)

AGENDA		
Item/Comments	Time	Discussion/Outcome
1. Agenda Review and Approval of the March 27, 2019, minutes:	5 mins	There was a review of the minutes and approved with the following corrections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd page DI is Disproportionate impact • 3rd page – No. 4 remove the word “if” and replace with “it.”
2. Budget Liaison Report: (Joan, Rosa, and Michelle)	5 mins	The group reviewed the handout provided by Rosa who reported the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the ACCJC Annual Fiscal Report that is prepared yearly. • Page 1 provides financial report, revenues, expenses, and fund balance. • Page 2 – we have to report on bond issuances • Cash balance is \$188 million. It looks high because it includes all funds for all programs and includes categoricals, construction, and child development. • Report is due May 9. There were no recommended changes.
3. Expanded PAC: (Barbara and Michelle) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Goal Setting Update • Institution Set Standards (ISS) 	45 mins	Barbara reviewed the ACCJC Annual Report and noted the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions 6-8 asks for Fiscal Year information. However, online and in the guidebook, it asks for Fall information, which is the information we provided. Once presented at Accreditation Steering Committee, the correction was made to annual information per ACJC feedback. • The ruling from ACCJC requested annual information. • No. 7 is unduplicated, meaning that students are only counted once. These are degree applicable credit courses and have increased slightly.

- No. 8 relates to unduplicated head count. ACCJC provided clarification regarding the ruling is truly 100% online and not hybrid (classroom plus online). We had to change our numbers for that as well as change them from Fall to Fiscal Year.
- Percentage increases are automatically calculated.
- Will provide updated report for next meeting. Due to ACCJC on **May 9th**

Questions 12-16 are related to stretch goals. The first line on each set is the ISS for that particular year. ACCJC has listed the stretch goals. We can indicate 0% at this time, but we have to come up with our stretch goals. Our meeting in May will do this work.

We have to acknowledge that the goals that we have in general are institution set standards and are based on the historical data.

- We have new data from the Chancellor's office that we need to reflect upon.

Expanded PAC

Barbara reminded the group that Expanded PAC met on April 10 and they were asked to do several things. Barbara shared those findings with the group. Results were posted on the white board.

- The topic categories of metrics focused on Guided Pathways, SEAP, and Hiring were the top 3 categories.
- Examples were provided on how to measure those 3 categories.
- On the strategic plan diagram, the ticker tape will be removed. The areas of Guided Pathways, SEAP, and hiring will replace the ticker tape as our new metrics.

The distributed document represents a culmination of everything that was done at Expanded PAC on April 10, 2019.

		<p>The group participated in a group activity tasked with reviewing what was summarized at Expanded PAC. We have to make recommendations on how we are going to change the strategic plan info graphic</p> <p>Group 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Full goal description and/or include clarification in glossary2. Agree it's too busy in the middle (too many arrows)3. Include general glossary, key terms, i.e., subject-specific plans.4. Agree that PIE is siloed by department. Inter-department connection.5. Why are subject matter plans not easy to include?6. Agree we get lost in flow chart. Agree it's too busy in the middle with too many arrows7. Budget cycle is missing8. Integration of PIEs/units not clear <p>Group 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Link between Strategic Plan and College Goals<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How are goals connected to GP and SEAP• Goals should be fully written on the document2. Unclear if the college is attached to a specific PIE or all PIEs.3. Need more clarity as to what it all represents.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More definitions and clarification is needed. For example, PIE, units, subject-matter plans.• Where do we start?• Legend <p>Group 3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Ticker at the bottom (if those are our goals then the ticker should be at the top?)<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminate ticker. Unclear, needs to be clear.2. How does it all connect?
--	--	---

- We've talked about that – flow chart idea
 - Graphic does not represent something that they can visualize e.g. vase is easier to conceptualize.
3. Are we focused? Change to Student Achievement Goals so that it's more clear
 4. Consistency of + and up arrow
 5. Ticker: Goals – where are we?
 - We mean metrics
 6. Are these the right goals?
 7. Ticker timeline

The group did a quick report out. It overlaps a bit with the above and synthesizes this work.

Group 1

1. Where to start
2. Expanded definition
3. Right goals
4. Expanded/sustain
5. Better reflection of structure
6. Clearer data purpose
7. Repetitive
8. Visibility of focus

Group 2:

1. Goals are good
2. Ticker tape is not good
3. More definitions/explanations needed
4. Color is great

Group 3

1. Agree it's too large in the middle (too many arrows)
2. Full goal description and/or include clarification in a glossary
3. Include glossary in lay terms (i.e., subject specific plans)

			<p>4. Goals – maybe we need to list in its entirety and make sure they are connected to GP and SEAP.</p> <p>5. Map goals to GP and SEAP</p> <p>6. Should Goal 1 and Goal 5 be separated</p> <p>Group 4:</p> <p>1. Clarify how Pathways, Equity, and Mission relate</p> <p>2. Put the goals in the infographic, not as a legend</p>
4.	Strategic Plan Process: (Barbara) Data	25 mins	Next meeting
5.	PIE Update: (Michelle and Pedro)	25 mins	Next meeting
6.	Other:	5 mins	Ron Bean distributed <i>Technology Master Plan – Feedback from Expanded PAC for EFMP Instruction Team Themes</i> . This represents results of the Expanded PAC Activity. Members provided their feedback on the Technology Master Plan draft.
7.	Future Agenda Items: Institution Set Standards Stretch Goals		
<p>Future Meetings: 4th Wednesday of each month from 1:30pm-3:00pm – Building 4 Room 2440</p> <p>May 22 June 12 (if needed)</p>			