



November 29 - 30, 2016 – Hilton Waterfront Beach Resort

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

A. Roll Call

President Bruno called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. and welcomed members and guests.

J. Adams, C. Aschenbach, R. Beach, D. Davison, A. Foster, S. Foster, J. Freitas, G. Goold, G. May, C. McKay, C. Rutan, L. Slattery-Farrell, and J. Stanskas.

Liaisons present: Irene Malmgren, Chief Information Officer Liaison, Vice President of Instruction, Mt. San Antonio College.

Guests present: David Morse, Long Beach City College and Monica Porter, Santa Ana College.

B. Approval of the Agenda

MSC (Aschenbach/Beach) to approve the agenda.

C. Public Comment

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Executive Committee on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

No public comment.

D. Calendar

Members were informed about current deadlines.

E. Action Tracking

Members discussed the action tracking sheet including how to update items. The items on the tracking sheet are the result of actions taken by the Executive Committee at prior formal meetings. On the current list there are several items that are more than two years old. Members were requested to review the action, make recommendations for removal or address.

F. Local Senate Visits

Members updated the Local Senates Visits tracking sheet.

G. Dinner Arrangements

Dinner was not provided.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. November 2, 2016, Meeting Minutes, Davison

B. Member Registration for Association of American Colleges & Universities' (AAC&U) 2017 Annual Meeting, Smith

C. Attendance at Association of American Colleges and Universities' 2017 Diversity, Learning, and Student Success Conference, Beach

D. CTE Regional Events, Slattery-Farrell/Freitas

Item II. D. was pulled.

MSC (Slattery-Farrell/McKay) to approve the consent calendar as amended.

D. CTE Regional Events, Slattery-Farrell/Freitas

The CTE Leadership Committee is recommending that two regional events be held in December to provide CTE Liaisons, CTE faculty, senate presidents, deans, and other interested parties with information to assist them in the development of the Strong Workforce Program funding proposals due in January. The committee recommended that the regional events be held in December; however, Executive Committee members felt that December would not be enough time for advertisement and suggested that the meetings be held in spring instead. A concern was raised that spring might not be soon enough given that colleges were creating their CTE Strong Workforce funding requests now and might need more guidance in preparing these reports. It was suggested that if the committee felt that some direction was needed prior to the spring regionals, webinars could be a better option. The webinars and the regional meetings would also logically inform presentations at the CTE Leadership Institute in May.

MSC (Freitas/Goold) to return this item to the CTE LC for refinement and bring back to the January meeting.

Action:

This item will return to the January meeting for consideration for approval of regional dates and a draft agenda.

III. REPORTS

A. President's/Executive Director's Report – 30 mins., Bruno/Adams

President Bruno and Executive Director Adams updated members on their recent activities since the November meeting.

Strong Workforce Program recommendation 13.a. called for the dissemination of effective practices in the recruitment and hiring of diverse faculty and the application of minimum qualifications and equivalencies. In response, the Chancellor's Office formed a task force to address this recommendation. Vice Chancellor Walker, Vice Chancellor Ton Quinlivan, and Bruno tri-chair the task force, which is comprised of Chancellor's Office staff, ASCCC representatives John Freitas, Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, and Jolena Grande, and representatives from the CEO, CIO, and HR organizations. The group recently met and discussed developing a white paper that will have contributions from all the groups on the task force and include history of the task force, background on development of CCC minimum qualifications, effective practices, and other related topics. The paper will walk a fine line between recommendations and local control. More information to follow after the next meeting.

Bruno and Freitas visited Monterey Peninsula College to provide assistance on equivalency. While in Monterey, they attended the EOPS Conference. The attendees at the conference expressed concern for the populations they served because of possible changes in federal policies that may be implemented with the new administration.

Bruno and Adams met with a staff member for Assemblymember Dodd. The Assemblymember is interested in teacher retention in K-12 but he might entertain introducing legislation that could affect community colleges. He is particularly concerned with rural schools. Building relations with the Assemblymember will be important as he is moving to the Senate next term.

Several members of the Executive Committee attended the CCLC conference and participated in a number of presentations including civic engagement, Wheelhouse Leadership Project, diversity hiring, and open educational resources. Prior to the conference, Bruno attended the CEO meeting to participate in discussions regarding Guided Pathways and IEPI.

Bruno participated in a Collegiality in Action presentation with CCLC at College of Alameda.

Bruno, Stankas, and Adams discussed with UC Academic Senate an interest in establishing pathways in chemistry and physics based on the UC Transfer Pathways. The UC Academic Senate leadership has agreed to investigate the possibility of some sort of guarantee. A number of colleges are having problems creating ADTs in the two disciplines of Chemistry and Physics because of the high units so establishing a pathway with UC may assist in demonstrating that we are working on a student pathway that may prepare our students for UC and CSU. For UC, the pathway would demonstrate a real desire to improve UC transfer rates, while increasing diversity. Additionally, it is evident that UC is interested in building a stronger relationship with CCCs and a stronger partnership will be beneficial for both segments. Incoming Chancellor Eloy Oakley, who remains a

UC regent, is interested in establishing a closer relation between the two segments.

B. Foundation President's Report – 10 mins., May

The Foundation board held a very productive meeting on November 18, 2016, in Southern California. Directors discussed the \$5,000 raised via the 2016 Fall Plenary session fundraising campaign, which will go towards research on faculty diversity hiring, planning for the 2017 Spring Plenary Fling, possible reception or dinner prior to the Faculty Leadership Institute; update on the research collaboration with FACCC on the impact of full-time faculty on student success, status on the efficacy of SLOs research, research on the holistic approach to professional learning, and updating Foundation director orientation.

C. Chief Instructional Officer Liaison Report

The CIO Liaison Malmgren updated members on a number of topics of mutual concern. Locally, CIOs are working with faculty to determine how the Strong Workforce Program funding is allocated and will be audited. Since this is the first time these funds are available, there are some challenges because this is a new process.

The CIOs have some apprehensions with proposed changes to the Chancellor's Office curricular process. The CIOs are concerned with possible consequences for those colleges that have a weak curriculum structure, a new CIO, or unclear curricular processes. With the move to local curriculum approval processes, there needs to be a safety net to ensure that the curriculum process is effective and students are not harmed.

The CIO Board discussed IEPI and the need for clarity on the role of IEPI in providing effective process and practices. IEPI facilitates the sharing of practices by content experts. It was noted that the IEPI Executive Committee should consider having a representative appointed by the CCCCIO.

The CIOs have sent a letter to NACIQI similar to the ASCCC's letter and is considering sending a CIO representative to the NACIQI hearing to support the Chancellor's Office report on the Accreditation Commission on Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC).

The ACCJC is holding its first conference next year. The CIOs noted that the Commission is calling for proposals from organizations to present at this conference. However, it might be more useful for the community colleges to hear from ACCJC and not other groups. There are numerous opportunities to hear from other groups and it would be helpful for ACCJC to use their first event to provide the California community college constituents with an opportunity to learn from ACCJC about new policies, practices, as well as issues and concerns to inform accreditation visits.

D. Liaison Oral Reports (*please keep report to 5 mins., each*)

Liaisons from the following organizations are invited to provide the Executive Committee with updates related to their organization: AAUP, CCA, CCCI, CFT, FACCC, and the Student Senate.

No reports from other liaison groups.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Legislative Update

The Executive Committee briefly discussed the California election and local bond measures.

The Legislative and Advocacy Committee chair proposed that a Legislative Day pre-session be held prior to the Faculty Leadership. The pre-session would be an opportunity to bring in senate presidents and Legislative and Advocacy Liaisons to tour the Capitol, visit with possible legislators, have conversations with the Chancellor's Office, FACCC, and other groups, and learn about state and local level advocacy. Additionally, the Foundation discussed sponsoring a reception on the Wednesday, June 14, 2016, for legislators, Chancellor's Office, Board of Governors, and the pre-session attendees.

MSC (May/Davison) approve a pre-session at the Leadership Institute for a legislative day.

Action:

- The Office team will work on plans to secure a location for the pre-session legislative day and advertise the event.
- The Legislative and Advocacy Committee will work on an agenda for the Legislative and Advocacy day and bring back to the Executive Committee for consideration for approval.

B. Outline to Update the 2008 Technology

After receiving feedback from the Executive Committee at the November pre-plenary session, the Online Committee discussed the need for an update to the 2008 Technology paper or the development of a new paper. The committee determined that a new paper would be a better solution to address changes to online education and drafted another outline for the Executive Committee's consideration. They also recommend a three prong approach to developing the paper, which would include several *Rostrum* articles and then a paper. Concern was raised that *Rostrum* articles do not have the reach that an adopted paper would have and the committee might want to develop a white paper instead, which could inform an adopted paper. This strategy was used to develop the recent curriculum paper, which was very effective. The *Rostrum* articles then could be used to provide background for the paper, generate interest in the topic, gather information from the field, as well as form the basis for the white paper.

- C. Using this process might extend the paper timeline but could be very useful to the committee in informing the paper.

MSC (Goold/Freitas) to approve the outline for a new technology paper.

D. Partnerships for Noncredit Summit Spring 2017

The Noncredit Committee chair reminded members that at the last Executive Committee meeting members agreed to partner with ACCE on noncredit regional meetings, technical assistance, and other related issues. Since that time, the committee has seen requests for more and more technical assistance and had other conversations about the larger need for noncredit professional development activities. Given these request, the Noncredit Committee chair and ACCE representatives brainstormed ways to increase resources for supporting noncredit. Both groups considered whether or not the regional meetings would be sufficient to address the need for more information about noncredit. They determined that a summit might be a better use of time and resources and agreed that a partnership with other constituent groups, including 3CSN, CLP, and CCCCCO, would be beneficial to developing the summit. The groups were approached and agreed to participate in planning the summit if approved by each of the groups governing bodies.

Given the quantity of requests for resources from the field, the groups felt that the number of people who would be interested in attending might be larger than usual so the event should be two-days. It is anticipated that the ASCCC would lead the work in partnership with ACCE, 3CSN, CLP and CCCCCO Academic Affairs with support from IEPI to produce a Noncredit Summit in late Spring 2017. If the Executive Committee agrees to the event, then the committee suggests that the regional meetings be cancelled.

MSC (Goold/Slattery-Farrell) to partner with ACCE, 3CSN, CLP and CCCCCO groups to hold a two-day summit supported by IEPI, and to cancel the regionals.

E. Revised Charge for Accreditation and Assessment Committee

In Spring 2016, the delegates adopted Resolution 9.06, which called for the Executive Committee to revise the charge of and rename the Accreditation and Assessment Committee. The resolution acknowledged that the inclusion of assessment in the Accreditation Committee charge gave the false perception that assessment was only related to accreditation when assessment is a curricular matter. The committee is recommending a revised charge that clarifies that the Accreditation Committee assists colleges with outcomes assessment and how it fits into goal setting and institutional planning. The following is the proposed charge:

The Accreditation Committee advises the Executive Committee and the faculty in matters related to accreditation and continuous quality

improvement. The committee identifies and disseminates knowledge and information regarding faculty roles and effective practices in conducting comprehensive college-wide assessment, meeting and documenting accountability standards, self-evaluation methods and reports, attaining and maintaining accreditation status, and in supporting faculty as they reflect on outcomes and set goals for improvement. The committee receives input from, and collaborates with, pertinent outside groups including regional accreditors and federal agencies, their policies, and processes. Under the direction of the President, designated committee members assist faculty and local academic senates with accreditation and institutional evaluation matters. The committee also plans the annual Accreditation Institute that offers training in accreditation issues, policies, and best practices.

MSC (Freitas/Davison) to approve the charge as modified.

Action:

The revised charge will be posted to the website.

F. System-wide Faculty Development Survey

No discussion. The Executive Director will work with the Faculty Development Committee chair to further develop the survey and bring it back in January.

Action:

A revised survey will return to the January meeting for consideration for approval.

G. Apprenticeship Programs and State Requirements

The Strong Workforce Program (SWP) legislation directs the system to evaluate the minimum qualifications for apprenticeship as recommended by the Board of Governors task force recommendations. Current law grants current apprenticeship instructors the authority to recommend changes to the minimum qualifications through the Chancellor's Office to the Board of Governors via regular consultative processes. Education Code 87357(a)(1) states:

“ With regard to minimum qualifications for apprenticeship instructors, the board of governors shall consult with, and rely primarily on the advice and judgment of, appropriate apprenticeship teaching faculty and labor organization representatives. In each case, the board of governors shall provide a reasonable opportunity for comment by other statewide representative groups.

The ideas around apprenticeship programs in institutions of higher education include the pairing of coursework and paid work experience for the student. The state and federal government are very supportive of such programs as students learn a trade while earning college credits and money to support themselves.

With this part of the SWP directives, the ASCCC began researching this directive and how apprenticeship is used in the field. Currently, there are 21 colleges with some apprenticeship program. By far, the Foothill-DeAnza and Santiago Canyon CCDs have most of the apprenticeship programs and utilize most of the money available by the state. That money is often referred to as RSI (Related Supplemental Instruction) or Montoya money. Most of those programs are directly tied to the traditional trade unions including electrical, plumbing, HVAC, etc. Apprenticeship programs generally do not claim regular apportionment.

In practice, the relationship between the college and industry seems tenuous. Curriculum must be approved through the regular college processes either as credit or noncredit instruction and the program must be approved by the state. The curriculum committees are asked to place the course in either credit apprenticeship or noncredit apprenticeship. However, instruction usually takes place off-campus at a union office with instructors selected by labor and paid by labor, not by the college. That said, the instructor must be the instructor of record and therefore meet the minimum qualifications for apprenticeship. Currently, those minimum qualifications are:

§53413. Minimum Qualifications for Apprenticeship Instructors.

On or after July 1, 1995, the minimum qualifications for service as a community college faculty member teaching credit apprenticeship courses shall be satisfied by meeting one of the following two requirements:

1. Possession of an associate degree, plus four years of occupational experience in the subject matter area to be taught; or
2. Six years of occupational experience, a journeyman's certificate in the subject matter area to be taught, and completion of at least eighteen (18) semester units of degree applicable college level course work, in addition to apprenticeship credits.

(c) On or after July 1, 1995, the minimum qualifications for service as a community college faculty member teaching non- credit apprenticeship courses shall be either of the following:

1. The minimum qualifications for credit apprenticeship instruction as set forth in this section, or
2. A high school diploma; and six years of occupational experience in the occupation to be taught including at least two years at the journeyman level; and sixty clock hours or four semester units in materials, methods, and evaluation of instruction. This last requirement may be satisfied concurrently during the first year of employment as an apprenticeship instructor.

There has been concern expressed by curriculum committees that the curriculum submitted does not conform to the college's standards or that the assignment of an appropriate discipline based on the best preparation of potential faculty to teach the depth expressed by the curriculum and the breadth of knowledge required to be college level. Faculty leadership have also reported it is difficult to maintain appropriate engagement between apprenticeship programs and college processes including program review elements of student equity evaluation, certificate and degree completion rates, and institutional planning.

In addition, the AB86 (2013 ó 14 Budget Act) and later Adult Education Block Grant legislation granted fiscal authority for apprenticeship programs to the California Community Colleges. This has added to the distrust between organized labor unions and the community colleges as the Chancellor's Office works to understand the fiscal responsibility and expenditure plans of the labor unions that receive most of the money associated with apprenticeship.

A recent meeting of the California Apprenticeship Council concluded with a draft proposal to change the minimum qualifications and are attached at the end. It appears the proposal is to change the minimum qualifications to significantly reduce the college education requirement. Such a change will further exacerbate the concerns of curriculum committees.

The ASCCC will continue to investigate how apprenticeship can best serve our students and develop effective practices for new apprenticeship programs. Stankas will lead this effort and report back to the Executive Committee. No action taken.

H. Guidelines for Local Senate Visits

The Relations with Local Senates Committee (RwLS) reviewed guidelines used by the 2010 committee when making Local Senate visits. These guidelines were informed by ASCCC standing committees as well as other work of the Executive Committee members and approved by the Executive Committee for use in making local senate visits.

Members who recently made local senate visits noted that local senates are requesting less visits by someone who is at the meeting to observe and more from representatives who can speak to practices and policies. This observation reinforces the RwLS recommendation to develop a process to provide local senates with experts or mentors who can provide assistance to new senate president on a variety of issues.

Members discussed creating a process similar to the California community college Partnership Resource Team (PRT), where experts in specific areas are pulled together to provide resources to local senates. If the PRT process is replicated for the ASCCC's use with local senates, then there would be the need for an application process. For example, colleges would complete an application,

developed by RwLS and approved by the Executive Committee, that would gather topics of concern for local senates, provide topics under discussion at the state-level, or request specific training for professional development. Another application would gather information from faculty volunteers about their expertise in specific areas such as governance, accreditation visits, distance education, curriculum, minimum qualifications, etc.

There would be three options for local senates: 1) RwLS visits to local senates where members of the committee are present to provide an information session about what is happening at the state level; 2) PRT type conversation where local senates identify topic areas for discussion and the ASCCC faculty assigned provide an interaction of policies and practices; and 3) technical assistance in specific areas where Executive and Standing Committee members are available to provide expertise in specific areas.

It was noted that in both items 2 and 3, the Executive Committee members would be approached first to seek their availability, then the committee expertise in the topic (e.g., EDAC and diversity topics), then the RwLS, and finally faculty volunteers from the field would be identified.

By consensus, RwLS will discuss the feedback from the Executive Committee and develop a recommendation about how best to provide resources to local senates as discussed.

Action:

- The local senate visiting form, cover letter, and topics will be updated.
- Executive Committee members will send to S. Foster and Adams topics for inclusion in the guidelines for local senate visits.
- RwLS will develop a menu of topics available to local senates.
- The RwLS will bring back a recommendation based on this discussion to the February Executive Committee for consideration.

I. Diversity in Faculty Hiring Regional Meeting

The chair of the Equity and Diversity Action Committee presented the agenda for proposed faculty diversity hiring regional meetings. Beach noted, however, with the release of the EEO Diversity Best Practices Handbook, the agenda for the regional meetings should be changed to reflect the recommendations and effective practices in the handbook. Executive Committee members discussed other topics to be included in the regional meetings such as cultural competency training, job description development, and faculty orientation. By consensus, the audience will be faculty, administrators, and human resources experts.

MSC (Freitas/Goold) approve the theme of the regional and partnership of Association of Chief Human Resources Officers (ACHRO).

Action:

- Adams will contact ACHRO to see if they would like to partner with the ASCCC on the regional meetings;
- A save the date will go out immediately;
- This item will return to a future meeting for consideration for approval.

J. CTE Institute

In September members approved a request for funding from IEPI to extend the CTE Leadership Institute to include partnerships with the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCA) and California Community College Classified Senate (4CS), administrative and classified professional leaders in our system. The initial proposal expressed a need to provide adequate leadership and guidance to colleges within our system on CTE matters by uniting CTE faculty, administrators, and classified professionals to work together to ensure the Strong Workforce Program funding is targeted to meet the overarching goals to increase availability of CTE programs and to improve the quality of CTE programs across the system. This coordinated training of college leaders across silos would allow for the development of a shared language for continued CTE leadership level discussions at the college. However, the proposal was not funded.

Adams is proposing that the CTE Institute be held with the original funding as approved by the Executive Committee in the approved budget. She noted, however, that because we did not receive the funding requested we may not be able to offer free registration to the CTE Liaisons.

MSC (Goold/McKay) to continue with the CTE Institute as proposed within the original budget amount.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Chancellor's Office Liaison Report

No report from the Chancellor's Office staff. However, members were updated on several Chancellor's Office advisory groups activities.

B. Board of Governors/Consultation

The Executive Committee was updated on the discussions and actions taken at the Consultation Council and Board of Governors during their recent meetings in November. Consultation topics under discussion included an accreditation and a recent accreditation survey and a community college safe haven. The board discussed their 2017 meeting dates, election of the board president ó Cecilia Estolano and board vice president Tom Epstein, implementation of the FON (approved by the board with some discussion), IEPI indicators, legislative update, ADT update, update of OEI, EPI, and CAI, and the EEO Diversity Best Practices Handbook. Detailed information can be found on the CCCCO website at cccco.edu.

C. Board of Governor’s Interviews

After the Board of Governors interviews last year, questions were raised about the interview process including whether interviews were needed and how much leeway should be given to the Executive Committee in considering information not revealed during the interview itself. The Standards and Practices Committee was asked to review the need for an interview and whether or not any additional information could be considered.

The Standards and Practices Committee reviewed the process and determined that the interviews should be conducted. Since the process is not a human resource process because the Executive Committee is making a recommendation to the governor rather than hiring someone. Because the process is not a hiring process, the Executive Committee has latitude to discuss the candidate using additional information not necessarily included in the resume. The Standards and Practices Committee recommends that no changes be made at this point.

D. EEO and Diversity Advisory Committee Update

The EEO and Diversity Advisory Committee has been meeting over the past year. The ASCCC has been involved in developing the effective practices with the Chancellor’s Office. The Chancellor’s Office reviewed all the equity plans submitted by the colleges to gather information about practices used by them to accomplish the goals of equity. The committee developed a handbook containing the effective practices; however, the handbook goes beyond the hiring effective practices by addressing post hiring as well as cultural competency. The handbook was presented to and accepted by the Board of Governors.

By consensus, A. Foster will draft a letter to accompany the handbook circulated to the field including recommendations for how to incorporate the effective practices into the work of the college. The letter should go out now because hiring is beginning soon.

E. Fall Plenary Session Debrief

The Executive Committee debriefed the 2016 Fall Plenary Session including the resolution process.

F. Executive Committee Members Discussion

The Executive Committee discussed current work load challenges and ways to communicate with internal and external stakeholders.

G. Civil Safety Resources and Support Workgroup

The Executive Committee discussed the purpose of and participation in the Civil Safety Resources and Support Workgroup. An impromptu group comprised of ASCCC, CIOs, CSSOs, SSSCC, and FACCC brainstormed ideas how to support our students in the current political environment. While each individual organization can support our colleges, there might be ways that collectively the groups can also work together to create safe spaces or safe haven where students

feel protected and safe to learn. It was noted that CEOs might be hesitant to participate because of their Boards of Trustees political interests so faculty might want to take the lead on a discussion about how to communicate when topics are difficult. The ASCCC might also want to develop a repository of resources on our website on what colleges are doing to create this safe space for students.

H. Messaging about the Common Assessment Initiative

The Executive Committee was updated on the current status of the Common Assessment Initiative.

The Chancellor's Office and CAI Project Staff have been working on confirming the definition and scope of the project. The common assessment was originally created by legislation since it was one of the recommendations of the Student Success Task Force, and most of the components of the common assessment system that are being developed were included in the original grant proposal or because of interests expressed by stakeholders including adopted resolution by the Academic Senate. Adopted positions of the Senate include the requirement for a writing sample that would be human scored, that the test produce information about student skills beyond course placement, and that there be no common cut scores that accompany the common assessment. At this point, it appears that the Chancellor's Office is trying to bring all of their staff up to date while the CAI Project Staff is trying to push ahead and get the new assessment test approved as quickly as possible.

At the request of the Chancellor's Office, no timelines for the project can be released until there is agreement on what components will be included with the common assessment, where each component is in development, and how long each item will take to complete. To help with this, additional project management has been brought in to work with the CAI Project Team. The Chancellor's Office is being asked to give a comprehensive update to the steering committee at the beginning of the meeting on December 7. Additional information may be available after the meeting with the Chancellor's Office on December 15.

Faculty are continuing to work with the project to bring the common assessment to our system and it is important to remind the field that a considerable amount of work has been done and that the collaboration among discipline faculty is not lost. The course mapping that has been done on campuses will still be useful and colleges that haven't mapped their courses yet can still do so while work on the common assessment continues. The Academic Senate and its representatives are still working hard to create the common assessment that the faculty have been waiting for.

Rutan and Aschenbach will draft a message to send to the field, which Bruno will share with the Chancellor's Office prior to sending to the listserv.

VI. REPORTS *(If time permits, additional Executive Committee announcements and reports may be provided)*

A. Standing Committee Minutes

- i. Accreditation and Assessment Committee, Rutan
- ii. Basic Skills 9.12.16 & 10.3.16, Aschenbach
- iii. Equity & Diversity Action Committee Minutes, Beach/Smith
- iv. Noncredit Committee 9.19.16 & 10.17.16, Aschenbach
- v. Standards and Practices Committee, Freitas

B. Liaison Reports

- i. Basic Skills Advisory Committee, Aschenbach
- ii. California Community College Curriculum Committee 9.15.16 & 10.20.16, Davison
- iii. California Community Colleges Chief Student Services Administrators Association Update, A. Foster

C. Senate and Grant Reports

- i. C-ID Advisory Minutes, Mica
- ii. Intersegmental Curriculum Workshop Minutes, Mica

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted by,
Julie Adams, Executive Director
Dolores Davison, Secretary