Academic Senate
Minutes

Date: Friday October 23, 2015　　　　　　　　　**Time/Location:** 1-3 PM / Room 113

Senate Roles and Responsibilities (The 10+1)	
1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines.	7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
2. Degree and certificate requirements	8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
3. Grading policies	9. Processes for program review
4. Educational program development	10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success	11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate
6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles	

Senators: Matt Clark (President), **Donna McGill-Cameron** (CTE), **Donna Bahneman** (Adjunct), **Jaya Shah** (Math & Science), **Kevin Ferns** (Secretary, FaLaHum), **Greg Gassman** (Social Science), **Christopher Howerton** (At-large, VP Elect), **Jose Vallejo** (Student Services)**, Harry Lyons** (Clear Lake Faculty Ex officio)

Absent: Michael Sramek (ASWCC Rep), **Pam Geer** (Adjunct At-large)

Guests: P. Skillman, R. Clague, J. Foster (ASWCC), C. Recouvreur (ASWCC)

Call to order at 1:07 p.m.

Item	Description-Type	Lead	Background and Objective
I	**Approval of Agenda -Action**		Approve agenda of 10/23/15 (MSC Howerton/Bahneman)
II	**Public Comment**		Guests are welcome to comment on any item on the agenda or not on the agenda. For items on the agenda, they may comment now or during the discussion of that item.
	Discussion		
III	**Approval of Minutes-Action**		Review and approve the minutes of 10/9/15 and 10/13/15.
	Discussion/Decision: ➢ Approve the 10/9/15 minutes as amended (MSC Howerton/Vallejo) ➢ Approve the 10/13/15 minutes as amended (MSC Howerton/Vallejo)		
IV	**President's Report - Information/Discussion**	Clark	
	Discussion/Decision: 1. See the attached report. 2. Clark participated in the Area A meeting this morning. The spring Area A meeting will be April 1 at Butte College. The resolution packet is heavily focused on the baccalaureate degrees. 3. The Library Advisory Committee will be revising its purpose statement. 4. On the topic of AP 6700, there is a need to track costs better than we have been in the past. Administration is working to better communicate the process and rationale.		
V	**Committee Appointments - Action**	Senate	**Objective**: Appoint faculty members to committees.
	Discussion/Decision: None.		
VI	**Senate/Committee Reports - Information**	Senate	

	Discussion/Decision: 1. McGill-Cameron reports that the Curriculum Committee had a spirited discussion with the CLC faculty regarding CTE programs curriculum. It was interesting and things were accomplished. 2. Howerton reports that AP 1420 needs a close look with regard to diversity. 3. Vallejo reports that student services is working to communicate important changes to students regarding the new BOG fee waiver requirements. Close to 70% of our students receive financial aid. More outreach is being planned. Student services is also working on new methods for intervention to assist students. They are also hiring more adjunct faculty to support student services. 4. Ferns reports that some FALAHUM members are disappointed that the English full time faculty position was delayed so long that the window for recruitment and interviews will most likely be pushed into the winter break. This unfortunate timing may also negatively affect the pool of candidates who apply.		
VII	**Ex-officio Reports - Information**	Ex-officio members	
	Discussion/Decision: 1. Lyons reports that the realignment is moving forward.		
VIII	**Portal - Information/Discussion**	Clague, Skillman	**Background**: IT has been exploring a possible replacement for the MyCampus Portal—one that is mobile friendly, pleasingly designed, and that offers true single sign-on. Roger Clague and Peter Skillman will present a short demo. **Objective**: Information and feedback.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. P. Skillman reports that District IT is looking at a solution to the current portal problem. One issue is logging in to the portal (among many). The solution is called LookingGlass, and the new software will be called an intranet, not a portal. It will be mobile friendly and have complete integration with Canvas. It will provide for better communication among the colleges, staff, faculty, and students. Clark asks if this has enough improvements to encourage more reluctant faculty to embrace this new technology. P. Skillman responds that this is much improved over the previous technology, which was developed in the 1990s. R. Clague adds that this will allow for one log-on. This will demand a change of perspective for many in the district, but he is certain that our lives will be improved by the enhanced capabilities. R. Clague believes this progress will tie in to other changes being proposed by the IT Department, including Virtual Desktop Infrastructure, enhanced wi-fi capabilities on campus, and increased training and opportunities for online offerings. The district just received a grant of $150,000 to pay for MyWCC. In addition, campus safety is a concern, and District IT is looking at communications capabilities. The new MyWCC intranet and a corresponding mobile app are estimated to be ready by the start of Fall 2016. Clark asks about streaming capabilities connecting classes between WCC, CLC, and CCOF. R. Clague reports that shared classrooms will be addressed on a case by case basis, but courses could be set up in a matter of months. Clark asks what happens to the technology plans if the economy tanks in a few years. R. Clague responds that we have a number of funding sources, and IT is committed to using funds on one-time costs rather than hiring additional staff. Education is the art of the possible, and we are only limited by our imaginations.		

IX	**AB 798 – Information/Discussion**	Sramek, Foster	**Background:** ASWCC has passed a resolution asking the WCC Academic Senate to take advantage of AB 798 which allows California Community College to apply for grants to increase student access to open source resources with the intent of reducing student costs and increasing student access. The first step would be a senate resolution to increase student access to high quality open source materials. Jesse Foster and Michael Sramek will present the resolution and provide a presentation. **Objective**: Information and feedback in anticipation of considering a resolution supporting increased student access to open source materials.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. C. Recouvreur reports that high quality open source materials are available for many classes at WCC. ASWCC recommends that we take advantage of 10-20 courses where the course materials cost more than the course itself. Grants are available and ASWCC would like to see WCC take advantage of them. See the attached resolution. Open source materials are sometimes better than the books themselves, as they are interactive. Not all courses may be suitable for open source books, but those courses typically have lower textbook costs. Howerton asks whether curriculum would be affected. Some courses have specific texts based on their descriptors. McGill-Cameron questions the quality of some of the available materials. J. Foster responds that the material is always being updated online, and that materials have improved over time. AB 798 requires a senate resolution and then college administration support to develop a grant proposal. We would need to identify 10 course offerings that would be good candidates for the grant as well. Vallejo notes that this would benefit many of our students who are already on BOG fee waivers and other forms of financial aid. The senate will revisit this issue at the next meeting. Clark will work with S. Lanier and Howerton to put a draft resolution together. Clark will also solicit administrative support.		
X	**Faculty Evaluation Process and Instrument – Information/Discussion**	Senate	**Background:** As part of revising forms for faculty member evaluations, three new forms have been proposed for evaluation of librarians. **Objective**: Review and provide feedback regarding the draft forms.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. Please forward comments to Clark directly.		
XI	**Consolidation of Budget & Planning (B&P) and Program Review Validation Team (PRVT) – Information/Discussion**	Senate	**Background**: A draft purpose statement for a merged PRVT/B&P committee will be presented. **Objective**: Review draft purpose statement and provide feedback.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. Please forward comments to Clark directly.		
XII	**LGBTQ Safe Zone Training – Action**	Clark	**Background**: WCC has not had Safe Zone training in over a year. The cost for a comprehensive training is seen as an impediment. **Objective**: Discuss the possibility of using senate monies to help fund Safe Zone training.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. Clark reports that administration will contribute funds to make this happen.		

XIII	**Curriculum Support Across the District – Information/Discussion**	Asmus	**Background:** The senate asked Asmus to form a recommendation for comprehensive support for curriculum across the district. Asmus worked with DCC to create a proposal and will present the proposal to the senate. **Objective:** Information and feedback.
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed		
XV	**Future Agenda Items- Discussion**		Division Chairs, College Catalog, SSS Priorities, CCOF, ADA in the Classroom
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed		

Meeting adjourned 3:00 PM

Meeting with WCC Administration (10/20; meeting of 10/13 was canceled) – Highlights:

1. The administration agreed to work with the senate to augment funds from the Diversity Committee to host an LGBTQ Safe Haven event at WCC. It was suggested that January 29 (a fifth Friday) might be a time that would allow wide participation among both faculty and staff (and perhaps even students?). As a side issue we discussed what might be done (other than fifth Fridays) to obtain broad participation at professional development activities. The possibility of a regular Spring Convocation was mentioned as a possible strategy.

2. We talked in great detail about AP 6700 Civic Center and Other Facilities Use. Among the important points of the discussion –
    (A) The process that is being used is for tracking purposes; there is no intent to charge Ethnic Studies, for example, for an event that it host.
    (B) The process will be applied consistently and across the board. For example Asmus was asked to complete the same paperwork for the FFA event she hosted at WCC and Moreno was for the Semillas y Culturas – Seeds and Cultures event.
    (C) There are many processes that are associated with hosting events that need to be tightened up. For example, none of the promotional emails or posters for Semillas y Culturas – Seeds and Cultures mentioned WCC as a sponsor. Other processes include sufficient lead time for facilities prep, proper channels for press releases and following AP 3950 Hosting Elected Officials, Dignitaries, and Guest Speakers. (President White also indicated a plan to create a campus events calendar and then us a combination of the Foundation and an external group to help promote events hosted at WCC.
    (D) White also opined on the desirability of having broader campus buy-in to events and better student participation at events hosted during the week.

3. We touched briefly on dual enrollment and an article from Community College Weekly. I will forward an excerpt.

4. We briefly discussed the Student Success Center, Student Support, and EMP/Institutional Effectiveness. I will forward documents that we looked at very briefly.

Meeting with Human Resources Director Whitfield (10/15) –

Kemble and I met with Whitfield to discuss sabbatical and the status of work done by the Sabbatical Leave Task Force. The Chancellor's primary concerns are: (1) the process should be a college process, not a district process, and (2) sabbaticals not interrupt students' progress through their educational journey. We agreed that there are solutions through HR to address the latter concerns (e.g., hiring full-time temporary replacements rather than attempting to cover the load of the member taking the sabbatical with a number of adjunct faculty members. (It was also agreed that the responsibility for covering the load falls upon administration and HR, not the faculty member taking leave. Since (1) is a shared senate/bargaining-unit concern, we agreed that we would craft a proposal by late this semester so that any bargaining unit work can be done in conjunction with the contract negotiations. Faculty concerns have primarily been: (A) the perception that reasons for approving sabbaticals have been changed. (B) the work of the Sabbatical Leave Committee has not been given proper weight in the process, (C) monies that are contractually budgeted for leave have not been available, and (D) faculty members at smaller sites or in smaller departments are at a disadvantage in the process. Kemble also noted that he had heard that in some cases WCC deans were encouraging WCC faculty members not to submit sabbatical leave requests. (I professed to not having heard anything to that effect.) We agreed that in transitioning the process to a college process we would clean up and clarify the process to address these concerns. (E.g., we might look at rolling some portion of unused leave monies to the next cycle or to the college's professional development funds.) I will work on a draft to go to senates before the end of the semester. We didn't discuss the Sabbatical Leave Task Force or the District Sabbatical Leave Committee role in the process, but I will engage members of both as the draft is developed.

Budget & Planning/PRVT Joint Meeting (10/15) – Highlights:

1. We brought Dean Martinez somewhat up to speed regarding the program review process. Martinez will meet with former Dean Senecal on October 21 to familiarize herself with the process.
2. White presented the EMP documents that he presented to the senate at our last meeting.

DC3 (10/20) – Highlights:
1. YC VP Jukes reported that he and Konuwa had drafted a fee schedule for AP 6700 and that YC has developed a Facility Use request form. These will be brought to DC3 in the near future. [A side note: Kemble asked where work like this would originate in the absence of CLAS, which he heard was no longer meeting. The response was that while CLAS hadn't met lately, it had not been eliminated.]
2. Some time was spent defining the difference between a council and a committee. Although the distinction may be clear, our documents are awash with the terms being used almost interchangeably.
3. A long discussion on the role of DC3, the possibility of bringing BAT and IERT into DC3, the membership of DC3, and the dissemination of information from DC3. Richter was tasked with drafting a DC3/BAT/IERT purpose statement. A Survey Monkey or some other survey technique will be used to begin discussions of membership.

College Council (10/16) – Highlights:
1. Dean Ortiz-Mercado presented a draft Student Services Council Charter. This was in response to a charge from College Council last year.
2. CAT will present a prioritization of the Convocation activity strategies early next month.
3. Governance structure redesign was discussed as part of a necessary component of the EMP. A gap in our governance structure is enrollment management. Currently a number of committees touch on enrollment management issues, but there is not a comprehensive enrollment management process.
4. Regarding governance, Data Inquiry Group leads (roughly division chairs) were mentioned as a possibility, as was restructuring our divisions. The DIG lead's role sounded a bit different than what I think most of us had thought a division chair's role might be. It will be important to thoroughly flesh out details for either.
5. Details of the schedule for October 30 were discussed. From 9-9:50 there will be a joint meeting of College Council and the Academic Senate, focused on governance structures. From 10-11:30 there will be a college-wide EMP event. Then from 12:30-3, there will be a CCOF Compression Planning Event at CCOF.

Miscellany
1. DCAS will meet twice next week. The first meeting will focus on committee structure of committees connected to DCAS.
2. Although my raising of civility in my previous President's Report was botched at best (although reflecting, I think that it was destined to be), I hope that people don't let the poor presentation distract from the core issue. If a colleague is behaving in an unprofessional manner, ignoring their behavior can be viewed as acceptance of the behavior, both by the person behaving unprofessionally and the target(s) of the unprofessional behavior. DC3 was given access to the Ruffalo/Noel-Levitz Employee Satisfaction Survey Data last week. While digging through the data I was shocked to find the following response to one of the open-ended questions: "… at WCC. Some faculty members are nasty to their coworkers." (The same responder also wrote that "Staff are outstanding", so it wasn't all bad news.) This survey was conducted last spring, long before the events that lead to the discussions between the college and senate leadership regarding civility took place. We have also had campus climate on and off the senate agenda throughout the history of the WCC Academic Senate. The issue I referred to in the last president's report is not the problem; it was merely a manifestation of the problem.
3. The Fall ASCCC Plenary is in Irvine, November 5-7. Shah and I plan to attend. If any others wish to attend, please let me know ASAP. Next week we should see the docket of resolutions after the Area meetings have added to or amended the docket I sent out two weeks ago.
4. Under desirable qualities the following were added on the flyers that went out for the math and the English positions: (1) *An understanding of Hispanic Serving Institution and the Latino student experience,* and (2) *Bilingual competence in Spanish and English.* We have had conversations relating to concerns-about and

positives-of similar language in the past. However, neither the senate nor the Diversity Committee has made any recommendations about such language nor have we done any research into what best practices exist.

5. I will give a brief verbal report from LAC and from the Area A meeting which both precede the senate meeting tomorrow.

ASWCC Resolution 2015:02

College Textbook Affordability

Authors: Christopher Recouvreur, Michael Sramek, Jesse Foster,

Natasha Sramek, Ali Harder

Whereas, textbook costs have risen 1041 percent since 1977 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, outpacing the median wage increase two fold, according to the Social Security Wage Index,

Whereas, electronic courseware licensed at a cost to students does not meet Title 5 § 59400 requirements that such materials are of continuing value to a student outside of the classroom setting,

Whereas, open source textbook and courseware solutions reduce the cost to districts and students,

Whereas, reducing the overall cost of attendance will result in a growth in enrollment for Woodland Community College and allow for higher levels of student success by allowing students to spend more time studying and less time working to pay for expensive textbooks,

Whereas, by preventing the free distribution of course textbooks and software, copyright holders limit the extent to which students and schools may benefit from the aforementioned cost savings,

Whereas, the use of open source courseware curated by WCC Faculty would result in high quality customizable course materials that would increase student success,

Whereas, AB 798 would authorize the local academic senate of a campus of the California Community Colleges to (A) adopt a local campus resolution to increase student access to high-quality open educational resources and reduce the cost of textbooks and supplies for students, and (B) upon adoption of the resolution, develop a specified plan, in collaboration with students and the administration, that describes evidence of the campus' commitment and readiness to spend an initial grant of up to $50,000;

Resolved, the Associated Students of Woodland Community College take a stance of support for AB 798,

Resolved, the Associated Students of Woodland Community College encourage the Academic Senate of Woodland Community College to obtain funds for open courseware on campus through AB 798,

Resolved, the Associated Students of Woodland Community College encourage the Academic Senate and College Administration to develop a specific plan of implementation for open courseware programs funded by an AB 798 grant for high volume core curriculum courses,

Resolved, upon expiration of AB 798 funding, the Associated Students of Woodland Community College encourage the Academic Senate and College Administration to support the ongoing development of open courseware materials for WCC Courses deemed suitable by the Faculty member.

Yuba Community College District Faculty Evaluation Form IE 1S
Librarian Addendum

A. **Evaluation**
4 = Exceeds Expectations, 3 = Meets Expectations, 2 = Marginal, and 1 = Unacceptable

Librarian Performance and Organization	4	3	2	1
In your assessment, consider the following: • Assists students in locating relevant materials • Made appropriate referrals to additional information resources or campus resources. • Develops library instructional tools for reference and instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐
In your assessment as a supervisor, consider also the following: • Accessible and flexible in providing reference and instruction • Coordinates circulation, ILL, reserves, reference, and instructional services • Selects/de-selects library materials in order to build, organize, and maintain the library collection	☐	☐	☐	☐

Explanation of Assessment:

Pilot Student Evaluation of Library Instruction

1. The instructor explained the outcomes of the session
   a. Clearly from the beginning
   b. Clearly but not from the beginning
   c. Generally
   d. Indirectly
   e. Never
2. The instructor organized the material of the session
   a. Clearly
   b. Very well
   c. Adequately
   d. Not so well
   e. There was not any clear organization in this presentation
3. The instructor encouraged student participation and was receptive of student views
   a. Not Applicable
   b. Always
   c. Often
   d. Occasionally
   e. Rarely
   f. Never
4. The instructor was sensitive to students having difficulty during instruction, changing the approach or offering new explanations
   a. Not Applicable
   b. Always
   c. Often
   d. Occasionally
   e. Rarely
   f. Never
5. The instructor was willing and available to offer individual help if you needed it
   a. Not Applicable
   b. Always
   c. Often
   d. Occasionally
   e. Rarely
   f. Never
6. The instructor was clear in presenting the subject matter
   a. Always
   b. Often
   c. Occasionally
   d. Rarely
   e. Never
7. The instructor presented clear instructions for activities to students during the session
   a. Not Applicable

    b. Always
    c. Often
    d. Occasionally
    e. Rarely
    f. Never

8. How would you rate this instructor overall?
    a. Excellent
    b. Good
    c. Average
    d. Fair
    e. Poor

NOTE: Please use the back of this form on which to explain what this instructor is doing well and/or what specifically the instructor should do better. Give examples.

Appendix XX
Librarian Student Reference Evaluation

Please indicate your appraisal of the librarian's performance by drawing a circle around the number that most closely expresses your view. The purpose of the process is to improve the librarian's effectiveness. **Do not sign you name to this sheet.**

10. Describe the strengths of the librarian; please be specific and give examples.

Rate the librarian in each of the following categories:	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Below Average	Poor	Does Not Apply
The librarian:						
1. Was knowledgeable regarding appropriate information resources.	5	4	3	2	1	X
2. Made me feel comfortable in seeking assistance.	5	4	3	2	1	X
3. Understood my request.	5	4	3	2	1	X
4. Communicated clearly.	5	4	3	2	1	X
5. Was genuinely interested in helping me.	5	4	3	2	1	X
6. Was effective in teaching me how to use library resources.	5	4	3	2	1	X
7. Made appropriate referrals to additional information resources or campus resources.	5	4	3	2	1	X
8. Was someone I would recommend to other students.	5	4	3	2	1	X
9. My overall evaluation of this librarian is:	5	4	3	2	1	X

_____
_____

11. What could the librarian do to improve their effectiveness?
_____
_____

12. If you have any additional comments regarding any categories listed above, please be specific and give examples.
_____
_____

Standing Committee: Institutional Effectiveness Committee
Sponsor: WCC VPI
Committee Co-Chairs: Sonia Ortiz-Mercado (Dean of Student Success & Planning) & Matt
Clark (Academic Senate President)
Committee Purpose: The WCC Instructional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) is charged with
coordinating and integrating college plans and recommending budget priorities to the President
that are consistent with the college's vision and mission statements, and Board strategic
directions. The WCC PBC will ensure that planning will drive resource allocation and the budget
process, and assessment and continuous improvement will drive the planning process.

The Planning & Budget Committee will have a membership that represents all college
constituencies and will organize and conduct its operations based on a Charter and Operating
Rules approved by the WCC Academic Senate and the College Council and Administration.
The IEC serves the following purposes:

1. Recommend budget priorities to the President;
2. Review Tentative and Adopted budgets to ensure that they are consistent with annual
   institutional goals, objectives and college plans.
3. Inform college constituencies of the budget status through campus wide communication,
   including budget forums.
4. Review benchmarks and outcomes to ensure continuous improvement in the overall
   planning and budget process.
5. Monitor the budget process to
   - Ensure alignment with the Continuous Improvement Model and the Budget
     Allocation Model.
   - Track budget timelines and completion of tasks.

Meeting Schedule:
The committee will meet on the 1st and 3rd Thursday from 12 PM – 1 PM

How Work Is Communicated:
1. Minutes and agendas will be posted to the WCC website.
2. Periodic progress reports will be given to the WCC College Council, the WCC Academic
   Senate, and the WCC President.

Recommendations go to:
WCC College President
Task Force Purpose: The Program Review Validation Team (PRVT) is a task force of the IEC.
PRVT will provide feedback to programs submitting reviews and will forward recommendations
of program priority levels (enhance, maintain, restructure or revise) with justification to
appropriate college committees. The intent of the committee is to make the program review
process one that improves programs at WCC for WCC students and the communities WCC
serves. In doing so it will focus on the goals and values reflected or delineated in the WCC
Mission Statement, the WCC Education Master Plan, and the WCC Accreditation Self-Study.
Further, the guidance of the WCC Academic Senate and the WCC College Council shall be
strongly considered.

Rev. 10-23-2014

The PRVT serves the following purposes:

1. Reviewing of program reviews and program review updates.

2. Providing feedback regarding program reviews and program review updates.

3. Collecting requests from program reviews and program review updates and forwarding an integrated list of requests to appropriate committees. These lists may also include support for requests.

4. Providing recommendations to improve the program review process.

5. Providing recommendations regarding college program priority levels

6. Categorizing requests and determining their alignment with the college EMP as well as the Woodland Community College and Yuba Community College District's Strategic Plans.

Guidelines and Parameters:

1. The committee operates consistently with the YCCD participatory decision making process.
2. Sponsor, chair, and members will carry out responsibilities assigned to the committee and function under the Team Roles as defined in the WCC College Handbook.
3. Issues outside the purview of the committee will be referred to the appropriate representative body or committee.
4. Members will solicit input from the WCC community and maintain an open dialog with colleagues during all aspects of process development and forming recommendations.
5. Members will come prepared for each meeting and will have completed any assignments necessary to move the business of the meeting towards completion.
6. An agenda will be distributed three (3) days in advance of any meeting.
7. Minutes will be approved at the subsequent meeting and will be distributed within 5 days of their approval.
8. The sponsor and the chair will make periodic reports to the WCC College Council and the WCC Academic Senate.

Resources:

1. WCC Mission Statement
2. WCC Accreditation Self-Study
3. WCC Education Master Plan
4. Colusa Outreach Educational Advisory Committee
5. WCC Student Learning Outcomes Committee
6. YCCD Technology Committee
7. YCCD Chief Business Officer
8. WCC Student Success Committee

9. WCC Budget and Planning Committee
10. WCC Strategic Plan
11. YCCD Integrated Planning Process

Outcomes and Deliverables:
1. Integrated list of requests from program reviews
2. Feedback regarding program reviews and program review updates
3. Recommendations for program priority levels
4. Recommendations for continuous improvement of program review process
5. Integration of planning processes touched on by program reviews and program review updates

Recommendations Go To:
1. WCC IEC for review and action
2. WCC Academic Senate and WCC College Council for review
3. WCC Faculty Staff and Administrative Planning Committee, Instruction Equipment Request Committee, Scheduling Committee, WCC Curriculum Committee, District Technology Committee, and District M&O for information

Instructional Effectiveness Committee
IEC Membership:

Position	Term	Name
Sponsor	On-going	Al Konuwa (VPI)
Co- Chair (Senate President)	2014 – 2016	Matt Clark
Co-Chair (Dean of Student Success & Planning)	On-going	Siria Martinez
** Executive Dean CLC	On-going	Annette Lee
Faculty Reps (2) from PRVT		
ASWCC Reps (2)	2015-2016	Babin Dahal
	2015-2016	TBD
Classified Reps (2)	2015-2017	Denise Browning
	2016-2018	TBD

PRVT Membership:

Above plus –		
FSAPC Rep	DBC*	TBD
Curriculum Committee Rep	DBC*	Brandi Asmus
Scheduling Committee Rep	DBC*	TBD
District Technology Committee Rep	DBC*	Julie Brown
SLO Committee Rep	DBC*	TBD
Student Services Faculty Rep	2014 – 2017	Laney Mangney
**CLC Faculty Rep	2016-2019	TBD

Rev. 10-23-2014

Maintenance/Facilities Rep   2014 – 2016   TBD
Dean of Instruction   On-going   Monica Chahal
Dean of Student Services   On-going   Siria Martinez
* Determined by committee being represented. Due to overlapping committee work one person could fill two positions.
** Placeholder for after CLC transition.

Resource Members
District Director, Information Technologies   Roger Clague
District Director, Maintenance and Operations   David Willis