**Initiator** (Committee, person, etc.) | President Perez
---|---
**Date of Submission** | February 4, 2014

**Recommendation**  
(*Please be specific)*

College Council evaluated the *Process for Review of the Mission Statement*. College Council deemed the process somewhat cumbersome, and modified it to streamline the review, approval and vetting. College Council also revised the timeline so that review of the mission statement will take place during the spring term beginning in spring 2015, to allow for any changes to be approved in time to ensure the statement continues to drive strategic planning, is included in the next year’s catalog, and is disseminated campus-wide. The revised process is as follows:

1. The divisional shared-governance committees (Budget and Planning Committee, Education Planning Committee, Student Support Services Committee) and ASO review the mission statement and make suggestions for any changes.
2. The results of their reviews and suggested changes are forwarded to College Council.
3. College Council receives and considers all comments and suggestions and formulates a recommendation for any changes to the mission statement.
4. College Council forwards the recommended mission statement to the divisional shared governance committees, ASO, Academic Senate, AFT Faculty Guild and AFT Staff Guild for review and comment.
5. College Council receives and considers all comments and suggestions, formulates a final recommendation for approval of any changes to the mission statement, and forwards it to the President.
6. The President considers the College Council’s recommendation and takes action to approve the recommended changes to the mission statement or to retain the existing mission statement.
7. A Town Hall is scheduled to publicize campus-wide the action on the mission statement.
8. College Council re-evaluates the process for review of the mission statement and makes any necessary changes for improvement, which will be implemented in the next annual cycle.

Leslie Milke moved to approve and D’Art Phares seconded; the motion passed unanimously with one abstention.
| **Budget Impact**  
*(If any, submit planning budget form)* |
|------------------------------------------|

---
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RESEARCH ADVISORY TASK FORCE (RATF): Sarah Master, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, presented the following action item: Accept the “Guidelines for Assigning Priorities to Research Requests” recommended by the RATF as the system to be used for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) for setting priorities among research projects. Dr. Lee helped to formulate this process because one doesn’t currently exist. Danny Villanueva requested training be provided and Dr. Perez suggested RATF discuss the following questions: 1) What if a faculty member looks at the databases and comes up with their own research and data collection and 2) How is this validated or not? Monica Moreno moved to approve and Mary Lou Mendoza seconded; the motion passed unanimously. A copy of the action item is on file.

REPORTS FROM SHARED GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES

BUDGET & PLANNING COMMITTEE: Danny Villanueva, Budget & Planning co-chair, reported on a recommendation from last month to add a sixth question as recommended by Dr. Perez. The committee reaffirmed the requests with the additional question. The action item reads: The Budget and Planning Committee recommends that the College Council approve its new metrics for resource allocation. This metric consists of six questions to be completed by the Vice President of each division for each resource request.

1) Is this position/equipment new or is it a replacement?
2) Is this position/equipment needed to satisfy a mandate, safety/accreditation requirement, or a workload distribution (position only)?
3) Why is this request needed?
4) How will this request benefit students?
5) What are the ongoing costs or savings related to this position/equipment?
6) How does this request contribute to SLOs/SAOs?

The question was called and the motion passed unanimously. A copy of the action item is on file. Further review at the College Council retreat, February 4 will assess the resource request criteria.

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (EPC): D’Art Phares, EPC co-chair, submitted a written report with an attachment on Program Review Assessment and Modification Report. There were no action items.

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE (FPC): Walter Bortman, FPC co-chair, reported on WEC’s report. There was no report from the Bond program and the Facilities Use Policy was tabled by the committee. Two action items will be presented in February: 1) Convert LRC Room 208 for Professional Development to use as a Faculty Resource Center (Eagles Nest) and meeting area. 2) Chicano Studies Department has requested space for a resource center. Bungalow #6 is vacant and has been identified as temporary space for them. Jose Maldonado was elected co-chair of the Facilities Planning Committee representing faculty. Leslie Milke requested FPC to provide an assessment of available space.