



Minutes for Administrative Planning Council

Wednesday, April 16, 2014

8:00 am – 8:55 am

Building 8, Room 119

Present: Larry Buckley, Gregory Anderson, Robin Richards, Chialin Hsieh, Vickie Nunes, Brandon Price, Debbie Joy, Joan Tanaka, and Dave Vigo

Absent: Maggie Souza

1. Role of APC	Chialin Hsieh
<p>The committee decided that the role of APC members are connected with their offices. The committee also discussed the future calendar and meeting agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-Up Report 2014 review and recommendation—Summer 2014 • Follow-Up Report 2014 approval—Fall 2014 • Evaluation of the College Benchmark—Summer 2014 • Dialogue for SLO (Unit Outcome Assessment)—Summer 2014 • Participation/Evaluation of the Educational master Plan objectives—Summer 2014 • Evaluation of program review and process—Spring 2015 • Evaluation of resource requests—Spring 2015 • Evaluation of the Participatory Governance Process—Spring 2015 	
2. Evaluation of the Participatory Governance Process	Robin Richards
<p>The committee went through each of the specific recommendations from the key participatory governance groups and discussed its completion. Several suggests were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APC suggested PBC to review and update Participatory Governance Manual. • APC suggested PBC to create one calendar for monthly tasks for all planning committees (PBC, IPC, SSPC, and APC) • APC suggested to review instructional equipment sooner than later. • Currently APC posted its agendas and minutes on APC’s website. Next year, APC will disseminate the agendas and minutes via college emails as well. • Some information APC did not know so APC left them blank. 	

3. Evaluation of the College Benchmark	Chialin Hsieh
<p>APC discussed the Cañada College Benchmarks and Goals. After analyzing the actual results from 2011-12 and 2012-13, the committee discussed and decided that our #4 Transfer Benchmark is too high. Instead of 275, the committee decided to set the Transfer Benchmark 250. #4a UC/CSU Transfer Benchmark was asked to adjust to 150 instead of 165. The reason was that our enrollment was decreasing over the years and expected high transfer rate might be unreasonable. The committee asked to continue monitoring our benchmark and to have more than 2-year information in order to evaluate the appropriateness of the benchmarks.</p>	
4. Evaluation of Program Review Process	Robin Richards/ Chialin Hsieh
<p>The committee expressed that the program review form was confusing. Some items were for past progress and some items were for the further plan, and it was not clearly defined in the form. Members suggested re-organizing the form.</p>	
5. Follow up with Program Review resources requests	Gregory Anderson/ Chialin Hsieh
<p>Office of Instruction, PRIE, and Business Office were requesting a work study student to support the work in building 8.</p>	
6. Future Agenda items	
<p></p>	