



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Signature Programs Taskforce

Summary

10:30 - 11:30 a.m.

FCC HS-1 /RC CCI-208 /WI AC1-149 / MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of January 17, 2013

Present: Brett Camacho, Jim Chin, David Clark, Natalie Culver-Dockins, Marcy Davidson, Cynthia Elliot, Kelly Fowler, Pamela Gilmore, Kirtley King, Tom Mester, George Railey, Christopher Whiteside, Tim Woods, Kerry Ybarra

The meeting was called to order at 10:33 a.m. by G. Railey.

I. Review of Signature Programs Guidelines (Update) – G. Railey

G. Railey began this portion of the meeting by reading the charge of the Signature Program Committee. He noted that he had conversed with the campus presidents on the scope of the groups work and that they had been clear that the focus of the Taskforce should be on defining what a signature program should be without specific attention to funding or budgetary matters. This was followed by some discussion of campus vs. district sponsorship of such programs, and the associated Committees that would determine how funding would be resolved in each case.

II. Review of Signature Programs Definitions, Other Colleges Districts – T. Woods, D. Clark

T. Woods noted that there is no current universal definition of signature programs in the state of California. He provided the group with copies of an article entitled, "Setting Academic Priorities, Identifying Signature Programs" which they reviewed during the meeting. This paper identifies the following process, which the Taskforce plans to adopt:

- 1) Data to be captured;
 - a. CTE Program data from each campus (on groups Blackboard site)
 - b. Data from program reviews
- 2) Identification of stakeholders;
 - a. Taskforce members were asked to email their recommendations to C. Crill-Hornsby.

- b. It was suggested that curriculum analysts from campuses should be included in Taskforce meetings as non-voting members in order to allow them to provide their expertise
 - c. In the case of WI, Michelle Johnson would act as the local expert
- 3) Defining of programs.

There was some discussion about how new and emerging programs would be determined to be signature programs. It was stated that language for identifying programs as signature should be standardized throughout the district with the possible use of a program proposal template in order to screen both existing and new programs for their signature potential.

T. Woods also provided two other documents which gave examples of the manner in which signature programs have been defined at other colleges/districts for the groups review. D. Clark noted that no one resource was definitive, and that each college/district seemed to have its own process for determining what a signature program would be for their location.

III. Discussion of Current Campus CTE/Perkins Programs – G. Railey

There was a discussion of the criteria to be developed in order to review all the campus CTE/Perkins eligible programs to determine their eligibility to be signature programs. After some initial suggestions, a timeline for developing this criterion was developed. See Next Steps for assignments regarding this timeline.

IV. Next Steps

Taskforce members to email C. Crill-Hornsby their recommendations for those who should be included in the review process as campus-level stakeholders.

Timeline for development of Signature Program review criterion:

- 1) January 28th – lists of recommended criteria to be sent to C. Crill-Hornsby by Taskforce members;
- 2) February 4th – master list of criteria to be sent to Taskforce in template format. Criteria to be ranked by importance 1 thru 3;
- 3) February 8th – lists of ranked criteria to be returned to C. Crill-Hornsby by Taskforce Members;
- 4) February 11th – overall compiled list of ranked criteria returned to Taskforce for use in discussion at next Signature Programs meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:38 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Review of Recommended Stakeholders for Taskforce (G. Railey)
2. Review of Ranked Signature Program Review Criteria (G. Railey)

Next meeting February 21, 2013 at 10:50 AM

NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Signature Programs Taskforce

Summary

10:50 - 11:50 a.m.

FCC OAB 226/RC LRC-104 /WI AC1-149 / MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of February 21, 2013

Present: Christopher Boltz, Brett Camacho, Jim Chin, David Clark, Natalie Culver-Dockins, Marcy Davidson, Paula Demanett, Cynthia Elliot, Kelly Fowler, Pamela Gilmore, Cheryl Hesse, Michelle Johnson, Kirtley King, Tom Mester, Kelli O'Rourke, George Railey, Christopher Whiteside, Tim Woods, Kerry Ybarra

Guest: Mary Anderson, PhD Student (shadowing Dr. Railey)

The meeting was called to order at 10:53 a.m. by G. Railey.

I. Review of Signature Programs Charge Statement– G. Railey

G. Railey began the conversation by noting that he has received two email messages from campus personnel with questions regarding the scope and focus of the Signature Program Taskforce and Committee. He then referred the group to the Signature Program Charge Statement (*provided in the meeting materials*) in order to clarify the purpose of the group. He noted that funding decisions will be made by the campuses, not by the Signature Program Committee, and that the main purpose of the group is to define the terms of 'signature programs' in the district and determine methods in which those same programs can be best showcased in the community.

K. Ybarra noted that it is more difficult to establish definitions for signature programs when it unclear what the final purpose of the Signature Program Committee will be once programs have been defined. G. Railey noted that it appears that the Signature Program Taskforce/Committee was formed to address districtwide accreditation recommendation #1: the addition of WI as a college in the district, and the placement of programs in the district in general. He stated that he believes that the district needs to establish a mechanism to ensure planning of programs, but that the final decisions would still be campus based. G. Railey stated that he would seek further clarification from the Chancellor's Cabinet regarding the final purpose of the Committee.

P. Gilmore asked for clarification on the connection between the work of the Signature Program Committee and the DRAMT group. There was some discussion of this topic, with note that the DRAMT is awaiting input from the Signature Program

Committee. It was stated that input to the DRAMT from this body may be used in order to determine how these programs are factored into the final allocation model. T. Woods noted that definition of signature programs is commonly tied to funding models in the literature on this subject. K. Flower noted that how these two groups activities tie together may change the work product of the Signature Program Committee. G. Railey noted that there is no indication at either Chancellors Cabinet or DRAMT meetings that there will be a direct tie between the definition of signature programs and funding.

II. Review of Recommended Stakeholders for Taskforce - G. Railey

G. Railey stated that he had received a request for clarification as to how many non-CTE staff are currently included in the Signature Programs Taskforce. He asked for shows of hands of non-CTE members, a number of responses were noted. G. Railey then noted that the Signature Program Taskforce's meetings are open and anyone is welcome to attend.

III. Review of Ranked Signature Program Criteria – G. Railey

The discussion of the ranked program criteria began with a note as to the inconsistencies in the methodology of gathering the group's responses. Not all members ranked their choices in the same manner. It was determined that the group would be asked to rank their choices a second time, this time with greater detail in the instructions to ensure consistency. C. Crill-Hornsby will send group members an updated version of the criteria worksheet for their use and will include a timeline for completion of the task to ensure completion prior to the next meeting on March 7th, 2013.

A discussion of the ranked criteria as presented with the meeting materials covered the following sections of the Quantitative portion of the worksheet:

- 1) Demonstrated Community
 - a. FCC tracks this data for program review;
 - b. M. Johnson noted that Rhea Riegel may have historic examples of this, but that it is not currently tracked at RC/WI;
 - c. T. Woods noted that this includes environmental scanning and Economic Modeling Specialists Inc., (EMSI) database;
 - d. G. Railey also noted that this would be included in the Federal Jobs Report.
- 2) Student Completion Data
 - a. FCC tracks this data for program review;
 - b. RC/WI should have access to this information as well (M. Johnson);
 - c. M. Johnson noted that the employment portion of this data would be harder to pin point as it is not currently tracked by the colleges and is not readily available through research resources.
- 3) Demand for Program

- a. FCC tracks this data for program review;
 - b. RC/WI should have access to this information as well (M. Johnson).
- 4) Fill Rate for Classes (Normally for Existing Programs)
- a. This is a key factor for enrollment management;
 - b. Data for this criteria is readily available;
 - c. This data can also be disaggregated as necessary with the student-to-teacher ratio;
 - d. There was some discussion of this term and it's possible different intentions depending on caps vs. seats
 - e. In the case of new programs, faculty can use data from schools that are currently hosting the program in order to provide this detail and/or LMI data to determine the regional demand;
 - i. Labor market research – Michelle Marquez
 - ii. Regional program saturation
 - f. Wait lists;
 - i. Each campuses policy and even program level is different;
 - ii. Data changes as soon as first day of class passes;
 - iii. There is no way to predict how many additional students may be waiting for a course.
- 5) Capital Expense
- a. May be a more of a factor for new programs than for established programs;
 - b. May not have a heavy weight in determination as some programs are not lucrative but are still necessary;
 - c. Cost is not a determining factor of quality;
 - d. K. Fowler noted that this information may be brought up in another way under the later criteria, "Cost Per Student";
 - e. K. Ybarra noted that this criterion may be one that can be highlighted in order to focus on external funding opportunities.
- 6) Student Enrollment
- a. Data may be difficult to come by because not all students enrolled in a course are seeking to complete a program/certificate in that subject area;
 - b. This criterion may be better served by being split into two alternative criteria:
 - i. Student Demand
 - ii. Community Demand
 - c. There was some discussion as to what makes a 'student' in a program, how this criterion differed from Fill Rate, and how this criterion would need to be defined in order to adequately allow for data to be collected.

G. Railey noted in discussion that he would seek information on the CCCCCO new program criteria to send to the group for them to compare with the criteria being discussed here. He noted that any new program would need to engender a districtwide discussion and in order to ensure that all necessary due diligence has been done for strategic planning.

There was discussion of how to bring program review information to a district level without replication of effort; G. Railey noted that the districtwide group has no desire to replicate/review campus work. He stated that the campuses will determine their own benchmark levels for determination of what will be a signature program at their location. This data may come from program review, but will not be used in the same manner.

There was a discussion of the program focus of the group; CTE vs. all programs. G. Railey stated that the campus presidents had requested a CTE-only focus for the signature program review at this time. In order to confirm this, G. Railey will seek verification from the presidents and bring their input back to the group. It was noted that there may need to be two different review processes, one for each program type (CTE vs. all programs) because of the potential differences in available data. However, most data should be available for both types.

IV. Next Steps

G. Railey will seek further clarification from the Chancellor’s Cabinet regarding the final purpose of the Signature Program Committee

C. Crill-Hornsby to send ranked criteria worksheet to group with detailed instructions and timeline for completion of the task to ensure completion of work prior to the next meeting on March 7th, 2013.

G. Railey to seek information on the CCCCCO new program criteria and send to the group for comparison to the proposed SCCCCD signature program criteria.

G. Railey to seek verification from the campus presidents regarding the intended scope of the work of the Districtwide Signature Program Committee (CTE vs. all programs). He will bring their input back to the group.

G. Railey to provide group members with a copy of the pertinent section of the Districtwide Accreditation Recommendation for the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:58 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Review of Districtwide Accreditation Recommendation G. Railey
2. Review of CCCCCO ‘New Program’ Criteria G. Railey

3. Review of Ranked Signature Program Review Criteria G. Railey
4. Review of Recommended Stakeholder for Taskforce G. Railey

Next meeting March 7, 2013 at 1:30 PM



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Signature Programs Taskforce

Summary

1:30 – 2:30 PM

DO Conference Room / RC PCR / WI AC1-270 / MC PCR

Notes from Meeting of March 7, 2013

Present: Roll call was not taken for these recorded notes.

The meeting was called to order at 1:36 a.m. by G. Railey.

I. Review of Districtwide Accreditation Recommendation – G. Railey

G. Railey began the conversation by noting that materials for the districtwide action items from the Accreditation Commission Report had been provided as materials for this meeting and explained where this material can be found in other sources.

G. Railey noted that the Accreditation Team will be returning to follow up on their recommendations with the campuses and district this fall and to review evidence toward our progress. The efforts of this Taskforce will be a small part of that response to recommendation for the district.

The SCCCD district Strategic Plan addresses the recommendations and both documents mention the location of Signature Programs. G. Railey clarified that the charge of the Taskforce is to define what SCCCD considers a signature program, but not to determine the location of these programs in the district. T. Woods clarified and G. Railey agreed that the eventual Signature Program Committee is a body that will create an overall process and determine the final criteria for pin-pointing signature programs, which the campus Program Review Committees will use to analyze their college's program offerings in order to determine what a signature program is at their sites.

G. Railey stated that he had asked the Chancellor's Cabinet this past Monday to clarify what types of educational programs would be the focus of the Taskforce's work on this definition. He noted that the response was that the focus would be on CTE programs only.

There was a lengthy discussion of the Signature Program Taskforce's charge statement vs. the SCCCD district response matrix. G. Railey stated that the Taskforce's work is governed by the charge statement, which includes an assertion

that final determination of what will be a signature program is a campus-level decision. Additionally, and how those programs are vetted and funded will be completed by bodies other than the Signature Program Taskforce. G. Railey noted that he believes this will be determined through program review and campus level planning. There was a question as to the need for a districtwide definition if each campus was to determine its own final signature programs. G. Railey noted that this was to establish a standard that would ensure that there was not a disparity between the methods used at each of the district's campuses. He stated however, that unless the charge of the Taskforce is changed at some point in the future, the campuses will continue to retain the final say on what they will call a signature program.

The following concerns were identified during further discussion:

- 1) If the AACJC recommendation would be addressed enough for their next visit later this year;
- 2) Campus ability to determine what programs would be signature programs (location);
- 3) Duplication of signature programs at multiple campuses;
- 4) Ensuring that thresholds for signature program status are high enough to ensure that not all programs fall into 'signature programs'.

II. Review of CCCCCO 'New Program' Criteria - G. Railey

This portion of the agenda was not discussed at this meeting.

III. Review of Ranked Signature Program Review Criteria – G. Railey

P. Gilmore requested that the top 3-4 criteria be established at the districtwide definition of a signature program and come up with measureable values for each (metrics and rubrics to be established for each of these). There was a discussion of who would establish the measures – campus or district – and it was noted that the process the standards for these measures would need to be high and that the Taskforce would be in a position to determine thresholds (specific measures), while the campuses defined the process by which those measures are applied (application of the method of review).

There was also discussion of how programs would fall out of a signature program status or be placed on probation, if economic or educational conditions changed.

The group determined that they would take the top four from both the qualitative and the quantitative criteria* and determine measures for each. The following measures were identified during the course of the discussion that followed:

Quantitative	Qualitative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDD/WIB Reports/EMSI data; • Local labor market data; • Regional labor market data; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory Committee input; • Capacity for additional students; • Capacity for additional resources;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory Committee data; • Perkins – Section 4, Required Outcome #9: high wage, high skill or high demand occupations; • Anticipated growth; • Number of students interested in program; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stewards resources efficiently;
---	---

**It was noted that many of these items are, in detail, the same criteria but may have different measures, both qualitative and quantitative.*

T. Woods, D. Clark, C. Whiteside, and T. Mester will be working on a template for further discussion of the topic of measures for each of the top criteria which they will bring to the next meeting of this group. Consideration to be given to the criteria suggestions as previously reviewed by this body.

IV. Review of Recommended Stakeholders for Taskforce – G. Railey

This portion of the agenda was not discussed at this meeting.

V. Conclusion

G. Railey noted that, while he acknowledges that there would be additional work to be done in order to meet the needs of the AACJC recommendation; he thinks it is important that this Taskforce be deliberative and thoughtful in analyzing everything that they do as this work is shaping the process by which this project will move forward. Not all recommendations from the Taskforce will be accepted by Chancellor’s Cabinet, and recommendations are not set in stone. G. Railey asks for patience in this work and requests thoughtful consideration and discussion of the options available.

VI. Next Steps

T. Woods, D. Clark, C. Whiteside and T. Mester will complete a template for discussion of measures for each of the top criteria to present at the next meeting.

C. Crill-Hornsby to set meeting date in April by working with group members via e-mail.

Meeting adjourned at 2:41 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Review of Planning Calendar for Signature Programs Taskforce..... G. Railey
2. Review of Template for Criteria Measures
.....T. Woods, D. Clark, C. Whiteside, T. Mester

Next meeting TBA



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Signature Programs Taskforce

Summary

12:30 – 2:00 PM

FCC OAB 126 / RC LRC-104 / WI AC1-149 / MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of April 24, 2013

Present: Christopher Boltz, Jim Chin, Marcy Davidson, Paula Demanett, Kelly Fowler, Pamela Gilmore, Tasha Hutchings, Michelle Johnson, Tom Mester, George Railey, Tim Woods, Kerry Ybarra

The meeting was called to order at 12:32 a.m. by G. Railey.

I. Introductions – G. Railey

See notations on attendees, above.

II. Review of Signature Programs Charge – K. Fowler

K. Fowler provided the group with a number of documents for their reference in this discussion via email prior to the meeting.

K. Fowler referenced district strategic plan item #3 and lead a discussion of the objectives related to the formation of the Signature Program Taskforce included in the Objectives Matrix. This focused on objective 3.2; subparts a, b, c & d. Additional discussion clarified that the district's role in the achievement of these objectives is to provide a methodology for identification of signature programs that will then be applied by the campuses in accordance with their own planning needs. G. Railey specifically clarified that it was not the goal of the Signature Programs Taskforce to bring about the movement of programs from one campus location to another and that any new programs being developed would be governed by the regular channels of curriculum development via the campuses (ie ECPC).

K. Fowler summarized by saying that the taskforce's goal was to establish an overarching definition of signature programs, with the campuses determining the metrics that would be used to examine and enact the definitions application at their location.

K. Fowler then referenced districtwide accreditation recommendation #1, "The includes creating, developing, and aligning district and college plans and planning

processes in the following areas: strategic planning, technology planning, organizational reporting relationships of centers, locations of signature programs, funding allocations, and human resources and research capability.” She noted again that location of signature programs is part of the development of new programs rather than existing ones.

Finally, K. Fowler referenced the Signature Program Taskforce charge statement:

- Define signature programs with the intent to improve student access, equity and success.
- Recommend a process to guide the identification, support and evaluation of new and existing signature programs.
- Recommend strategies to promote signature programs, garner community support, and increase external funding.

There followed a discussion of the charge items listed above. It was noted that the taskforce is actually identifying two separate processes in current programs; CTE and non-CTE.

K. Fowler proposed that the taskforce concentrate on developing a set of criteria for the campuses to select from in determining their signature programs, with the campuses selecting their own metrics for program success to be defined as signature. Addition terms to be used as alternates to ‘signature’ were also discussed.

K. Ybarra stated that the definition of the signature program needs to be overarching one that encompasses both CTE and non-CTE courses. K. Fowler noted that this may be the case, but that CTE is the first step of the discussion and the direction that was given to the taskforce based on the input of the campus presidents.

P. Demanett noted that curriculum is currently be proposed and accepted without ever going through program review. K. Fowler noted that the development of processes to ensure the proper vetting of new programs through the correct campus and district channels is a part of the third section of the taskforce’s charge statement.

K. Fowler asked if there were any additional issues regarding the purpose and charge of the group that needed to be discussed prior to beginning work on the development of a definition of signature programs. There as a discussion of various group members concerns regarding the use of a signature program definition by the DRAMT group to determine funding allocations to the campuses. After an extensive discussion of the possibility of this action on that groups part, K. Fowler noted that the Signature Program Taskforce should plan to be careful and deliberative in its process of definition and process creation regardless of the possible application of that definition and process in future.

III. Why Define Signature Programs – ALL

K. Ybarra noted that there needs to be a districtwide approach on the following two issues:

- 1) Definition of all signature programs (CTE and non-CTE);
- 2) How all CTE programs are addressed throughout the district (not just signature programs);

The group noted that it was important to establish threshold requirements that can be measured and that match to Ed Code and other regulatory needs as well.

It was noted that the proposed signature program review template was drafted from the FCC CTE Program Review form. Further discussion of the origins and prior use of this form lead to a determination to follow the plan outlined below:

- 1) Each campus to pull three examples of prior CTE program review (variety of program success levels to be considered: high, medium, and low). Selection should be based on quality of data and demonstrated work product of the programs;
 - a. These items should be send to C. Crill-Hornsby for general distribution to the group no later than 5/10/13.
- 2) K. Fowler, K. Ybarra, and G. Railey to meet and draft signature program definition narrative;
- 3) Signature Program Taskforce will then develop/propose a timeline for campus integration of this new process.

Meeting adjourned at 1:18 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Review of Example CTE ProgramsALL

**Next meeting May 16th, 2013
2:30 – 3:30 PM**



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Signature Programs Taskforce

Summary

12:30 – 2:00 PM

DO Conference Room / RC CCI-208 / WI AC1-270 / MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of May 16, 2013

Present: Christopher Boltz, Brett Camacho, Jim Chin, Paula Demanett, Pamela Gilmore, Cheryl Hesse, Tasha Hutchings, Michelle Johnson, Tom Mester, George Railey, Kerry Ybarra

The meeting was called to order at 12:32 a.m. by G. Railey.

I. Introductions – G. Railey

See notations on attendees, above. As G. Railey was not available for the duration of the meeting, K. Fowler acted as Chair for this session.

II. Review of Example CTE Programs – K. Fowler

The group had been provided with a set of example CTE Program Reviews and a template of the Program Review Summary sheet via email for their review prior to the meeting.

K. Fowler began by noting the following in regards to the structure of the Taskforces work; 1) to create an overall process for identification of signature programs that each campus will use in its own manner, and 2) that budgetary matters do not fall within the purview of this Taskforce.

K. Fowler then lead the group in a review of the provided example CTE Program Reviews and asked the group to define the best attributes from the provided materials.

P. Demanett & P. Gilmore noted that the best attributes of these program included:

- Large number of graduates and certificates awarded;
- Job market information provided in report (both local and state level);
- Narrative was well written;
- Student outcomes discussed;
- Quantitative Data summary:
 - GPA levels;
 - Retention levels;
 - Success rates;

- Completion rates (compared to prior cohorts);
- Labor market data;
- Employment data or completion rates (required by EdCode)

There was discussion of employment data; 1) if students were employed in the sector that they had trained in or not, and 2) difficulty in finding cohort related data on employment. The addition of short-term certificates to programs and the automatic awarding of certificates via Datatel were also discussed. K. Fowler noted that she would suggest that the Taskforce’s plan for review of programs include a list of metrics like the ones above, that the campuses can then select a pre-determined number of in order to review a programs status as a ‘signature program’.

III. Review of CTE Program Review Template - ALL

It was noted that this sheet was used previously in the district (within the past four years, as best determined), and that it provides a good thumbnail sketch of a programs states. After reviewing the samples and template provided, the group suggested the following changes:

- Update of the ‘Recommendations’ section to address signature programs in Section IV;

The updated form will be recommended for use districtwide in for those programs that wish to apply for signature status on their campuses.

IV. Review of Draft Signature Programs Definition - ALL

A draft definition of Signature Programs was provided to the group for review by K. Ybarra and K. Fowler.

It was noted that this definition was broader than CTE programs only in the first paragraph of the document, with a more specific CTE program focus appearing in the second paragraph. Discussion of the potential methodology of use of the document included the following ideas:

- Programs can voluntarily submit an “application for signature status”
- Program Review Committee (or another body determined by the campus) will review the data provided on this form;
- Reviews to occur every two years at time of regular program review;
- Annual reports on the status of signature programs to be submitted to ECPC as a listing of approved/discontinued signature programs.

K. Fowler and K. Ybarra to update the language of the last paragraph of the definition based on the groups input.

There was additional discussion of how probationary status might be determined and how a program might be removed from signature status. Ultimately the campuses will determine their own process of how to deal with programs if they begin to decline.

The group discussed the issue of volunteer participation of programs in the proposed process at length. This tied in with a discussion of the purpose of this group (Signature Program Taskforce) and the work it is performing. This discussion was general and lead to a determination that additional work on the process being developed would be necessary as a part of the Charge of the group, with additional potential outcomes being determined by other districtwide groups or the campuses once that process has been created/approved.

V. Next Steps - ALL

- 1) Updated draft of process to be distributed to the Signature Program Taskforce for their review over the summer break by K. Ybarra and K. Fowler;
- 2) Face-to-face meetings of group set for August 19th and 26th from 3:00 – 4:30 PM at the DO North for discussion of additional phases of development of the process.

Meeting adjourned at 3:34 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Review of Draft Process TemplateK. Fowler, K. Ybarra
2. Discussion of Process DevelopmentALL

**Next meeting August 19, 2013
3:00 – 4:30 PM
DO North, Building B, Room 305**