

2011-2012 GRCC Academic Governing Council (AGC)

Executive Committee Summary Report for GRCC Faculty



**Presented by
AGC Executive Committee:**

Ann Alexander, Laurie Chesley,
John Cowles, Moss Ingram, Mike Light,
Robert Long, Gilda Gely

grcc.edu/agc

Purpose of AGC

“This organization shall represent the faculty and academic administration in the formation of policies and procedures on academic and professional matters, and shall act as a vehicle for the communication of such matters to interested parties” (AGC Bylaws).

Policies/Practices Adopted

Issues for consideration are brought to AGC by individuals or committees from anywhere in the College and at any time. Issues approved for consideration are generally presented a minimum of three times before the AGC. This allows for a clear explanation of the issue, and time to disseminate and retrieve information from the various units of the College and make changes as needed.

The AGC is an advisory group reporting to the Provost. During the 2011-2012 academic year, the AGC discussed and adopted the following policies.

1. Seminar Policy Development (January 2012)

- Dean Patti Trepkowski described the need for this policy to ensure quality of curricula and support the means to offer special topics.
- The following policy was adopted:
 - A seminar course focuses on a topic that is not included and/or studied in depth in the discipline’s regular course offerings. In a seminar course, a group of students work with a faculty member to study this special topic.
 - A seminar course topic is not intended to become a regular course in a curriculum. The purpose is to provide a unique opportunity for a group of students and a faculty member to explore a special or new topic. The topics of seminar courses in a discipline will typically not be routinely repeated.
 - If a new course is intended to become part of the regular curriculum, it is not a Seminar course, and it needs to be fully developed using the New Course Approval Process.
 - A course intended to be offered periodically as an enhancement to the curriculum should be developed as a new course, unless the content of the course will be substantially different each time it is offered.
- Additional elements of the policy address seminar course numbering and maximum student participation in seminars.
- AGC discussed this policy in November 2011, December 2011, and January 2012. This policy was approved at the January 2012 meeting and will be reviewed during Winter 2015.

2. Meeting the Needs of Low-Level Readers (January 2012)

- In November, Linda Spoelman and Vikki Cooper presented evidence that GRCC was not meeting the needs of its lowest-level readers. Further, it was established that there were no other available resources to provide assistance to this very high-needs population. A proposal was presented to establish a six credit hour RD 095 reading course that would meet three times a week for three hours.
- In January 2012, the AGC voted to recommend that the work be started to request approval for RD 095 through the New Course Process.

3. Credit Hour Definition (February 2012)

- Dean Patti Trepkowski described the need for a definition of credit hour in response to requirements of the Higher Education Act and accrediting agencies, as well as financial aid eligibility.

- The following definition was adopted:
 - A credit hour gives value to an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement of those outcomes. A credit hour requires a minimum of one hour of direct faculty instruction and two hours of out-of-class student work each week for the equivalent of fourteen weeks. Many academic experiences are integral to courses or programs because they allow students to practice and apply their learning in the laboratory, studio or workplace. Each of these requires additional contact hours to earn a credit hour.
 - AGC discussed this policy in September 2011, November 2011, and February 2012. This policy was approved at the February 2012 meeting and will be reviewed during Winter 2015.
- 4. Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) Policy Development (March 2012)**
- The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Assumed Practices call for colleges to have clear policies related to Prior Learning Assessment. Students are awarded credit for learning outside of the College through a rigorous process that documents attainment of learning objectives.
 - A pilot project, initiated in 2007, was conducted in Business and Computer Applications. The pilot was based on standards and practices set forth by the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning. Paula Sullivan and Mike Kiss presented the results of the pilot in October 2011. Feedback was received and in March 2012, AGC voted to extend the policy to any academic Department or Program wishing to participate in PLA.
 - A MOU has subsequently been put into effect which will be incorporated into the next Faculty Contract.
 - The next regular review of the PLA Policy is scheduled for Winter 2015.
- 5. Revision of 8.1.1 Dual Enrollment (March 2012)**
- In January 2012, Dean Tina Hoxie presented the Dual Enrollment policy for review and highlighted current trends. The term “Dual Enrollment” is currently the standard of practice and replaces “Early College.”
 - The Dual Enrollment program at GRCC is open to qualified high school juniors and seniors. Dual Enrollment applicants must:
 1. Be at least 16 years of age and/or high school juniors or seniors
 2. Have cumulative GPAs of 2.5 or higher.
 3. Be approved by their high school counselor and /or principal
 4. Currently be pursuing their high school diploma
 - The next review/revision date for this policy is Winter 2015.
- 6. Recommendation of Graduates (April 2012)**
- Diane Patrick requested a vote by the faculty of AGC to grant the corresponding associate degree and certificate to students that meet graduation requirements by April 6, 2012 (for academic year graduation). She requested the same recommendation for those students meeting the requirements by the completion of the summer semester.
- 7. Policy on Academic Load for Students (April 2012)**
- Dean Laurie Chesley described the need for a definition of academic load in response to requirements for Higher Learning commission (HLC) Assumed Practices.
 - The proposed definition is based on past practice, benchmarking with other community colleges, and internal student success data.
 - The following definition was adopted:
 - Students who want to enroll in more than 18 credit hours in a semester must get permission from the appropriate Associate Dean.*
 - *Appropriate Associate Dean is the AD for Faculty Evaluation/Hiring in the School which houses the student’s program or the course which takes the student over 18 credits.

- AGC discussed this policy in November 2011, February 2012, and April 2012. The policy was approved at the April 2012 meeting and will be reviewed during academic year 2014-2015.
- 8. Admission Application Cutoff and Blocked Enrollment (April 2012)**
- In November 2011, Dean Tina Hoxie introduced the related topics of admission deadlines and changing the restriction on late enrollment. Current policies do not place a restriction on admissions to the College but do limit enrollment to midnight of the second class meeting day. In February 2012, data were presented that showed evidence of lower academic performance associated with late admissions applications and enrollment. Information was distributed to AGC members with the request to return with feedback from their Departments/Programs.
 - At the April 2012 meeting, after much discussion, the following policy recommendations were passed:
 - GRCC will not accept new student application five business days prior to the start of a semester.
 - GRCC will not allow students to enroll in a class after midnight of the day before the class meets for the second time.
 - The Cut-off policy accomplishes the following:
 - It promotes student success.
 - It allows more opportunity for academic advising.
 - It allows more time to deliver other needed services to students.
 - It pushes students toward more responsible behavior and planning.
 - It gives students more time to schedule their lives around their classes.
 - It removes service bottlenecks.
 - The Blocking Late Enrollment policy accomplishes the following:
 - It allows for limited swaps if the second class has not met.
 - It promotes student attendance to the first class.
 - It promotes student responsibility and planning.
 - It facilitates building a learning community from the start of a course.
 - These academic policies will be reviewed in 2016-2017.
- 9. Clicker Standards (April 2012)**
- In January, Lisa Gloege presented an issue paper concerning Clicker Standards. If clickers are to be used in the classroom, would it not be best to make one clicker standard so students can use them in any course? The standard clicker could be sold in the bookstore just like other required course materials. A committee was assembled to explore the various options with regard to issues such as cost, use by disabled students, and applications for cell phones.
 - By March 2012, the committee had chosen a preferred clicker. Information about the “i>clicker 2” was distributed and feedback requested from Departments/Programs for a vote the following month.
 - In April 2012, the AGC elected the i>clicker 2 as the standard for the College. Implementation will begin in Fall 2012. Faculty members are encouraged to include clicker information in their syllabi if appropriate; there will be staff development training related to the use of the clickers.
 - This academic standard will be reviewed in 2015.

Updates and Presentations

Throughout the year a number of faculty, academic administrators and staff made presentations and submitted updates of work related to issues that had campus wide importance and to decisions made at AGC during previous years. The following is a list of those updates and presentations. Details for each one can be obtained by visiting the AGC website (www.grcc.edu/agc). The dates within parentheses indicate the month when the update/presentation took place. Some of the issues will be scheduled to return to AGC for further updates.

1. President's Remarks (September 2011)

- President Ender reported that enrollment was down but with Lisa Freiburger, the new Chief Financial Officer, at the helm he had no doubt the budget would stay intact.
- As of the September AGC meeting, \$15.2 million had been raised. Warren Hall and the Business Program will be named after two different families that have donated to this campaign.
- Next steps will be to ask the Board to support a 2012 millage campaign. The millage, limited to 10 years' duration, would ask residents to fund technological and capital expenses of the College.
- Dr. Ender believes that with this millage we can show that we have raised 15 million plus dollars on our own, before coming and asking the community for help, which had not been done with the last two millages. He also stated that currently he has 50 faculty position authorization forms (approximately 35 for existing positions and 15 for new positions) signed. Once the faculty members have a new contract, these positions will be posted.

2. IIPD Update (September 2011)

- Andy Bowne said that there were a dozen recipients that shared \$36,000 in funding over the last year. He reminded the group of the two upcoming deadline dates - October 21, 2011 & March 23, 2012. He said that the application can be found online – www.grcc.edu/iipdgrants.

3. AQIP Project Update (October 2011)

- We need three College Action Projects at all times; we have five. Each is also a strategic plan item.
- HLC revises its accreditation criteria every 10 years and has implemented substantial changes. The current (Beta) version of the document is posted online (see *HLC Criteria Beta Version*).
- US Department of Education has demanded that the HLC be stronger in requiring action. GRCC did an assessment against HLC proposed minimum expectations. As a result, we adopted the draft of the administrative ethics policy and several more policies will need to be addressed in AGC. Our evaluation will begin in November, 2012, the first to be evaluated under the new guidelines.

4. Student Conduct and Behavior Intervention Team (BIT) Update (October 2011)

- Sara Dorer has distributed the reporting option handout to all faculty, offered training sessions via the Center for Teaching Excellence, and created an online resource with Camtasia. A faculty guide to managing disrupting behaviors will be up on the site soon at <http://www.grcc.edu/BIT>.
- We have seen a strong increase in the use of our early alert tool. Before the software was implemented we reviewed 30 cases; since that time, only 12.
- We now have a fully developed BIT team and belong to the National BIT Association. BIT is a preventative measure to reduce risk; its goal is to help students be successful via intervention.
- There was discussion about students exhibiting concerning behavior. She described the thorough evaluation process before the decision is made to allow the student back into the classroom.

5. Athletic Oversight Committee Update (November 2011)

- Tina Hoxie recapped how the Oversight Committee, formed at the President's request, was to report out annually.
- From that feedback the implementation of the Early Alert pilot and work around an Academic Advising Model was undertaken, determining what the best model was to use for students' benefit.
- Her presentation reviewed athletic accomplishments, leading into the scoreboard and a definition, following up with data regarding graduation rate by sports.
- A question was asked in regards of what standards have to be met in order for a student to play. Charlie Wells stated that a GPA of 1.75 or better with 12 credits was required for the first semester; for second semester, a 2.0 GPA completing 24 credits was required. Any athlete on academic probation is not eligible to play.

6. Bookstore Team Report-Out (December 2011)

- Mike Vargo reported on Bookstore Liaison work. During Fall 2011, the team reviewed issues including wrong books, quantity ordered, late orders, order changes, and publisher under-prints. The team also surveyed department heads, program directors, and ESPs regarding problems or concerns with textbooks.
- Mike also met with a representative from Follett and learned that other Follett institutions have 3% to 5% missing texts two weeks out, while GRCC has over 30% missing two weeks out. Approximately half of missing texts are due to issues out of our control, but the other half is due to late orders.
- Both training for Online Ordering along with new processes in regards to textbooks for adjunct faculty were also completed. Mike asked that the following happen: meet deadlines, continue to use online ordering, revise procedures for instructor choice adoption submissions, continue to assess pain/gain related to instructor choice texts. Mike added that Stewart has been working hard to help improve this process and feels that he is an easy “scapegoat,” but we are half of the problem. If we got orders in by the deadline, the problems would be reduced down to 15%. The bookstore has also agreed to carry all the AFP texts.

7. Learning Environment Team (LET) Update (January 2012)

- Ric Underhile reported that he has been charged with review of the history, responsibilities, authority, and strategies of LET.
- He also plans to repopulate the team, and has invited old and new members, including the Dean of Kendall Institute. AGC members recommended representation from Maintenance and Disability Support Services.
- Ric plans to audit and consolidate all LET information, review national expectations and benchmarks, and create a charter.

8. Library Policy on Collection Development (January 2012)

- Pat Ingersoll introduced the Library staff liaisons and shared the Library Collection Policy. She asked that each department review the policy and assign one faculty member from the department to act as the department’s library liaison. The library staff would also be willing to attend departmental meetings to answer any questions or to gather comments in regards to developing this policy. The Library Collection Policy will be presented twice more at AGC for discussion and vote.

9. General Education Distribution (March 2012)

- The AGC Executive Committee Summary report of 2010-2011 outlines an approved pilot rubric that illustrates the strategy for organizing the three general distributions and related criteria and learning outcomes associated with each. This rubric will be used throughout the subsequent year in association with the newly adopted Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), program outcomes and review, and learner outcomes identified in the Course Curriculum Document (CCD).
- In March 2012, an update on progress was given by Steve Abid and Ric Underhile. As of that time, the Social Science Department had volunteered to be part of the pilot.
- Pilot departments will, using the rubric, review each department course and determine into which distribution it best fits.
- The need for developing an institutional process for validation of department course placement was proposed.

10. PY 097 Research Results (April 2012)

- PY 097 is a course designed for students who are not personally prepared for college. In April 2012, Frank Conner gave an update on the history of the course and addressed the question, “Does this course make a difference.” Dr. Conner provided data about retention that answer the question in the affirmative.
- As of this date, students testing into three or more AFP courses are required to take this course. As of Fall 2012, students testing into two or more AFP courses will be required to take PY 097.

Policies/Practices for Consideration during 2012-2013

1. Academic Standing Policy (review)
2. College Generated Graduation Policy (new)
3. Common Syllabus Elements (new)
4. Distance Learning Faculty Advisory Board (new)
5. Grading Procedures Revision (review)

2011-12 Procedural Decisions

1. Approval of Standing Committee Chairs
2. Brainstorming Issues Reviewed and Applicable Changes Instituted
3. New Member Orientation Conducted
4. Member Elections Conducted
5. Board Reports Presented (Once Each Semester)
6. Recommendation of Graduates Performed
7. President’s Report Issued
8. Provost’s Reports Issued (All Meetings)
9. Bylaw Revision/Review Conducted
10. Year End Evaluations Reviewed and Applicable Changes Instituted

AGC 2011-2012 Evaluation Results and Actions taken

Every year the Executive Committee of AGC organizes an evaluation and uses the results to improve AGC's processes for the following year. The evaluation for 2011-2012 took place during the April meeting. The results from the first part of the survey and the response from the Executive Committee of AGC follow:

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Response from ExecAGC |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|--|
| 1. AGC fulfilled its purpose. | 38% | 56% | 6% | 0% | |
| | 94% | | 6% | | |
| 2. AGC accomplished an appropriate amount of work. | 39% | 52% | 10% | 0% | |
| | 91% | | 10% | | |
| 3. The scheduling of AGC meetings was adequate to complete the work. | 44% | 50% | 6% | 0% | |
| | 94% | | 6% | | |
| 4. Communication from AGC Exec helped me prepare for meetings. | 35% | 45% | 16% | 3% | We plan to continue to improve this process, and welcome suggestions from AGC membership. |
| | 80% | | 19% | | |
| 5. The AGC website provided useful information. | 10% | 52% | 39% | 0% | The Executive Committee will continue to improve this and other forms of communication with members. |
| | 62% | | 39% | | |
| 6. I was successful in obtaining feedback from my department or program. | 16% | 65% | 16% | 3% | Members reported that meetings and e-mail were their most successful means of obtaining department and program input. |
| | 81% | | 19% | | |
| 7. The topics and issues addressed at AGC were relevant. | 38% | 56% | 6% | 0% | |
| | 94% | | 6% | | |
| 8. The information presented at AGC meetings was useful. | 31% | 59% | 9% | 0% | |
| | 90% | | 9% | | |
| 9. The quality of discussion in AGC meetings advanced the work. | 6% | 61% | 33% | 0% | AGC members may contribute to enhanced discussion by coming prepared with specific discussion items and recommendations. |
| | 67% | | 33% | | |
| 10. AGC made effective decisions this year. | 21% | 73% | 3% | 3% | |
| | 94% | | 6% | | |
| 11. The decisions made by AGC had a positive impact on the college as a whole. | 22% | 66% | 9% | 3% | |
| | 88% | | 12% | | |

AGC 2011-2012 Year- End Evaluation: Summary of Open Comments

Things that worked well:

1. Improved voting process, especially clickers
2. Availability of refreshments
3. Variety and importance of topics
4. Timeliness – right number of meetings and conduct of meetings is good
5. Document availability – before meeting and on website
6. Meetings well prepared, planned and conducted
7. Discussion in meetings and feedback from departments

| Areas for Improvement | AGC Executive Committee Response |
|--|---|
| 1. Deliver documents in a more timely and efficient manner (send earlier, put on website, organize by content) | The Executive Committee will continue to improve the process of sharing meeting materials, including both electronic communications to members and the AGC website. |
| 2. Improved technology and environment | The Executive Committee is investigating additional response and communication methods, and has purchased new GRCC standard clickers for use at AGC meetings. |
| 3. More snacks and more healthy snacks | We will review alternative options for snacks, taking the budget into consideration. |
| 4. Focus more on statistical research in proposals | AGC presenters currently preview their presentations with the AGC Executive Committee. Review of research and data will be included as part of this process. |

| Issues for Next Year | AGC Executive Committee Response |
|---|--|
| 1. Online learning – success rates, 25% goal, distance learning policies | As a committee of the AGC, the Distance Learning Faculty Advisory Board will address these issues and report to AGC members during 2012-2013. |
| 2. Declining enrollment | The AGC Executive Committee will ask members for clarification of this issue at the September 2012 AGC meeting. |
| 3. HLC (and other external mandates) | The AGC Executive Committee will ask members for clarification of this issue at the September 2012 AGC meeting. |
| 4. Prerequisite enforcement – final phase (sequential courses) and AFP before college-level | <p>Both Arts & Sciences and Adult & Developmental Education have had discussions about making successful completion of all AFP classes a prerequisite before a student could take any college-level courses. More in-depth study of the impact this change would have on student success, scheduling, enrollment, and staffing needs to occur. Currently, a department could institute a course prerequisite of having successfully completed appropriate developmental courses; however, no department should institute this kind of prerequisite before a careful analysis of the impact it would have on student success, scheduling, enrollment, and staffing.</p> <p>The issue of prerequisite enforcement in sequential courses taken in sequential semesters is being addressed in a departmental action plan led by Mike Vargo, SAS Associate Dean of Operations, this year. He has been working with the Registrar's Office on this problem. A solution will be piloted in select sequential courses for Winter 2013, with full implementation targeted for Fall 2013. Updates will be provided to AGC.</p> |
| 5. Placement (3) – ALL students tested and placed in Math and English, mandatory placement in Reading | Students who receive an ACT subscore below 18 for Reading, English, or Math must take the Accuplacer test for those areas, as approved by AGC. There is mandatory placement in English and Math based on the Accuplacer score, also as approved by AGC. That is to say, a student placing into developmental writing or math cannot take any higher English or Math class until he or she has successfully completed the appropriate developmental course(s). Currently, although the AGC has approved mandatory placement in Reading, due to staffing constraints, we are unable to meet the demand for the number of RD sections we would need to offer if mandatory placement in Reading were implemented. |
| 6. General Education distribution system and process | AGC meetings during 2012-13 will include updates and discussion on this topic. |
| 7. Developmental students – too much attention, declining levels of skills and success rates | Students placing into one or more developmental courses make up over 50% of our total student population. GRCC is an open door institution and we remain committed to ensuring our students are prepared to succeed. AGC has spent considerable time discussing this issue and creating policies to ensure student success. In Winter of 2013, students placing into two or more foundation courses will be required to meet with an academic counselor and enroll in PY 097 (AGC policy decision). In addition, these students cannot self-enroll until they have completed PY 097 with a grade of C- or higher. We anticipate that AGC will spend less time on policy development in 2012-2013 and beyond on this issue. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>8. Start-and-stop times for classes</p> | <p>The revised class start-end times have been in effect for the past two academic years. Initially, the fact that the end times of some classes were the same as the start times of others (and that students could enroll in these courses) caused confusion. The approach of the Associate Deans' offices was that faculty had the right to enforce their expectations about timeliness to class, as well as attendance, and did not have to make special accommodations for those students who signed up for these classes. It was the responsibility of the student to alter his or her schedule, and Associate Deans' offices assisted students with this problem, whenever possible. Faculty members have been supported in their decisions, and reports of this problem have diminished.</p> |
| <p>9. High school dual-enrolled / Middle College students</p> | <p>Dean Dan Clark will present updates and discussion on this topic during at least two AGC meetings in 2012-2013.</p> |

AGC Executive Committee and AGC Members Responsibilities

AGC Executive Committee Members' Responsibilities

According to the bylaws, AGC Executive committee members have the following duties, responsibilities, and authority:

- Preside at all meetings of the Academic Governing Council and at any special meetings called by the council.
- Schedule meetings of the Academic Governing Council and prepare the agenda for those meetings.
- Appoint, subject to Council approval, the Chairpersons of all standing and ad-hoc committees. Appoint members of standing and ad-hoc committees, subject to the confirmation of the council.
- Serve as ex-officio members of any and all Council committees.
Serve as a liaison between the Provost and the AGC.
- The Executive Committee will also perform the duties of the Chairperson on a rotating basis to
- be determined by the Committee. The individual serving as chair at a particular meeting will only be allowed to vote in the case of a tie. All other members of the Executive Committee will be voting members of the AGC.
- The Executive Committee will also be responsible for keeping all records (including minutes, committee reports, and dissent forms) and for transmitting copies of approved minutes, reports, and forms to any interested party upon request.

In order to perform these duties the Executive Committee members:

- Meet twice a month from September to April.
- Hold two planning retreats during the Summer.
- Have divided their responsibilities by member and specific tasks that include a detailed list of actions that take place during the AGC meeting, during the AGC Executive Committee meetings and outside those occasions. The following list represents the work performed during a year by the Executive Committee members.
 - Performed at AGC monthly meetings
 - To serve as parliamentarian for each meeting.
 - To deliver an orientation for new members.
 - To lead meetings as necessary.
 - To facilitate table discussion at meetings.
 - To facilitate technology.
 - To monitor dynamics of meetings.
 - Performed at Exec AGC bimonthly meetings or retreats
 - To analyze previous AGC meetings (form/structure and content).
 - To prepare an agenda for monthly AGC meetings.
 - To preview presentations and prepare presenters as needed.
 - To bring up possible topics for discussion.
 - To prepare year-long agenda for EXEC AGC meetings.
 - To plan/organize and carry out the election processes.
 - To plan the yearly evaluation. (April)
 - To revise official forms (decision form, minority opinion form, committee action form, issue proposal form, etc.)

- To track decisions and assign who will complete and send the decision form to the Provost Office.
 - To set up committees.
 - To assess Executive Committee work. (June)
 - To prepare AGC year long agenda.
- Performed outside meeting time
 - To initiate and lead the periodic revision of the bylaws.(as-needed)
 - To develop an orientation for new members. (August)
 - To revise the team charter and formally submit it to the designated official. (January)
 - To prepare and submit budget requests to meet the needs of the group for meetings. (January)
 - To recruit members as needed. (yearly)
 - To report updates to Cabinet (monthly)
 - To present AGC to new faculty members as part of the new faculty institute. (October)
 - To prepare a year end report. (May)
 - To run the elections. (yearly) (May/June)
 - To prepare and deliver updates for the BOT meetings. (December and May)
 - To maintain AGC history.
 - To communicate with presenters on intended outcomes, dates of presentation and date of AGC Executive Committee preview if necessary. (monthly)
 - To communicate individually with presenters regarding meeting materials for sharing and presenting. (monthly)
 - To post all meeting and presentation information on the AGC website. (monthly)
 - To revise minutes. (monthly)
 - To coordinate the logistics for each meeting (room set-up, technology, etc.). (monthly)
 - To communicate/update on work done and decisions. (monthly)
 - To prepare and present decisions forms to the Provost Office. (monthly as needed)
 - To set up meeting arrangements for Executive Committee (monthly)
 - To prepare and administer AGC evaluation for all faculty (bi-annual) (April)

AGC Members' Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of AGC members to attend all meetings and to represent their respective departments in the discussions and decisions. AGC members also have the responsibility of communicating with their departments the issues and decisions and anything else that is discussed during the monthly meetings.