



**CPC Meeting  
March 17, 2016  
2:30 – 4:30 PM  
T-1200  
Summary Notes**

**2:30 – 3:00 PM (CPC Only)**

*Present: Eva Bagg, Terri Long, Lou Anne Bynum, Ann-Marie Gabel, Greg Peterson, John Downey, Shauna Hagemann, Kenna Hillman, Christina Moorhead, Jorge Ochoa, Jeri Florence, Dina Humble, Adrian Novotny, Suzanna Scholz, Colin Williams, Haley Nguyen, John Pope, Jennifer Holmgren*

*Absent: Eloy Oakley, Karen Kane, Rose DelGaudio, Michelle Shih, Brittany Lieberman, Thomas Hamilton, Therese Wheeler*

*Guests: Hussam Kashou, Melissa Infusino, Kim Myers, Sheneui Weber*

1. The Summary Notes from February 18, 2016 were accepted with corrections.
  - The members agreed to re-order one item on the agenda. The item “Institutional Priorities for 2016-17” was moved to the end of the Agenda.
  - E. Bagg, K. Hillman, and J. Downey noted that they had been appointed to run the meeting since E. Oakley was unable to attend and K. Kane could only attend for the VP-Level Plan presentations.
2. ACCJC Follow-Up Report Update
  - E. Bagg said that the ACCJC Follow-Up Report was submitted. She thanked K. Kane and T. Long for their input throughout the process of writing the Follow-Up Report. She also thanked the College Planning Committee for their help in addressing the first recommendation. K. Hillman, C. Williams, and H. Nguyen were thanked for their assistance in addressing the second recommendation.
  - E. Bagg noted that the Commission will review the Follow-Up Report in June and that the college should receive a response by July or August.
  - A. Gabel asked if the Follow-Up Report has been shared college-wide. E. Bagg said that the Follow-Up Report has not been shared with the college yet. She said that the report will go to the Board of Trustees next week and will be posted on BoardDocs. At that time, the report will also be posted on the Accreditation page of the LBCC website. The report will also be shared in an email to the college community.

**3:00 – 4:30 PM (Combined CPC and BAC Meeting)**

*Present: Karen Kane, Eva Bagg, Terri Long, Lou Anne Bynum, Ann-Marie Gabel, Greg Peterson, Chris Carter, John Downey, Shauna Hagemann, Kenna Hillman, Christina Moorhead, Jorge Ochoa, Jeri Florence, Dina Humble, Adrian Novotny, Suzanna Scholz, Colin Williams, Haley Nguyen, John Pope, Wendy Koenig, Lynne Misajon, Jennifer Holmgren, John Thompson, Cindy Baker, Sem Chao*

*Absent: Eloy Oakley, Rose DelGaudio, James Henchey, Michelle Shih, Brittany Lieberman, Thomas Hamilton, Sheila Daniels, Therese Wheeler*

*Guests: Hussam Kashou, Melissa Infusino, Kim Myers, Sheneui Weber*

3. Vice Presidents' VP-Level Plan Presentations
  - Academic Affairs

- i. T. Long presented the Academic Affairs VP-Level Plan. She noted that 30 individuals from the campus constituent groups participated in the development of the VP-Level Plan.
    - ii. J. Downey added that instead of developing a separate PCC Plan this year, meetings were held at PCC to collect feedback and this feedback was incorporated into the Academic Affairs and Student Support Services VP-Level Plans.
  - Administrative Services
    - i. A. Gabel presented the Administrative Services VP-Level Plan.
    - ii. One member asked for clarification on the meaning of the strategy “implement integrated identity management.” A. Gabel clarified that integrated identity management is another word for single sign-on.
  - Student Support Services
    - i. G. Peterson presented the Student Support Services VP-Level Plan. He noted that last year he received feedback that the objectives for Student Support Services should be more measurable and that the strategies should each only relate to one goal. He said that this year in the planning meetings, they created objectives that are measurable and created strategies that each exclusively relate to one goal.
    - ii. One member asked for clarification on which department the resource request labelled “enrollment services” was for. G. Peterson clarified that the resource request referred to the Counseling Department.
  - Human Resources
    - i. R. DelGaudio was unable to attend the meeting. Kim Myers presented the Human Resources VP-Level Plan on her behalf.
    - ii. One member asked for clarification on the meaning of the resource request for a “talent manager coordinator.” K. Myers clarified that a candidate for this position would be trained in organizational development.
    - iii. A member asked for clarification regarding the strategies listed for the “director of talent” position and asked what was meant by “curriculum design.” K. Myers clarified that curriculum design would be focused on curriculum created for training purposes, such as the curriculum for the LEAD Academy.
  - College Advancement and Economic Development
    - i. L. Bynum presented the College Advancement and Economic Development VP-Level Plan.
    - ii. One member asked for clarification on the definition and membership of the “CTE team” mentioned in the plan. L. Bynum clarified that the CTE team currently consists of Mollie Smith, David Gonzales, and Melissa Infusino and that the purpose of this team is to work on more closely aligning contract education and not-for-credit programs and grants. The member also asked why the CTE Subcommittee Chair was not invited to these meetings. T. Long clarified that because this team is working on contract education and not-for-credit programs, credit and noncredit faculty do not need to be involved at this time.
4. Institutional Priorities for 2016-17
- K. Hillman and E. Bagg lead the discussion. E. Bagg reminded the members that the purpose of creating institutional priorities is to help direct prioritization at the VP-level.
  - K. Hillman asked the members to review the handout on the 2015-16 Institutional Priorities and to use the remaining time to identify potential updates to the Institutional Priorities.
  - A discussion occurred on potential updates to the Institutional Priorities.
  - A workgroup was formed to create a draft of the 2016-17 Institutional Priorities. A. Gabel and J. Downey volunteered to participate in the work group. Members agreed that the draft of the Institutional Priorities will be emailed to the members before the next meeting so that members can approve the Institutional Priorities at the next meeting.