



CPC Meeting
April 21, 2016
2:30 – 4:30 PM
T-1046
Summary Notes

Present: Eloy Oakley, Karen Kane, Eva Bagg, Lou Anne Bynum, Rose DelGaudio, John Downey, Shauna Hagemann, Kenna Hillman, Christina Moorhead, Jorge Ochoa, Jeri Florence, Dina Humble, Suzanna Scholz, Colin Williams, Haley Nguyen, John Pope, Jennifer Holmgren

Absent: Terri Long, Ann-Marie Gabel, Greg Peterson, Michelle Shih, Brittany Lieberman, Adrian Novotny, Thomas Hamilton, Therese Wheeler, Marshall Fulbright

Guests: Hussam Kashou, Tim Wootton, Medhanie Ephrem, Amy Smith, Lauren Sosenko, Mary Marki, Paul Creason, Kim Myers, Tony Tortorice

1. The Summary Notes from March 17th were accepted as written.
2. Institutional Priorities
 - a. K. Kane asked members to review the draft of the Institutional Priorities and asked if anyone had any recommendations for further modifications.
 - b. The institutional priorities with suggested changes is below:

Institutional Priority 2016-17

The top priority of the College is to enhance the infrastructure of the learning environment and support services to directly improve rates of course completion, progress through foundational skills sequences, and student attainment of academic credentials.

In order to accomplish this top priority, the College will:

- **Focus resources to introduce or scale-up student success innovations that are supported by data showing promising preliminary results or demonstrated effectiveness**
- **Maintain fiscal stability**
 - **Acquire and manage funding to support student success initiatives**
 - **Acquire and manage funding to support equitable outcomes to close achievement gaps**
- **Analyze and dedicate resources that build effective organizational structures college-wide including:**
 - **Focus resources to implement Business Process Reviews and Design Thinking vetted recommendations**
 - **Focus resources to continue analysis throughout other areas of the College**
- **Support effective integrations of technology in the learning and work environment**

- c. The committee members were asked to accept the institutional priorities as amended. There were no objections.
3. Approval of the 2041 Facilities Master Plan
 - a. Tim Wootton and Medhanie Ephrem gave a presentation on the 2041 Facilities Master Plan.
 - b. Several members had questions about the 2041 Facilities Master Plan.
 - i. One member asked if in the future, the college plans to move toward a design-build method for new buildings. M. Ephrem said that they have used a design-build method for the three newest buildings and plan to continue using this method for future buildings.
 - ii. Another member asked if the new buildings at PCC will have larger multi-purpose rooms. M. Ephrem confirmed that there will be a larger multipurpose room constructed that is similar to the size of Dyer Hall.
 - iii. Although there is no formal vote to support the plan, all members present agreed that they were in support of the 2041 Facilities Master Plan.
4. Presentation on the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) Annual Convention in Chicago
 - a. While there were six attendees at the conference, four attendees were present at the meeting. Amy Smith, Paul Creason, Mary Marki, and Lauren Sosenko presented their biggest takeaways from the conference. In general the four attendees felt that working toward the creation of pathways across the college would provide students with more direction, guidance, and supports.
5. Update on Business Process Review and Design Thinking
 - a. Tony Tortorici gave a brief description of the projects conducted by High Street. He noted that Academic Services had identified some areas to examine that did not directly relate to PeopleSoft and that in the next stage of the process these areas will be examined. He also said that High Street's report on financial aid had many recommendations, which included improving accuracy and streamlining the financial aid process. The recommendations have resulted in the creation of a yearlong project. The goal will be to have the project complete in 2017-18.
 - b. In regard to the Deloitte project he noted that many of the recommendations the college received in regard to purchasing can only be addressed in PeopleSoft version 9.2 and the college is currently using version 9.1. He said that the college will need to upgrade to version 9.2 before addressing the recommendations.
 - c. T. Tortorici said that he was very impressed with the design thinking report. He said that the next step for design thinking will be to aggregate all of the financial aid information into one location for students.
 - i. At this time, E. Bagg thanked S. Scholz for her work as part of the design thinking team.
6. Equal Opportunity Employment (EEO) Plan (1st reading)
 - a. Kim Myers briefly explained why the plan was developed. He noted that in order to support the plan an Equal Opportunity Advisory Committee must also be created.
 - b. K. Myers asked members to wait on reading the draft plan that was emailed to all members before the meeting. He noted that there had been several revisions to the document and noted that members can expect to receive a revised copy within four to five days. He asked that members provide feedback on the plan by May 13th and

that a second reading of the plan will occur at the College Planning Committee's May 19th meeting. The plan will go to the Board in May for approval and must be submitted to the Chancellor's Office by June 1st.

7. Recommendation from the Student Success Committee to Expand the Membership of the Student Equity Subcommittee
 - i. S. Hagemann explained the reasons why the subcommittee membership should be expanded. Primarily, the subcommittee felt that the membership must be expanded to accommodate the creation of many necessary taskforces. She noted that other community colleges have student equity subcommittee memberships that mirror the draft membership presented today.
 - ii. One member asked why only two administrators were listed in the membership. S. Hagemann noted that the intention was to have five administrators on the subcommittee and that three of the other representatives should be listed as administrators.
 1. S. Hagemann said that the administrators should come from the programs that are required for the Trailer Bill.
 2. It was suggested that the subcommittee consider revising the membership to include "five administrators consistent with the areas in the trailer bill."
 - iii. A member asked why the faculty co-chair of the Staff Equity Subcommittee is listed as a representative on the draft membership. S. Hagemann noted that the subcommittee wanted the co-chair to bring back information to the subcommittee since both subcommittees pertain to equity.

8. Administrative Regulation 2006 – Participation in Governance
 - i. K. Kane noted that recently created committees have included, separate from faculty representation, representation for CCA faculty. She noted that this is a direct violation of Administrative Regulation 2006.
 - ii. The members agreed that all memberships with CCA faculty representation that are in violation of Administrative Regulation 2006 should be revised to align with the regulation.
 - iii. E. Bagg and J. Holmgren agreed to bring the memberships with CCA representatives listed to the next College Planning Committee meeting.

9. Update on Strategic Plan
 - i. E. Bagg noted that the Strategic Plan Oversight Taskforce recently met for a four-hour planning session. At the session they utilized input from the retreats, as well as other sources, to create a draft strategic plan. The draft strategic plan will be presented to the College Planning Committee at their May 19th meeting.

10. Update on Planning Process
 - i. L. Bynum noted that the Vice President plans are currently being utilized to prioritize critical needs and they will be communicating with E. Oakley about this shortly.
 - ii. K. Kane mentioned that for the next cycle of department planning the department plan and program review subcommittee is looking at making some changes to the planning process for efficiency purposes. She noted that they are considering moving up the draft department plan deadline so that hiring priorities can occur earlier in the semester.