



**CPC Meeting
September 10, 2015
2:30 – 4:30 PM
T-1046
Summary Meeting Notes**

Present: Eloy Oakley, Karen Kane, Eva Bagg, Terri Long, Lou Anne Bynum, Greg Peterson, John Downey, Shauna Hagemann, Kenna Hillman, Christina Moorhead, Jorge Ochoa, Jeri Florence, Dina Humble, Michelle Shih, Janét Hund, Therese Wheeler, John Pope, Maria Narvaez

Absent: Rose DelGaudio, Ann-Marie Gabel, Brittany Lieberman, Karen Roberts, Thomas Hamilton

Guests: Sylvia Lynch

1. Welcome and Introductions – K. Kane welcomed the members. Each person introduced themselves, their position, and their role at CPC.
2. Orientation to CPC
 - a. Review of CPC Charge – Members reviewed the CPC charge. It is the expectation all members come prepared to the meeting, and that all have read any materials that were sent ahead of time.
 - b. Ground Rules for Committees and Task Forces – Members also reviewed the ground rules that were developed by CPC and Academic Council last year. These ground rules apply to all committees and task forces on campus, not just CPC. It was suggested to add a clarification that minutes/ summary notes should be posted online once they have been approved.
3. Approval of Summary Notes – May 21, 2015 – Summary Notes were approved with changes (see Summary Notes). The co-chairs will make every effort this year to keep the meeting within the two-hour timeframe and not exceed the time.
4. 2016-2021 Educational Master Plan
 - a. Oversight Task Force Charge and Membership – update on membership - T. Long will serve as the Executive Committee Appointee and Karen Rothstein will serve as the Dean. Academic Senate will begin recruitment for the three faculty members. AFT will be contacted for the Classified Rep.
 - b. Strategic Plan vs. Educational Master Plan - E. Oakley stated that the LBCC Educational Master Plan is actually more of a strategic plan. E. Bagg agreed and explained that a strategic plan is more of an overarching plan, i.e., an umbrella, with plans under it. There was agreement among the members to rename it a Strategic Plan. The plan is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Trustees in June 2016, so the task force needs to get started very soon. Academic Senate will work on appointing faculty ASAP.
 - c. Institution-set standards vs. Goals – E. Bagg explained the difference between institution-set standards and goals. Last spring, CPC set goals for the Institutional Effectiveness Indicator Rates for Successful Course Completion rates and Ending Fund Balance – both of these are aspirational goals. In contrast, ACCJC has asked colleges for institution-set standards, which are the minimum thresholds. E. Oakley added that the institution is not used to hearing the term “standards”, but the trend is moving towards setting standards, especially for CTE programs. The college must be clear about its goals vs. the standards, and to be aware that our goals should never be the standards. Members discussed how to disseminate this information to the rest of the college. It will be part of the development of the new Strategic Plan.

5. Committees and subcommittees
 - a. Student Success Committee updates
 - i. Coordination of various plans: Student Equity, SSSP, BSI – E. Bagg reported that the Student Success Committee met on Monday. K. Kane will be the interim co-chair for the moment. All thanked and expressed their appreciation for S. Hagemann for co-chairing the SSC. Last year, the SSC concentrated on the Student Equity Plan as well as receiving the SSSP Plan and the BSI expenditure report. This year, SSC will be a valuable resource for the development of the Strategic Plan.
 - ii. Student Equity Subcommittee – Last spring, CPC approved the charge with minor changes and gave the subcommittee the approval to recruit members. A recruitment for Student Equity Coordinator is also in progress; in the meantime, S. Hagemann is serving as the interim. She reported that there were 40 applications for student equity projects, 31 of which were approved. E. Oakley stated that academic quality and student success are at the core of the college’s mission. The college is creating different initiatives to achieve the same outcomes from different angles. As money comes from the state and other sources, the college must be able to put all these pieces together. As funding shifts, the college does not change initiatives, but finds different ways to fund those initiatives. The SSC should be empowered to ask those questions, and CPC should be asking those questions as well. The college must also be clear as to what equity means for our students. CPC will invite Karen Rothstein to present equity data to CPC at the next meeting.
 - iii. Promise Pathways Subcommittee – The coordinating team will bring the plan that was developed last year to SSC. S. Hagemann and G. Peterson will send the charge to M. Narvaez.
 - b. Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) and Educational Technology Advisory Subcommittee (ETAS) – Changes were made to their charges as requested by CPC.
6. Evaluation of planning process – A collegewide survey will be sent in November. Results of this survey will be included in the Accreditation Follow-Up Report that is due in March 2016.

T. Long suggested that CPC communicate the results of last year’s planning process, i.e., how many were hired, how many requests were fulfilled, etc. Members agreed it would be good to close the loop before the next planning cycle, and to get this information out before the survey. It seems most appropriate to get this information at the VP level, so VPs were asked to submit their lists by Sept. 30. G. Peterson has developed a color-coded chart to track this information, which might be useful for the other VPs to use. A workgroup (E. Bagg, K. Kane, J. Downey, and J. Pope) will work on the communication that will be sent out.
7. Participatory Governance Handbook update – M. Narvaez reported that the handbook is about 80% completed. A small workgroup (M. Narvaez, E. Bagg and K. Kane) met over the summer to work on the handbook. Portions of it will be used at a LEAD Academy session on participatory governance and decision-making. J. Downey and J. Florence volunteered to help finish work on the handbook.
8. VP and Academic Senate assignments for VP Plans:
 - a. T. Long – J. Downey and J. Ochoa
 - b. L Bynum – K. Hillman
 - c. G. Peterson – K. Kane and C. Moorhead
 - d. R. DelGaudio – J. Florence
 - e. A. Gabel – S. Hagemann
 - f. The timeline for planning was distributed. In the past, scheduling meetings for the School and VP Planning groups have been challenging, so suggested meeting dates have now been included on the schedule. Deans and VPs were encouraged to set their meetings as soon as possible.
 - g. A question was raised about the PCC Plan, since there is no A-VP of PCC anymore. T. Long replied that there should be integration, not separation, of the PCC plan: the part that is

instructional should be part of the Academic Affairs plan, while the part that is student services should be part of the Student Services plan. E. Oakley stated the challenge is that most of the academic deans and department chairs who work on the plans are at LAC; therefore, they must be explicit to include PCC in their planning. L. Bynum reminded CPC that there is a PCC plan, so CPC must close the loop on that one as well.

9. E. Oakley invited CPC to the College Promise Annual Report to the community on September 24th at 10 am in the Quad area. There will be many special guests including U.S. Department of Education Under Secretary Ted Mitchell, California Department of Finance Director Michael Cohen and former California State Senate Pro Tem Darrell Steinberg, Mayor Robert Garcia, and local educational leaders. He also conveyed President Obama's thank you specifically for LBCC for the work that the college is doing.
10. M. Shih thanked CPC for welcoming her to committee. She asked what she as a student rep could do to help the college. Members thanked her for her question and for serving on CPC. They offered the following suggestions:
 - See how everything is connected
 - Bring back the perspective of the student
 - Don't hesitate to report what is happening to students
 - Encourage other students to be reps; student reps are needed on other committees

M. Shih related an experience she recently had where the instructor allowed texting, snap chat, and sleeping during class. Members stated that the Faculty Handbook specifies what is allowed or not, but faculty have the responsibility to enforce it. In cases like these, students could talk to the instructor after class and/ or inform the department head and/or dean.