



**CPC Meeting
December 3, 2015
2:30 – 4:30 PM
T-1046
Summary Notes**

Present: Eloy Oakley, Karen Kane, Eva Bagg, Terri Long, Lou Anne Bynum, Ann-Marie Gabel, John Downey, Shauna Hagemann, Kenna Hillman, Christina Moorhead, Jorge Ochoa, Jeri Florence, Dina Humble, Suzanna Scholz, Thomas Hamilton, Colin Williams, Haley Nguyen, John Pope, Karen Kane, Maria Narvaez

Absent: Rose DelGaudio, Greg Peterson, Michelle Shih, Brittany Lieberman, Adrian Novotny, Therese Wheeler

Guests: Janét Hund, Lauren Sosenko, Sylvia Lynch

1. The Summary Notes from November 5th were accepted with corrections.
2. Strategic Plan Update
 - a. E. Bagg gave an update on the strategic planning retreat. The retreat will be held on December 4, 2015 from 4:30 to 8:30 pm at PCC in Dyer Hall. 68 people have indicated that they will attend. E. Bagg noted that there is an evenly distributed mix of faculty, classified and management that plan to attend.
 - b. E. Bagg said that the Strategic Plan Oversight Taskforce is currently developing a Moodle site. All faculty, classified staff and management will have access to the site. The Taskforce plans to post all of the documents from the retreat on the site for those who are unable to attend the retreat. The site will also include discussion forums to gather more input for the Strategic Plan.
3. Evaluation of Planning Process
 - a. K. Kane said that a planning process survey will be administered from December 4th to December 11th to solicit feedback on the college's planning process. The results of this survey will also be included in the ACCJC Follow-Up Report.
 - b. E. Bagg added that the survey is the same planning survey that was administered in 2012 and the current survey will provide feedback on how the college perceives the planning process adjustments that have been made since the 2012 survey. E. Bagg acknowledged that the timing of the survey is not the best since the semester is almost over, but asked that the members please encourage others to complete the survey.
 - c. K. Kane added that members of the Department Planning and Program Review Subcommittee have reported positive experiences with the current planning process.
 - d. E. Bagg added that the results of the survey will be brought to CPC before the Follow-Up Report is submitted to ACCJC in March.
4. Student Success Committee
 - a. The Student Success Committee charge and membership were reviewed. E. Bagg noted that the Student Success Committee spent a lot of thoughtful time revising the charge and membership. The Student Success Committee has expanded the number of plans with funding attached to them that need to be reviewed for alignment. The charge and membership of the committee now align with the Promise Pathways, SSSP, Student Equity, BSI, and AB86/AB104 Plans. E. Bagg said that the committee will communicate what the college is doing to improve student success directly to CPC.
 - b. Committee members discussed the size of the Student Success Committee and commented that 30 members is large for a committee. K. Kane said that the committee is large because there are individuals reporting to the committee from five plans and others who will be reporting to the committee for communication purposes. She noted that those who have been involved with the committee for a long time feel strongly that the committee should remain this size.
 - c. K. Kane thanked S. Hagemann for her service as co-chair of the Student Success Committee for the past eight years. J. Rodden will serve as the new co-chair of the Student Success Committee alongside E. Bagg.

- d. Committee members voted approval of the charge/membership, with no oppositions or abstentions.

5. Updates on Planning Committees

a. A. Gabel: Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)

- i. A. Gabel provided an update on the work the BAC has completed in fall 2015. The co-chair of the committee is Chris Carter. A. Gabel discussed that the committee has reviewed and approved the adopted budget, reviewed the annual report for our year-end numbers from June 30th 2015, and reviewed the first quarter report for the 2015-16 fiscal year. The committee continues to receive updates from the Community College League of California, the Chancellor's Office and School Services related to budget and has looked at the FTES results from 2014-15.
- ii. For spring 2016, the committee plans to review the 2nd and 3rd quarterly reports, develop budget assumptions for the tentative budget, review and approve the tentative budget, review what had been received from the governor, review the apportionment calculations, develop recommendation for CPC for the Institutional Effectiveness Fund Balance Goal, and review the FTES reports.

b. A. Gabel: Facilities Advisory Committee (FAC)

- i. A. Gabel provided an update on the work the FAC has completed in fall 2015. The co-chair of the committee is Bob Maxwell. At each committee meeting the members review updates on construction and small projects on campus. The members also approve small projects and review scheduled maintenance projects for the 2015-16 year. A. Gabel provided members with a two-page project prioritization spreadsheet from the masterplan. The committee approves and reviews changes to this list once a semester.
- ii. A. Gabel noted that facilities conducted a districtwide survey this semester. A survey was also administered to the occupants of the new AA and BB buildings. The results of both surveys were shared with the FAC.
- iii. J. Hund mentioned concerns about the bathrooms at PCC. She noted that she has heard numerous complaints about cleanliness. A. Gabel said that this issue was captured in the comments from the Facilities survey and was discussed at the VP planning group meeting. She said that they have some strategies in place to address this issue.

c. T. Long: Enrollment Management Oversight Committee (EMOC)

- i. T. Long provided an update on the work the EMOC has completed in fall 2015. The co-chairs of the committee are Paul Creason and Rodney Rodriguez. The committee has met once this semester and discussed the terms used in enrollment management. The committee plans to meet on December 8 to finalize their purpose, function, and membership. They also plan to review the enrollment management PowerPoint at this meeting to gain insight into the challenges and strategies of enrollment management.

d. S. Lynch: Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)

- i. S. Lynch provided an update on the work that the ITAC, formerly known as the Technology Taskforce, had completed since spring 2015. Last spring the Taskforce developed guidelines to upgrade employee computers. IITS has received funds for the technology refresh and plans to replace one-fourth of all full-time faculty and staff computers each year. The committee provided guidance on this replacement cycle. Employees with the oldest computers will be given new computers first. Full-time faculty have the choice of receiving a Dell or Mac laptop or desktop and full-time staff will receive a Dell desktop. IITS is starting to build an inventory list of all computers across campus. The committee also discussed the State Online Initiative for Canvas and how IITS is responding to the initiative. Hussam Kashou has hosted several workshops for faculty where Canvas has been demonstrated and is asking for feedback on Canvas from the faculty who attended. The committee also discussed Turnitin.com. The college is receiving 20 licenses as a pilot of the software and Hussam Kashou is asking for faculty volunteers to pilot the software this spring. ITAC also discussed the need for online security training. The first training will be on how to recognize phishing attempts.
- ii. Educational Technology Advisory Subcommittee (ETAS): There was no update on the ETAS.

- iii. Online Education Committee (OEC): S. Lynch said that the committee is still working on their membership. S. Lynch also mentioned that the state has released a common orientation for students to take at faculty discretion to inform them of the elements that are necessary to succeed in distance learning classes.

6. Design Thinking Discovery Phase – Call for Volunteers

- a. E. Bagg said that in November E. Oakley sent an email with an update on the design thinking process. This email also included an invitation to classified staff and faculty to participate in the next phase of the design thinking work. The next phase is the discovery phase and will involve a team of faculty and staff that is led by Helga Wild. The team will interview and observe students and staff. This phase must be completed by March, so the interviews and observations will occur over winter intersession. E. Bagg acknowledged that the timing is difficult, but that she welcomes any faculty to participate during winter. This phase will begin with a four-hour workshop on December 15 followed by a reflection session every Friday for 5 weeks where those who volunteered to conduct the interviews will reflect and debrief. This process will end on February 5th. The volunteers will be asked to commit a minimum of 24 hours to this process as members of the core team. H. Wild would like the core team to consist of 16 members. E. Bagg noted that this is volunteer work and there is no compensation. She asked the members to encourage faculty and staff to participate.

7. Research Brief

- a. Lauren Sosenko, Director of Institutional Research, gave a presentation on the research brief titled “Halfway There: An Analysis of Students who Complete 30 or More Units.” L. Sosenko explained the differences that were found between students who completed 30 units (i.e., completers) and went on to earn a degree and those who did not (i.e., non-completers). Several members posed questions about the brief.
 - i. One member asked if a survey has been administered to the non-completers because it may help to explain why non-completers fall off after 30 units. L. Sosenko responded that she has not conducted one yet, but that she intends to.
 - ii. K. Hillman asked what indicates when these students are struggling. L. Sosenko said that for this analysis they used course success rates as an indicator. K. Hillman mentioned that in many courses student attrition is high and asked if a simple survey could be created that faculty could send out to students who leave courses. This could be a potential way to get more feedback from those students.
 - iii. C. Moorhead asked L. Sosenko which courses are barriers to these students’ completion. L. Sosenko said the biggest barriers are transfer level math and English, as well as math 30. She also noted that many of the students in the non-completer group are attempting these courses toward the end of their time at LBCC. Another member mentioned that it would be interesting to see what other courses the non-completers take and wondered if they are taking general education courses and passing them. L. Sosenko said that non-completers are taking and passing on average 17 transfer level units.
 - iv. One member asked if funding for remedial math would be better spent on one-on-one tutoring instead of 16-week courses. E. Oakley said that this question is not unique to LBCC and has been raised across the country. He noted that currently, the work that is being done is to contextualize support within the math courses. At LBCC, the ALEKS software is helping keep students in class and move them through math. ALEKS has a large return on investment and the college is working to scale this software use. E. Oakley also noted that we most likely will not move from remedial courses to one-on-one tutoring only, but there are ways to get one-on-one tutoring through technology and interventions.
- b. E. Bagg said that the takeaway from this brief is that our college does well with persistence, intent to complete, and the percentage of students who reach 30 units. The non-completers with 30 units show promise and the college needs to understand more about them to help them complete.
- c. K. Kane mentioned that the brief is helpful and highlights where we can do better. The brief also brings up great questions which can lead to innovative ideas and strategies.