College Planning Council Minutes

October 27, 2011

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Multidisciplinary Center West (MCW)-312

1. Call to Order

This meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

Attendees:

Bransky, David – Asst. Dean/ Student Services

Bricker, Susan – Supervisor/Admissions and Records

Calote, Robin – President

Carrasco-Nungaray, Marian - Counseling

Chavez, Daniel – ASVC

Cogert, Barbara – Classified Senate President

Douglas, Robin – Supervisor/Child Development Center

Fernandez, Ralph – CTE

Garcia, Jenna – English

Gardner, Ty – Biology

Gorback, Karen – Asst. Dean/CTE and Community Education

Haines, Robbie – Academic Senate Secretary

Hajas, Sandy – Supervisor/Learning Resources

Harrison, Karen – ESL

Huddleston, Gwen – Dean/Distance Education, Professional Development, Social Sciences,

and Humanities

Jameson-Meledy, Kathryn, Grant Developer/Writer

Jones, Grant – Supervisor/Computer Services

Keebler, Dave – V.P./Business Services

Kumpf, Dan - Mathematics

Lange, Cari – Academic Senate Vice-President

Lara-Cruz, Christopher – ASVC

Lugo, Victoria – Dean/Student Services

Melton, Sandy - Nursing

Mortensen, Jerry – Asst. Dean/ CTE

Moskowitz, Bob – Art

Muñoz, Paula – EOPS

Oliver, Dave – Dean/Math & Sciences

Pauley, Mark – Academic Senate Treasurer

Sanchez, Ramiro – EVP

Scott, Kathy – Co-chair

Sezzi, Peter – Co-chair

Weinstein, Jeff – Supervisor/Business Services

Guest: Tammi Chaparro, Grant Jones, Brent Wilson, Leslie Drayton, Kammy Algiers, Mayo de la Rocha, Scott Rabe, Casey Mansfield, Michelle Millea, Bill Budke, Meredith Mundell

Gwendolyn Huddleston gave the presentation for the Social Sciences/Humanities Division.

Jerry Mortensen presented for his portion of the CTE Division. Two programs are being considered for possible discontinuance, Agriculture and Architecture. Bill Budke spoke about the Agriculture Program. Ralph Fernandez presented on the Architecture Program. These additional documents will be posted to the Program Review website.

There was discussion among the group about Agriculture and Architecture. Carrasco-Nungaray stated that many Architecture students are encouraged not to get degrees because it does not help with transfer.

Faculty Staffing Priority Rubrics were handed out by Peter. We will post the rubrics on the Program Review website.

At the conclusion of the presentations, there was discussion about the process, including appeals.

Faculty and staff have until October 31, 2011 to turn in their appeals form. It should be turned into Kathy Scott’s office. Appeals will be heard on November 9, 2011 at the regularly scheduled CPC meeting.

General discussion then took place at the process. K. Scott asked CPC members how the process worked at the program, division, and campus levels.

At the program level, Lugo said that it was difficult and confusing for student services because some programs have classes and some don’t. There are hybrids between instructional and service. The process needs to be clearer for faculty/staff in these areas. Douglas felt the same way about the Child Development Center.

At the department level, Munoz noted that the data was inaccurate or missing because they are categorically funded. Carrasco noted that the FTES was inaccurate. They would like to collect and have better data.

K. Harrison noted that as the single full time faculty member in her program, it was a time consuming process because she could not get part-time people together easily. She also did not have sufficient collaboration for the same reason. She noted that her WSCH figures were incorrect.

Cogert said that Dave Keebler put a lot of work into this project and acknowledged his work.

Lange said at the division level she would like a better standardized form.

Gardner noted that the program review process was an opportunity for programs to suggest ways to be more efficient, such as providing more student seats, but that these kinds of suggestions largely were not made, putting the decisions about cuts back on others to make. If some of these suggestions were made, we might not have to cut so much in other areas. There was some discussion that the form did not specifically ask for this kind of analysis.

Calote said that the final budget cuts would still be her responsibility. When she looks at the program reviews, she will also be looking at the data provided.

K. Harrison noted that her program review did have cuts and that they are trying to create a better program.

There was some discussion about whether faculty should vote on classified initiatives and vice versa. K. Scott noted that if we are examining initiatives, then perhaps all should have a vote. She noted that in her area, a classified person and service was one of the top priorities put forward by faculty. Melton said that faculty in her area also selected classified as their top priority.

K. Scott asked faculty and staff to go back to their divisions and gather input/feedback for the next meeting.

Christopher Lara-Cruz thanked everyone for doing the program reviews. He asked what happened with the process at this point. Sezzi briefly explained the process for discontinuance, including the role of the Senate and the board.

Several members noted how much they had learned from listening to the program review presentations.

Carrasco-Nungaray questioned the role of the committee and what the purpose was. She said that the process did not provide the president with the information she needed. Carrasco-Nungaray supported the way we made projected cuts in prior years where each area looked at 3%, 5%, and 7% potential cuts. She also expressed concern about why the college had to accept the board’s strategic plan as part of ours. K. Scott noted that they are separate documents and that task forces are addressing the board’s goals. There was discussion about the connections between the board as an elected body and the colleges. Sezzi suggested that faculty wanting to express their opinions on these kinds of issues go to the Senate meetings at which board members are present.

The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.