DRAFT

College Planning Council Minutes

November 9, 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 pm.

Attendees:

Annala, Lori – Classified

Bransky, David – Asst. Dean/Student Services

Bricker, Susan – Supervisor/Admissions and Records

Carrasco-Nungaray, Marian - Counseling

Chavez, Daniel – ASVC

Cogert, Barbara – Classified Senate President

Cowen , Will - Athletics

Douglas, Robin – Supervisor/Child Development Center

Erickson, Suzanna - ASVC

Fernandez, Ralph – CTE

Garcia, Jenna – English

Gardner, Ty – Biology

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

Haines, Robbie – Academic Senate Secretary

Harrison, Karen – ESL

Harrison, Tim – Dean/Communication, Kinesiology, Athletics, and Off-Site Programs

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

 and Humanities

Hull, Becky – Past Academic Senate President

Jameson-Meledy, Kathryn, Grant Developer/Writer

Keebler, Dave – V.P./Business Services

Kumpf, Dan - Mathematics

Lara-Cruz, Christopher – ASVC

Lugo, Victoria – Dean/Student Services

Melton, Sandy - Nursing

Moskowitz, Bob – Art

Muñoz, Paula – EOPS

Oliver, Dave – Dean/Math & Sciences

Pauley, Mark – Academic Senate Treasurer

Sanchez, Ramiro – EVP/Student Learning

Scott, Kathy – Co-chair

Sezzi, Peter – Co-chair

Weinstein, Jeff – Supervisor/Business Services

1. Public Comments

There were no public comments or announcements.

1. Announcements/Information Items

There were no announcements or information items.

1. Program Review Divisional Appeals. K. Scott stated that programs were appealing only when the division didn’t support the program.

At first it was thought that Agriculture would be appealing, but that is not the case. We will not be hearing Agriculture.

K. Scott stated that one appeal will be presented, EOPS, by P. Munoz . P. Munoz provided the Appeal Form to the committee and went over it. P. Munoz stated that she wasn’t sure if this should be an Appeal or a Minority Opinion. After discussion, it was decided it would be a Minority Opinion.

K. Scott said the Minority Opinion will be attached to the EOPS Program Review document. We developed the agenda item prior to receiving the report. It will be in the minutes that we discussed the Minority Opinion. By consent, this goes along with EOPS Program Review.

1. Action Items
2. Agriculture Appeal

There was no Agriculture Appeal so no action was needed.

1. EOPS Appeal

An action was suggested to accept or not accept the Minority Opinion. P. Sezzi said he didn’t think we need to vote on this. P. Sezzi said this is an information item not something we vote on.

1. Approval of Minutes, September 28, 2011

Hull moved to approve. The motion was seconded by Haines and carried all in favor.

1. Approval of Minutes, October 24, 26 and 27, 2011

After much discussion and several corrections from the draft minutes, it was decided the minutes for these dates would be reviewed/revised and taken to the 11-30-11 CPC meeting for action.

In the future, it was decided that minutes will not be taken on the presentations themselves because summaries and PowerPoint presentations will be available and posted to the website. We will try to capture, as much as possible, major points that are made pertaining to the presentations by others.

The next meeting will be on November 30, and the minutes for all of these prior meetings will be sent out in advance.

VI. Discussion Items –

K. Scott and Sezzi opened the discussion about how to improve the program review process for next year.

* Gardner: Programs that are able to make cuts and not have articulation affected should do so that other cuts do not need to be made and sections can be saved.
* Carrasco-Nungaray: We should take a holistic look at the entire campus, not just programs. We should look at our expenses in a transparent manner, look at every academic program to see if we are using the tiers correctly. These are the kinds of discussions we should be having at this council. Program review is missing self reflection.
* K. Scott: In the program review process, people were given data to analyze themselves honestly.
* Sezzi: The new program review process is significantly different than in the past. Some years ago, people were merely told what the cuts would be. We are being given an opportunity to influence decisions and for people to be heard.
* Sezzi: Per WASC the purpose of accreditation is to show that our students are achieving and that we are meeting our mission. We don’t have to do what WASC says, but there will be consequences. We no longer have the money to be excellent in everything. Cuts are going to be made, and we need to be excellent in the programs we maintain.

Paula Munoz stated that this discussion was not on the agenda and should be put on a later agenda. Others felt that the topic was related to program review and should continue.

* Lara Cruz: The divisions themselves should look at their programs to see if they can cut, but administration needs to make the final decision.
* Munoz: We need to look everywhere for cuts, not just our own areas.
* K. Scott: Cutting across the board (i.e. 3%, 5%, 7%, etc.) does not work because it hurts some essential programs that are already highly impacted. Many people did not support it previously. We need transformational budgeting.
* Fernandez: The CPC is reacting without the ability to do anything but listen.
* Keebler: Program review is a vertical process – this is the program’s domain. What is missing is the horizontal process. We have committees on campus, like the BRC, to provide some of the horizontal. We need efficiency in the curriculum. This type of discussion should be occurring at the Academic Senate.
* Harrison: We need to look at this year as a starting point where we are educating the Executive Team. Let’s say Athletics costs $800,000 to run an excellent program. It would be ideal to say that to run a great program is would cost $800,000, the next level could be 700,000, and the lowest step is 400,000. There has to be a level of trust that the dean knows how the program is going and he/she can share the wealth, i.e., he would be willing to go down to 750,000 so that a program like ESL can exist.
* Lugo: For three months in a row, we have heard students begging the board not to make cuts. But we have a $4M cut to make. The reality is that we are going to lose students, which feels terrible.
* Garcia: We are trying to develop a process that works in bad times and good. Perhaps we need to adjust our process and add variables such as making cuts in the bad times.
* Haines: The really hard decisions are going to have to come from administration, not the program. It’s great to have departments brainstorm, but when it comes to cutting sections, that comes from the top down.
* Hull: If we cut tier 3, it’s going to affect the student. Those are the kinds of things this process didn’t allow for. Putting a class off for a semester or a year is different than taking a class out of the catalog.
* Kumpf: We are all protective of our programs and even in the program review process you think how can I justify this. There has to be some outside audit body to look at the programs and ask some tough questions. The BRC is talking about doing that.
* Pauley: BRC is looking at a budget model that examines how to grow or shrink proportionally.
* Keebler: BRC will tell each dean --- here are your dollars and you need to produce so many FTEs. Same with services. The difficulty is where do the two numbers come from? We are not the same institution we were two years ago. We have to look at what we can do and serve the students at the best level. What BRC is trying to do is come up with parameters so that decisions can be made about which classes can be offered.
* Sezzi: From a fiscal perspective, the problems are not expenditure problems. They are mostly revenue problems. There is not enough money.
* A question was posed about whether we are following Tier 1, 2, or 3.
* Sanchez: The state only has 2 tiers – 1 for when it is part of a program, 2 for stand alone. We added another tier. i.e, Criminal Justice – in the good days we offered all of them. Now, we will have to alternate courses. Lastly, when the tier list went out and faculty members were asked to look at it, departments were asked to change their Tier status if there were corrections that needed to be made. We will continue to look at these requests.
* Carrasco Nungaray: We need to look at the parameters coming down from the state. How do we get our curriculum on campus aligned to that?
* Sezzi: We cannot guess what the legislators are going to do. Success is defined locally. Faculty define what student success is.
* Pauley: The faculty is on board with the transfer model curriculum.
* K. Scott: The planning parameters provided information about the need to reduce. We were given that direction. Instead, many people are asking for significant resources at a time when we need to be cutting back.

K. Scott and Sezzi asked each CPC member to report on the program review process and input they received from their own division:

* Fernandez: It was disturbing that no one knew what the process for discontinuance was. It is important for next year that we outline the process with the deans ahead of time. In the program review, there is information that is stated, restated over and over. It should be streamlined. He also stated that in PR a lot of the info was stated over and over again –maybe it can be
* Kumpf: We need to add more collaboration into the process.
* Garcia: We would like more specific and more disaggregated data at the course level. We would like to be able to request specific areas for research.
* Oliver: We need to provide feedback to Dave Keebler about what data wasn’t correct or was missing. That would help us to refine the process.
* Bricker: It is difficult for services that have instructional components. They did not get their data in a timely manner, and it was very challenging.
* Lugo: People liked having information about other programs in the division. It was nice for people to sit together, talk, and learn about others’ priorities.
* Carrasco-Nungaray: The timing was bad. We need to start the process earlier. The data was inaccurate and there was not a reasonable time for obtaining proper data (for service areas). The forms used lingo that needs to be explained. A better handout needs to be developed to help people get through the process. Forms need to be created to accurately reflect student services. Voting needs to be spelled out in advance. It should be a standardized process. For divisions with a mixed group of faculty and staff, the voting and ranking need to be separate. The outcome of all votes/ranks should be forwarded. We need time to read other programs’ program reviews so that questions can be asked at the time of the presentation. There needs to be at least two weeks for this.
* Jameson: On the positive side, programs saw a lot of data that they had not seen before.
* Cogert: We all advocate for students, but the classified staff is the glue that holds the college together.
* Melton: The discussion among the department members was healthy. People appreciated it. It was good for faculty see the budget and staffing information. Faculty talked about productivity. It was one of the best meetings they have had. There was group bonding. Challenge was that there seemed to be a lot of repetition in the form.
* Lara-Cruz: Overall process went well. Like anything that is new, there will be constructive criticism about how to improve.
* Gardner: We need more individual class data. We need more interaction, more collaboration. There should be a meeting beforehand for people to hear about the programs and a later meeting to do the rankings.
* Haines: We need more disaggregated data. We need to standardize the procedure for the presentations so that they can be shorter and less redundant. Perhaps we could discuss on mandatory flex day.
* Moskowitz: The division came together. A diverse group of programs worked for the better good. It was very collegial. The data, though, did not describe the students who are taking our classes. Who are they and why are they taking them? Art devised a survey to determine that information. When we are talking about making cuts, instruction is the last place we should cut.
* Hull: We appreciate that an effort was made to have a process that looks as if it will work for everyone. However, it was really instruction based. In student services, there are a lot of gray areas. The work is not strictly numbers. The process did not allow for that. It did, though, give everyone an opportunity to listen to their colleagues.
* Pauley: Some of the divisions have a large number of disciplines, and there could be a disadvantage to those divisions. Asked if we really need six hours of presentations. Could we instead have one meeting with the summaries and then a question/answer session.
* Cowen: We need the process to flow more easily. Also, we need to add components to get to the initiatives and findings.
* T. Harrison: We need to be clear about defining a program vs. a service unit. Qualitative data needs to supplement quantitative. It would be nice to a fact book on the recommendations made to the Executive Team.
* Huddleston: There was not enough time at the beginning of the semester. Both qualitative and quantative data would be helpful. In large divisions, the meeting took a long time. There should be a process where the divisions meet once and then have some time to think and then vote at a later meeting. In the division, people enjoyed hearing about each other’s programs.
* K. Harrison: Wish there had been more time. They could have used another meeting. The paperwork was intimidating and parts were redundant. Grateful for the data.
* Douglas: Division meeting went fine. Each program was given three minutes to present.
1. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 pm.