College Planning Council Minutes

March 28, 2012

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Multidisciplinary Center West (MCW)-312

1. Call to Order at 3:02 pm

Attendees:

Annala, Lori – Classified

Bransky, David – Asst. Dean/Student Services

Bricker, Susan – Supervisor/Admissions and Records

Callahan, Michael – Institutional Research

Calote, Robin - President

Carrasco-Nungaray, Marian - Counseling

Chavez, Daniel – ASVC

Cowen , Will – Athletics

Douglas, Robin – Supervisor/Child Development Center

Fernandez, Ralph – CTE

Garcia, Jenna – English

Gardner, Ty – Biology

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

Harrison, Karen – ESL

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

Hull, Becky – Past Academic Senate President

Jameson-Meledy, Kathryn, Grant Developer/Writer

Keebler, David – V.P./Business Services

Kumpf, Dan - Mathematics

Lange, Cari – Academic Senate Vice-President

Lara-Cruz, Christopher – ASVC

Melton, Sandy – Nursing

Moskowitz, Bob – Art

Muñoz, Paula – EOPS

Nielsen, Peder – Classified Senate President

Pauley, Mark – Academic Senate Treasurer

Sanchez, Ramiro – EVP/Student Learning

Scott, Kathy – Co-chair

Sezzi, Peter – Co-chair

Tovar, Antonio - ASVC

II. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

j

III. Announcements/Information Items

* Pertinent committee reports
  + DCAP

Calote reported that there is a new district council thanks to Sezzi as he said we needed to do something about the three colleges being put on Accreditation Probation. It is called the District Council on Accreditation and Planning, and it will focus on just that, accreditation and planning. It doesn’t have final membership yet. So far membership consists of the three college presidents, the three Academic Senate presidents and the Vice-Chancellor for Business Services. They are moving very quickly on things, and they hope to get a legitimate report together by October. They have met twice now, creating timelines and a list of things to be done; now they need to finalize the timelines and lists. The DCAP will be meeting Friday of this week after Consultation Council. Information has to be given out and feedback is needed. Calote also talked about “measurable outcomes,” which the committee is trying to finalize.

Sezzi said they have gotten a lot of work done in a short amount of time. We should be receiving a report soon. The minutes will be out soon also. Sezzi feels confident that enough work is being done to achieve the goal. Sezzi opined that in his opinion, we might be go from Probation back to Warning in October or possibly even taken off Warning and have our accreditation fully re-affirmed in October but a lot depends on who is on the team that visits us next Fall.

.

* BRC

Pauley reported that over the last couple of years a proportional budget model has been used. He also stated that workgroups have been reinstituted.

Keebler reported about the budget. We are finishing up FY12; in FY13 we are taking a $2.5 million hit at Ventura College: 31 positions are being abolished, 15 positions are being reduced in months, 10 vacant positions are being abolished if these proposals are approved at the April Board meeting, and the cafeteria is closing. The committee has also talked about the budget model (how does it work) and planning parameters for next year. The planning parameters will be presented to CPC at the next meeting.

* + Academic Senate

Sezzi said that the Senate had a first and second reading and has approved the changes to our General Education SLOs, also known as Institutional level SLOs. Senate also discussed changes in Aps necessitated by changes to Title 5 and Ed Code. They’ve also talked about “What is a Program?” That should be re-evaluated.

* + SLO Committee

K. Scott reported that four programs are piloting Program Level SLOs or mapping this semester: Child Development/Parker, Human Services/Sociology/Horigan, Medical Assistant/Newcomb, and Psychology/Pauley. She also reported that we are purchasing TracDat, and Moorpark College is going along with us. The purchase approval will go to the May Board meeting. Training on TracDat will start shortly after approval. Scott said they chose TracDat because it not only handles the instructional programs, it handles the Service Programs, Program Review, and strategic planning

Sezzi mentioned we will have Gardner and Newcomb facilitating SLOs in the Fall.

Munoz asked if there are division SLOs and the answer was no.

Gardner said we are getting close to the deadline for work to be turned in this term. Gardner will be going around and discussing with department chairs about the completeness of the assessment process.

* + Other

Nielsen reminded the committee that just a few years ago, there were 495 classified employees in the VCCCD and, if the Board approves the abolishments at the April Board meeting, we will be down to between 240 and 260 classified employees district-wide. There’s a possibility there will be 31 less Classified on this campus come next Fall pending upcoming Board action.

Lara-Cruz said the ASVC elections are next week on Tues and Wednesday. Chavez said they are thinking about a tricycle race. Sezzi said Lara-Cruz is doing exceptional work on behalf of the students. Calote said similarly that Chavez is doing a good job too.

Sezzi reported that the Chancellor’s search committee is progressing.

Classified Senate and ASVC will be added to the list of committee reports.

IV. Action Items

1. Approval of Minutes: February 22, 2012

Pauley motioned to approve the minutes with corrections noted, Lara-Cruz seconded, minutes were approved all in favor by the committee with 4 abstentions.

1. Core Indicators of Effectiveness – First reading

Lara-Cruz motioned to discuss and Douglas seconded. Scott said that perhaps instead of comparing ourselves to ourselves, she would like to compare ourselves to something in the ARCC (Accountability Report for Community Colleges). ARCC creates peer groupings and it compares us to peer groupings. Sanchez is not opposed to that. If you go to the ARCC report and go to the core groups, they vary. Some are alike and in others, some are not alike. Sezzi said there are 7 different methods in the ARCC report. Scott said we could look at it with Michael Callahan.

Munoz asked K. Scott why she would rather do it that way. Scott said if we keep comparing ourselves to ourselves and we are below the state average, then our success may not be what we think it is. She also said that it is important to compare ourselves to like-institutions. We should not, for example, compare ourselves to Moorpark College because they are not a Hispanic Serving Institution, they have a different demographic, and they do not have the same numbers or classes for basic skills students. Keebler suggested selecting 5 or 6 peers as a cohort against which to measure ourselves. Sanchez said we are always comparing ourselves to ourselves to see if we are making progress; how do we measure up to other colleges similar to us, are they doing better than us, what can we learn from them? This is another benchmark.

Callahan said there are 7 different core indicators in the ARCC. Callahan went over some comparison figures. Callahan said we don’t want a peer group that’s huge as is the case with ARCC. Scott said if we pick a peer grouping, we have to make it clear that we are not handpicking. The advantage of using ARCC is these are state-approved peer groupings.

Sezzi said this the Core Indicators we have created are a good starting point and that perhaps next year one of our goals can be to determine a peer grouping.

Hull asked if we are we going to go back in and put in real numbers rather than put in vague statements on the Core Indicators of Effectiveness handout.

Sezzi said we need to agree on what we are going to measure first. We should review them every year and see where we are going.

Scott said we could put that our goal is to be higher than we were in the prior year. This front page could be like a Table of Contents that provides the categories and the specific information is in subsequent pages.

Pauley said you almost have to take an average as your starting point.

Nielsen said we will have to watch #6 as some students may not be able to transfer to the CSUs and UCs because of the state budget problems. Scott said that other community colleges will have the same transfer issues also.

Regarding the wording in #6, Hull suggested changing the word “private” to “independent.”

After some discussion about the wording “transfer certified” in #6, it was agreed by all that “CSU/IGETC certified” will be used.

On the form, #3, Callahan recommended taking out “Total students and” and instead begin with “First time degree…..”

Lara-Cruz asked if the number five (5) should be a % in #2 and the answer was yes.

Scott asked if there were any other changes. None were noted.

Pauley motioned to move to a second reading. Lange seconded. All in favor, no abstentions.

V. Discussion Items

* Program review report

Scott handed out a list of the things we need to work on to make the Program Review process better than it was last year. She asked for input about the form. Scott sees two separate things: 1) The services need to get together because there was some issue with content (questions to which the services needed to respond) and 2) We need a subcommittee to oversee the entire process (i.e. voting, the method for running the meetings, etc.) Bricker suggested calling it a Process group. Originally, Bricker and Hajas chaired the effort for the Services. Bricker said she would talk to Hajas and Weinstein about working on Services, and a counselor will be named at a later date. Chavez will join this subcommittee if he can find the time. Scott will be on this committee if needed

Harrison suggested Sabrina Canola be on the Process subcommittee.

Chavez said if he can find the time he will be on both subcommittees.

Scott stated that the two subcommittees should meet at least once before this semester ends.

The Process subcommittee would discuss voting, timelines, meetings, prioritizing. Volunteers for this subcommittee are Scott, Nielsen. Sezzi, Bricker, Moore, Hajas, Lara-Cruz and Chavez. The committee will meet once before the next College Planning Council meeting.

K. Scott asked Doyle to review the membership composition for both subcommittees. Doyle said the Service Unit Outcomes subcommittee will consist of Susan Bricker, Sandy Hajas, Jeff Weinstein, a

               counselor (to be named), and, Daniel Chavez (if he has time).

Doyle reported that the Process subcommittee will consist of Kathy Scott, Peter Sezzi, Peder Nielsen, Susan Bricker, Jay Moore, Sandy Hajas, Sabrina Canola, Chris Lara-Cruz, and Daniel Chavez.

Hull asked if there will be a way to run our last Program Review process through TracDat. Keebler said someone would have to manipulate the data, but it can be done.

Scott said if you look at Long Beach City College and Napa Valley College site, they have links to the TracDat data and their Program Review documents were approximately four pages and very clear.

* Institutional effectiveness data

No data to provide today. Sezzi talked about DataMart. Go to Google and type in California Datamart. You can capture a lot of data. If anyone has any questions, you can ask Sezzi or Callahan. If you are looking for reliable student data, this website is where you want to go.

Scott said there are a lot of reports on the VC Institutional Effectiveness site.

VI. Other

There were no other remarks.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 pm.