Present: Eva Bagg, Don Berz, Byron Breland, Lou Anne Bynum, Hurtie Chukwidere, Cathy Crane, John Downey, Shauna Hagemann, Peter Knapp, Don Low, Lynn Misajon, David Morse, Maria Narvaez, Kevin Ryan, Sigrid Sexton, Bobbi Villalobos, Joan Zuckerman

Absent/ Excused: Phyllis Arias, Ann-Marie Gabel, Rose DelGaudio, Lynn Shaw, DeWayne Shaeffer, Robin DeVitt

Guests: Kim Anderson, Jay Field, Cindy Hanks, John Hugunin, April Mansfield-Juarez, Mae Sakamoto

1. Co-chairs’ Report
   - Summary Notes from November 5, with changes submitted by A. Gabel, were approved.

2. Technology Plan – Task Force Update & Approval of Plans
   Jay Field, co-chair of the Technology Plan Task Force, reported that they received good feedback from the two Tech Plan Forums that were held last month (Nov. 16 & Nov. 23). In general, the Tech Plan itself was “accepted”, and there were no significant suggestions made regarding it. However, there were proposed changes to the membership of the oversight committee, including adding a Classified rep and a Student rep, and specifying that there should be a PCC presence on the committee. The CPC agreed with the changes and also added the following modifications:
   i. Under Reporting Structure, change the last sentence to: “in consultation with the committee, reporting milestones will be determined by the CPC and the co-chairs of this committee”
   ii. Add terms for faculty members: up to two 3-yr terms
   iii. Add 2nd faculty member whose primary assignment is from PCC
   iv. Change “taskforce” to committee
   v. Remove names and leave titles only associated with “Resource Persons”

   The CPC approved the Technology Plan and the revised charge and membership of the oversight committee.

3. Accreditation Update
   E. Bagg reported that the ACCJC visit on Nov. 10th went very well. The preliminary feedback from the team was very positive. The President has received a draft of the team’s report, and it is favorable, but the official report and decision/ action from the commission will probably not be until February.

   During the visit, the team members noted that the college’s challenge ahead is to sustain the momentum and keep the process going. They met with K. Anderson and she reported that they were pleased to see that a structure is in place. They wanted to know how constituent groups were supporting the process and had some concerns about ongoing sustainability and maintaining the current pace.

   D. Morse did not hear any concerns when the team met with the Program Planning/ Program Review Implementation Team. C. Crane agreed and added that she felt good about all the
responses from the team members as well as from all around the table. She also thought it would be a good idea to post syllabi online.

B. Villalobos reported that the team members were interested in the deans’ roles in the accreditation process.

D. Berz reminded everyone that the Midterm Report is the next report to be submitted and that the college will have to report progress on all planning agenda items.

4. Program Plan/Program Review Update

The college is on schedule with the timeline for the program plan/program review. The school plans are due tomorrow, Dec. 4, and then they will be submitted to the VP Level groups. D. Berz reported that the VP Level Academic Affairs group met yesterday and they had some concerns about the timeline. Their next meeting is on Jan. 20.

5. Distance Learning Plan Task Force Update

April Mansfield-Juarez gave a detailed update on the Distance Learning Plan (see http://ie.lbcc.edu/CPC_DL_Oversight.cfm for document). The current task force plans to present the DL Plan to different groups on campus. The department heads have been given a spreadsheet showing the DL courses. K. Anderson pointed out that 174 DL courses have been approved, but only 104 of them are being offered.

There was a discussion about expanding the DL course offerings and the need, if any, for a DL Expansion TF. There was also a question if the President’s goal was 20% more courses or 20% more students (see note below). Also, is this an on-going TF, and if not, what is the timeline? If it is on-going, then should it be changed to “committee”? J. Downey also suggested adding more people to the task force, including a Dean. It was decided that there was no need to have a new task force on the expansion of DL courses. The existing oversight committee will bring forth to the CPC any recommendations as necessary and provide status updates.

[Note: Superintendent-President’s Agenda 2009-2011 includes goal to “Develop and implement a plan to increase by 20% the number of students served by fully on-line course offerings.” http://www.lbcc.edu/boardweb/presagenda2009-2011.pdf

DL Plan “LBCC will meet an anticipated growth in DL student enrollment on average of 20% per year over the next five years through shared governance practices proposed in this plan.”]

6. Enrollment Management – creation of ad hoc group

Since the Enrollment Management Plan has seven strategies (with subcomponents) and the Student Success Plan as thirteen strategies, it was suggested that an ad-hoc group be created to review both plans and see if any strategies overlap. However, D. Morse felt that this approach may be too narrow and not focused in the right way. He felt that what’s needed is actual oversight of the Enrollment Management Plan. He suggested the creation of a task force to review the plan and bring forth any recommendations for the creation of a standing committee. K. Ryan has some language that may be a good starting point to develop the charge.

7. Evaluation of Progress towards Educational Master Plan Goals and Development of 2011-2016 EMP

The previous process of developing the Educational Master Plan started with a retreat involving all the members of all the planning committees. At the retreat, some very broad goals were identified, and then workgroups were formed to further develop and refine the goals.

President Oakley would like to launch the new Educational Master Plan on College Day 2011. It was suggested that a planning day be held to get the development process started. Many members felt that due to budget constraints, an internal facilitator is a better choice than an external facilitator.
8. Non-credit classes in the summer

There was a long discussion about non-credit classes being held in the summer. Some of the faculty had been told that they could not schedule any non-credit courses in the summer. However, this was a miscommunication and this decision has not yet been made. There is a subgroup that is working on guidelines for core classes and these recommendations will be presented at the next Academic Council (AC) meeting. The Executive Committee met yesterday to discuss guidelines/criteria for summer session. The budget and FTES targets have been given out to the deans who are supposed give directions to department heads. However, courses have not been decided yet, and D. Berz had stated that the guidelines were going to the Academic Council. AC will also discuss and develop guidelines on credit/ non-credit/ enhanced credit courses. L. Misajon asked if non-credit courses can be considered “core” and this was affirmed.

9. The proposed Spring 2010 CPC Meeting Schedule is as follows:

- Thursday, Jan. 14 – CPC meeting
  - *Monday, Feb. 8 – priorities from VPs due to CPC*
- Thursday, Feb. 11 – CPC meeting
- Thursday, Feb. 25 – CPC meeting
- Thursday, March 11- CPC meeting
  - *Monday, March 15 – CPC sends priorities to BAC*
  - *Thursday, March 18 – BAC meeting*
- Thursday, April 1 – CPC meeting
- Thursday, May 6 – CPC meeting

A confirmed schedule with meeting times and locations will be emailed to the members as soon as it is available.

10. Future Agenda Items

a) Summer 2011 schedule

b) BAC charge