
Absent: Rose DelGaudio, Maria Narvaez, DeWayne Sheaffer, Janice Tomson

1. Co-chairs Report – no report. Summary notes from May 1, 2008 were approved.

2. Summary and Short Discussion on Reports from Task Forces and Committees
   
   - Budget Advisory Committee – Winford Sartin will be the new co-chair for BAC next year. There was a discussion regarding the development of college priorities. Input from the Department Heads was considered valuable and should be continued. It was suggested that for next year, the CPC determine how it might prioritize its list of college priorities. Perhaps the priorities will be phased or tiered; some may be identified as “ongoing.” It was explained that the BAC received the priorities from CPC, streamlined them and added detail regarding how specific budget requirements are calculated. At this level, more transparency is provided into the budget process. It was suggested that it may be more helpful to get Board and President goals as early as possible to inform CPC as soon as possible.

   - Facilities Advisory Committee – FAC is doing well and further defining its role. They have begun to develop a process for setting priorities. They are heading in the right direction with good leadership. There was question regarding FAC’s role in addressing staffing issues, and A. Gabel responded that all staff recommendations should go through the Vice President of the respective area and then to the Executive Committee. Requests are considered by the Executive Committee based on institutional needs especially as they contribute toward student success. It was brought up that CPC should have more input into the prioritization of facilities needs. The Facilities Department is working on an online job order system.

   - Student Success Committee – At the last meeting, Lisa Goddard, co-chair of the SSC, gave an update. The Student Success operational groups were in place prior to the formation of the SSC, but now SSC will oversee them to make sure resources are in place. SSC is working on their mission statement. D. Berz will present on the proposed reorganization as it affects student success. There was a concern that the SSC should have a better understanding of the work of the implementation teams. Perhaps CPC’s concerns should be made clear to SSC. It was suggested that members of the SSC might participate in the operational groups on a temporary basis to enhance communication between the groups and the SSC.

   - Program Plan/ Program Review Task Force – the Task Force feels it is progressing well and would like to extend their work into the fall. There is an urgency to move their recommendations forward, and the CPC needs to know what product they choose, including the pros and cons associated with it.

   - Technology Plan Task Force – The task force will build on their operational assessment. They want to continue with the same group to develop the goals and criteria for the plan. The CPC should provide the task force with directions and/or a revised charge.

   - Distance Learning Plan Task Force – The Distance Learning Plan is a good one and structured in a way that assigns specific parts of the plan to the appropriate groups. CPC has the responsibility to give input to the task force and allow them to disband. A comprehensive and integrated implementation plan is still needed. Implementation teams are a good idea, but who
forms them? It was suggested that plans are lodged with the administration to make sure that implementation happens, but the teams formed to implement a plan would report back to the CPC. The plan needs to be sunshined w/ other groups, but the question is what happens to the input? It was suggested that feedback goes back to the committee as a whole; others suggested that if the CPC identifies politically sensitive issues raised by a plan, then it would advise the co-chairs and suggest plan revisions as appropriate. It was recognized that the CPC is currently learning how to work with the new structure and that the Distance Learning Plan provides a good opportunity to try out the ideas being discussed.

It was suggested that the CPC needs to have a repository on the website for all plans that go through the CPC.

3. There was a discussion on how to provide feedback to the groups. The idea of using Survey Gizmo to collect broad input was discussed. The feedback collected could be consolidated into bullets that could be provided to the CPC.

4. Evaluation of the Planning Process
   o Survey Results – brief discussion only; asked for Executive Summary
   o Evaluation of 07-08 College Initiatives – tabled to Fall

5. The members asked for the CPC Fall Schedule via email.