CPC Meeting
April 2, 2009
12:30 – 2:00 pm
V-111
Summary Notes

Present: Eva Bagg, Sigrid Sexton, Phyllis Arias, Lou Anne Bynum, Hurtie Chukwudire, Cathy Crane, Rose DelGaudio, John Downey, Ann-Marie Gabel, April Juarez, Peter Knapp, David Morse, Maria Narvaez, Daniel Reich, Kevin Ryan, Shauna Hagemann, DeWayne Sheaffer, Joan Zuckerman, Byron Breland

Absent/Excused: Don Berz, Vincent Riojas, Natalia Schroeder, Leticia Suarez, Chris Villa

Guest: Patricia Alexander

1. Co-chairs’ Report
   • The March 5th Summary Notes were accepted with amendments.

2. Accreditation Updates
   • Program Plan/Program Review – D. Morse and E. Bagg, co-chairs of the Program Plan/Program Review Implementation Team, reported on their progress. The team has been organized into several workgroups to work on specific tasks. They met last Friday and will have a retreat on 4/3 to draft the process. The draft will be presented at the Department Head meeting next week, but the meeting will be open to anyone campus-wide. All are invited to give input. The team will meet again after spring break to incorporate feedback and prepare for the presentation to CPC on April 23rd.

   The proposed process includes task forces at each level as program review/plan moves forward. It is designed to be a cooperative process that includes discussion and feedback. It is also designed to involve more people. The process has not yet been shared with VPs, but some of the workgroups have contacted some of the VPs to get their input on specific items.

   Some members wondered about the purchase and implementation of TracDat and were concerned that we would not be addressing the ACCJC recommendation if we did not have a software product in place by October. E. Bagg clarified that the warning letter from ACCJC only states that the College should immediately complete its revision of its program review process and begin its implementation, and does not prescribe the use of any software. E. Bagg, D. Morse and other members of the team will be meeting with TracDat shortly after the Department Head meeting to discuss our proposed process and make sure that TracDat will fit our needs.

   D. Morse also informed everyone about a recent Academic Senate paper on Program Review. It contains good information on how to define a “program” and would also be useful for SLO assessment.

   • SLOs – An SLO Tribe was formed by the Academic Council to develop a plan for the college to address its ACCJC warning. The tribe presented a SLO Assessment Blueprint and process narrative for SLOs to the Academic Council. The plan includes work strands, responsible parties, and timelines. The blueprint was to comprehensively include all parts of the college involved in the assessment of SLOs. It also breaks down the warning into multiple components. It was explained that the Academic Council, comprising Academic Senate Executive Committee and the President’s Executive Committee, oversees whole planning process and deals with academic matters. It is the highest shared governance body on campus. Academic Council periodically creates “tribes” to address specific issues or problems. The Blueprint also calls for the establishment of a new Process Oversight Group to oversee all
activities related to student learning outcomes assessment for faculty and staff. C. Crane and E. Bagg are the co-chairs and the members are Patricia Alexander, Kim Anderson, and Wil Shaw. The membership of the committee was determined by the structure of the Curriculum Committee subcommittees.

A. Juarez was concerned about the timeline; she felt it was unrealistic to expect that 100% of all course and program SLOs would be completed by August 2009. E. Bagg stated that some course outlines already have objectives listed, but some of these can stand as outcomes. C. Crane said there will be clerical help to put SLOs into course outlines. S. Sexton said that everyone needs to do the best they can to meet the goal, and that there is a plan in place that will roll out very soon. P. Arias said that resources not available in the past will now be made available but that all this must be communicated to all faculty ASAP because we are losing time. She also said that courses that have not been taught in a long time should be deactivated so that SLOs will not have to be developed for them. A. Juarez stated that she was told to limit the number of courses, but P. Alexander clarified that the limit is on the number of outcomes per course, not on the number of courses. P. Alexander also said that each ASLO member has been assigned a school to help them develop program level outcomes. Also, since the definition of what is a “program” is still under discussion, there may be some leeway on how programs are defined. Another member suggested that departments can look at the program SLOs that they wrote during a flex day a few years ago to see if they can still be used with some tweaking. D. Morse wanted to make sure that the SLO reviewers would only be a technical resource, and not deal with content. T. Alexander agreed and also said that SLOs will be continually reviewed and possibly changed.

3. Class Schedule Budget Reductions – The CPC was presented with a draft charge of a new task force. A. Gabel explained that the creation of the task force is in response to the state budget and its impact on the District’s budget. The President’s Leadership Council suggested the creation of this special task force to look at enrollment trends, class schedules and adjunct and overload costs. The BAC wants to avoid straight across-the-board cuts and is using the priorities from CPC to help guide its consideration of cost-saving strategies. A. Gabel reviewed the state of the district budget, and she will be sending out a college-wide email about it. She will be asking departments for any voluntary budget reductions and to forward these to Sem Chao by April 23rd. Once the budget has recovered, they would be the first to have these funds reinstated.

There was a lengthy discussion re the new task force. Some were concerned that this only focused on the instructional area, and asked what mechanism is being used to look at the non-instructional side for potential cost savings. There were also questions about the previous enrollment management group – does it still exist and if so, does this new task force usurp it? D. Morse stated that as far as he knows, the enrollment management group has not existed for a while, and it was not a decision-making body. It was only in place to hear reports from the other groups. However, oversight of enrollment management is part of CPC’s charge. Members felt that perhaps the previous enrollment management group needs to be reactivated. S. Sexton agreed but wanted to focus on the task force charge for the meantime.

Other questions were raised regarding the membership of the task force, its co-chairs, and who it reports to. D. Berz had volunteered to be a co-chair, and some suggested it might be better if E. Bagg or M. Singhal co-chaired the group and then made recommendations to D. Berz. However, many felt that D. Berz was the right person to co-chair due to his input and expertise. P. Arias wanted to include in the task force’s charge that it solicit Department Head input and communicate with areas affected. D. Morse also wanted it specified that this is to create a short term policy, not long term; long term enrollment management policies will have to be discussed at future meetings. R. DelGaudio suggested adding a professional development component; this is something that could be used by everyone to learn how to use enrollment management. S. Sexton will make changes to the charge and it will be emailed to everyone for review. The members agreed that A. Gabel can include information about the task force in her college-wide email. The task force’s work would affect spring 2010 and fall 2010.