Present: Eva Bagg, Don Berz, Byron Breland, John Downey, Shauna Hagemann, Peter Knapp, Maria Narvaez, Kevin Ryan, Sigrid Sexton, Lynn Shaw, Bobbi Villalobos, Ann-Marie Gabel, David Morse, Hurtie Chukwiderere, Rose DeGaudio, Lou Anne Bynum, Lynn Misajon, Joan Zuckerman, DeWayne Shaeffer

Absent/ Excused: Don Low, Cathy Crane, Phyllis Arias, Elizabeth Arreaga

Guests: Jay Field, John Hugunin, Amit Schitai, Gerry Jenkins, Cindy Hanks, Tamara Hectus

1. Co-chairs’ Report
   The Summary Notes from Jan. 28, 2010 were accepted.

2. Accreditation Update
   E. Bagg reported that LBCC’s warning status has been lifted, accreditation was re-affirmed and no progress report is required. The next report due is the Midterm Report on October 2011. The college needs to keep its momentum and focus on original recommendations from the Evaluation Team. Progress towards the Planning Agendas included in the Self-Study Report will also need to be addressed in the Midterm Report. D. Berz stated that the Superintendent President extends his appreciation to E. Bagg for her role as the Accreditation Liaison Officer, and she was congratulated and commended for her efforts. E. Bagg thanked the committee and also thanked M. Narvaez, S. Sexton and D. Morse for their work.

3. Technology Plan Oversight - Committee or Task Force?
   After much discussion, it was decided that the Technology Plan Oversight group will be a Task Force, not a Committee. Changes were made to the charge. Members who will be appointed this Spring will serve until Spring 2011. Thereafter, membership will be appointed each Fall.

4. Educational Master Plan (EMP)
   a. Members were reminded to fill out the template on evaluation of progress towards 2005 – 2010 EMP Goals and email it to M. Narvaez by Feb. 22. Members were asked to collect input from their groups.
   b. Process to develop new EMP
   D. Morse described the process of how the current EMP was developed. After broad, overarching goals had been developed, standing committees were disbanded (except for BAC) and the members were re-assigned to different groups. The groups had one semester to work on goals, strategies and outcomes. Colloquia for each goal were held to get campus-wide feedback. He felt that the communication and feedback to the campus worked well, but that the evaluation component needs to be improved.
   For this current process, E. Bagg noted that the college should conduct various environmental scans (including CTE, business, workforce) as well as a needs assessment. D. Berz mentioned that the Community College League of CA (CCLC) has established a Futures commission. L. Bynum added that there should also be an economic development view of the region. L. Shaw
would like to see more information about future trends. B. Breland stated that he found many resources as he was working on the PCC plan. E. Bagg suggested that a small workgroup work on this and make recommendations to CPC. E. Bagg, L. Bynum, K. Ryan, J. Downey and R. DelGaudio volunteered to be on the workgroup.

5. Program Plan/Program Review
   a. VP Area Plans
      All VP Level plans and the PCC Inter-Level plan were submitted on time.
   b. Process on how to prioritize goals and develop institutional priorities
      D. Morse described the 3 end products needed from CPC:
      1. College level goals – these will be sent to the Superintendent-President to be included in his report to the Board of Trustees
      2. Budget priorities – these will be submitted to BAC
      3. Creation of any task forces necessary to move projects forward
      He and E. Bagg, as co-chairs of the Program Plan/ Program Review Implementation Task Force, suggested CPC create two small workgroups to look at 1) goals and 2) budget priorities (broader categories, not individual allocations). These will be discussed at the next CPC meeting on Feb. 25, and each VP Level Planning group will also have the opportunity to highlight major aspects of their plan.
      D. Shaeffer asked if these plans had already been sent out, but it is not necessary to do so, since these came up from the lower levels. In addition, these plans will be posted on the website. S. Hagemann commented that in the future, there needs to be more time for feedback back and forth as the plans are being developed. D. Morse and E. Bagg agreed. They are hoping that the next Flex Day will be used to start planning for next year, so that departments have more time.
      L. Bynum was concerned that having a group look at the budget priorities will set up an expectation that there are funds to cover requested resources. She suggested creating only one workgroup that will focus on the goals. A. Gabel stated that there is no money whatsoever available next year, however, this is an opportunity to re-allocate existing resources. CPC could play an instrumental role in this.
      The final decision from CPC was:
      1) To create a workgroup that will focus on goals (B. Villalobos, K. Ryan, L. Misajon, K. Miller, and S. Hagemann)
         a. They will group the goals into categories
      2) At the Feb. 25th CPC meeting, co-chairs of the VP Level planning groups will highlight major aspects of their plan.
      3) Also at that same meeting, CPC will prioritize the goals.

6. PCC Strategic Plan
   B. Breland distributed a revised version of the PCC Strategic Plan. This will be presented to the Board of Trustees on Feb. 23rd. He also brought forward a request to continue the PCC Inter-Level Planning group as a standing committee. Since CPC does not create committees, CPC will recommend this proposal to Academic Council.

Next Meeting:
Thursday, February 25, 12:30 – 2:00 pm, T-1046