Present: Gaither Loewenstein, Janice Tomson, Eva Bagg, Lou Anne Bynum, Rose DelGaudio, Ann-Marie Gabel, April Juarez, Kevin Ryan, Shauna Hagemann, Matt Lawrence, Rodney Rodriguez, Dana Van Sinden, Charlotte Joseph, Lynn Shaw, Jose Ramón Nuñez, Alta Costa, Maria Narvaez, Chris Recharte

Absent/ Excused: Greg Peterson, Byron Breland, Anthony Starros, Connie Sears, Kim Anderson, Karen Roberts

1. Chris Recharte, Sr. Office Assistant in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, was welcomed and introduced to the committee. She will be supporting CPC in some of the administrative duties.

2. The Summary Notes from February 14, 2012 were approved.

3. Recommended Institutional Priorities for 2012-13

J. Tomson introduced a discussion on the draft recommended institutional priorities for 2012-13. The discussion centered mostly on the number of priorities the college should have. Some members felt that five were too many and suggested that maybe the college should only focus on one priority. Others felt that all five priorities were important and it would be hard to eliminate any in favor of one or two. Upon further deliberation, the committee decided that student success is the top priority of the college but that the other four priorities would be included to support it. The professional development priority was also changed from “Align professional development with institutional priorities” to “Support professional development in alignment with the institutional priority.”

The priorities were revised as follows:

The college’s top priority is to improve rates of student success which include but are not limited to the following: AA/AS, AA/AS-Transfer, transfer, certificates of achievement and workforce readiness.

In order to accomplish this top priority, the College will strive to

- Maintain the college’s fiscal stability to afford opportunities for addressing the needs of students.
- Improve student readiness for success in college and provide a foundation for career and workforce skills.
- Acquire and manage funding to support student success initiatives.
- Support professional development in alignment with the institutional priority.
4. Discussion on Receiving Reports from Committees and Task Forces

The CPC committees and task forces will be giving status updates at the CPC meetings on April 24th and May 15th. M. Narvaez will confirm the schedule of reports with the co-chairs of the committees and task forces and will email the final schedule to CPC.

Based on the reports that were given in the Fall, the CPC needs to develop a process to address any actions needed or resources requested that may be identified in reports from the committees and task forces. For example, to whom should committees and task forces send their resource requests? A. Gabel stated that the VP of the area should include the resource request in their plan but all resource requests should follow the guidelines of the document “What to Leave In and What to Leave Out.” However, in some cases, the approval of a recommendation from a committee or task force precedes the identification of the VP area that will have the responsibility for its implementation. For example, the purchase of TracDat had to first be approved before it was decided which area would be responsible for it; TracDat was not included in Institutional Effectiveness’s plan until after the CPC endorsed its purchase as part of its approval of the Program Planning and Program Review Plan.

The committee decided that if CPC approves a request or recommendation from a committee or task force, it will be forwarded to the Superintendent-President. This follows the reporting structure of the CPC. The Superintendent-President can then have a discussion with the Vice Presidents to determine further action (i.e., funding, implementation, etc.).


G. Loewenstein stated that the college needs general guidance on how to approach the anticipated need for further reductions. For example, what are the parameters for reduction? Should the college reduce the breadth of its services in order to keep the quality of services that it does keep? It is necessary to receive input about future college priorities from all the members of the college community. Constituent groups should be engaged in dialogue with their members. It is clear that difficult decisions will have to be made, but people must take advantage of the opportunity to give their comments and suggestions; otherwise, decisions will still need to be made but with much less input.

A. Gabel stated that we have already cut $16 million in the last three years, but need to reduce $5 million for the tentative budget in June; in September, a plan for an additional $4.8 million in cuts has to be presented for the adopted budget in case the tax initiative in November fails.

It was determined that the CPC should develop a collegewide survey on this issue. A. Costa recommended that the survey questions be the same for all employee groups. In addition to surveys, collegewide forums and discussions should also be facilitated by the CPC. A workgroup was formed to develop survey questions. The following members agreed to volunteer: G. Loewenstein, J. Tomson, A. Costa, R. Rodriguez, S. Hagemann, and E. Bagg.

6. Promise Pathways Report

S. Hagemann reported that the last few Promise Pathways meetings have recently focused on the submission of the Title V grant application. However, each group is active and meeting regularly, and they will be submitting written reports.