1. Welcome
The co-chairs welcomed the CPC members to the first meeting of the year. The members introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Summary Notes – The Summary Notes from May 15, 2012 were approved with minor changes.

3. Review Charge of CPC
The membership of the CPC was reviewed. Representatives are needed for Department Head and ASB. C. Sears said there is a new process to appoint student reps, but they cannot appoint someone until the meeting schedule has been set.

G. Loewenstein asked members for any suggestions to make changes to the CPC charge. There were no suggestions about the charge itself, but there was a discussion on the number of committees and task forces. When the committees and task forces gave status reports last semester, all of them considered their group as viable, but perhaps the CPC needs to study this further. C. Joseph requested that a diagram of the structure of the planning committees and task forces be sent to the members. M. Narvaez will email the information.

There was also a discussion about the duplication of membership in the CPC and in Academic Council. Almost everyone in the CPC is also on Academic Council, and sometimes the issues and discussions get confused between the two. L. Bynum stated that although the groups have similar membership, the charges are different, and any changes to this structure would have to be discussed with the President. G. Loewenstein and A. Juarez both stated that changes are not being proposed at this time, but they want to encourage members to think about the planning structure, the charge and the membership. This discussion will continue at the next CPC meeting.

L. Zunich asked why the SLO Coordinator is part of the committee, but not listed on the membership. E. Bagg responded that the job description of the SLO Coordinator specifies membership to the CPC. The membership will be updated to reflect that.

As per the CPC charge, the Executive Committee members have been paired up with Academic Senate members as follows. These pairs will work together to co-chair the VP Level Planning groups:

- Ann-Marie Gabel and April Juarez
- Byron Breland and Jorge Ochoa
- Gaither Loewenstein and Pam Knights
- Greg Peterson and Matt Lawrence
- Lou Anne Bynum and Rodney Rodriguez
- Rose DelGaudio and Christiane Woerner

4. Review of 2012-13 Institutional Priority
Academic Affairs is supporting the 2012-13 Institutional Priority by implementing the following 4-point strategy:
- Program discontinuance to match resources to the size of the college
- Resource 25 and student center scheduling being implemented
- SLO assessment will be accelerated to progress towards "proficiency" on ACCJC rubric
- New repeatability regulations to shift resources to high waitlisted classes

This year, departments are writing projects and strategies instead of goals and they will be selecting which Educational Master Plan goal their project or strategy will support. Schools will still be able to write goals based on the departments' projects and strategies. Their goals could be how to further the progress of the EMP goals and/or be a subset of one of the goals.

Members asked for some examples of department project strategies, school goals and VP goals. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will gather some examples to share.

5. Strengthening the Linkage between Planning and Resource Allocation

Right now, there are several prioritization criteria in use at the college, such as the budget reductions criteria (from Spring 2012), program discontinuance criteria, hiring prioritization criteria, etc. There is also a criteria for Prioritization of Resource Requests which was created in 2009 by the Program Planning/Program Review Implementation Task Force. This criteria was distributed in 2009-10 to all the departments but it was unclear if or how it was used collegewide.

C. Joseph is part of a workgroup currently working on the criteria for hiring prioritization, and they were asked to also consider the Criteria for Prioritization of Resource Requests and make recommendations to the CPC on how to create an overall, collegewide criteria that can be used for resource allocation. The criteria being developed needs to be measurable, and prioritized or weighted.

For accreditation purposes, the college must demonstrate a clear link between planning and resource allocation, so a well-developed criteria that is actually being used will strengthen that link. Furthermore, disseminating criteria collegewide would be easier if there were only one agreed upon set of criteria.

6. Annual Department Planning Process

Members were reminded that departments should refer to the document "What to Leave In, What to Leave Out" before they enter resource requests for their department plans. This document was created last semester by a workgroup co-chaired by A. Gabel and A. Juarez to help departments enter appropriate resource requests. It should also help departments and schools prioritize requests. Peter Knapp, chair of the Program Review Subcommittee, has emailed the document to department heads and deans as a reminder.

The calendar for the annual department planning process was distributed. There might be an issue with the Institutional Priorities not being set until February 22nd, which is after Flex Day on Feb. 4th. There is still some discussion in Academic Senate whether or not Feb. 4th should be considered a "planning Flex Day".

7. Schedule CPC Meetings for Spring

Tuesday, Feb 19, 2:30 – 4:30 pm
Tuesday, Mar 19, 2:30 – 4:30
Tuesday, Apr 16, 2:30 – 4:30 (committee & task force reports, including FAC & BAC)
Tuesday, May 21, 2:30 – 4:30 (committee & task force reports)

Next Meeting: Thursday, November 8, 2 – 4 pm, T-1046