

COLLEGE PLANNING COMMITTEE (CPC) MEETING MINUTES
VENTURA COLLEGE
Wednesday, February 28, 2018
3:45 - 5:00 p.m.
CCCR

Voting Members						Non-Voting Members			
1	Faculty Co Chair	Lydia Morales	X	(acting) Classified – President	Pamela Yeagley Gabi Wood	X	Administrator - President	David Keebler (Interim)	
2	Faculty	Ryan Petitfils		Classified	Sarah Mossembekker	X	Administrator - Co chair Dean	Philip Briggs	X
3	Faculty	Marian Carrasco Nungaray		Classified	Jason Robinson	X	Administrator - VP	Kim Hoffmans	X
4	Faculty	Will Cowen		Classified	Sebastian Szczebiot		Administrator - VP	Damien Peña	
5	Faculty	Patty Wendt		Classified – Alternate	Nan Duangpun	X	Administrator - VP	Cathy Bojorquez	X
6	Faculty	Eric Martinsen		Student – ASVC, Vice President	Jessica Perez		Administrator - Asst. Dean	David Bransky	X
7	Faculty	Sandy Melton	X	Student – ASVC, Inter-Club Council President	Tatiana Juarez		Administrator - Dean	Felicia Dueñas	X
8	Faculty	Preston Pipal		Student – ASVC, Student Representative	Marleen Delgado		Administrator - Dean	Tim Harrison	X
9	Faculty	Robert Lawson	X	Supervisor	Alma Rodriguez	X	Administrator - Dean	Dan Kumpf	X
10	Faculty	David Young		Supervisor	Jeanine Day	X	Administrator - Dean	Gwendolyn Lewis-Huddleston	
							Administrator - Dean	Debbie Newcomb	X
Guests							Administrator - Dean	Lynn Wright	X
	Supervisor	Sue Royer	X	Classified Confidential	Andrea Rambo	X			
	Supervisor	Grant Jones	X	ASVC Student Rep	Mark R. Huff	X			

Agenda Item	Discussion Notes	Action?
1. Public Comments	Meeting called to order at 3:46 p.m. No public comments.	
2. Approval of Agenda - <i>Action</i>	Agenda distributed.	S. Melton moved to approve the agenda.

		S. Mossembekker seconded. Agenda approved.
3. Approval of 1/24/18 Minutes – <i>Action</i>	Draft minutes posted to the webpage. Phil asked for a review of the minutes and changes to be called out. Technology Master Plan Update moved to #4.	J. Robinson moved to approve 1/24 minutes. J. Day seconded. Minutes approved
4. <i>Technology Master Plan Update – Grant Jones – Discussion (re-numbered)</i>	G. Jones asked to give the Tech Master Plan Update before Facilities with no objections. The website was presented on the white screen. G. Jones began by describing the process that was followed to update the document. He explained that technology changes so rapidly that it was decided to make the Technology Master Plan a three-year plan as opposed to the other Master Plans and is active, meaning that it is still being worked on, so some of the work has already started on several of the initiatives mentioned. No questions for G. Jones.	
5. <i>Facilities Master Plan Update – Susan Royer– Discussion (re-numbered)</i>	S. Royer was unable to get presentation working on computer and up on white screen. The Facilities Master Plan is six-year plan (2017-2023). S. Royer gave a quick timeline of the process that was followed to update the plan. She explained the ideas that came forward and how it was implemented into the plan. She described the approval process that has been followed since last August and how input was received and included in the document. She added that one of the major issues in updating the document is how to deal with aging resources, but that is an ongoing conversation. L. Morales explained the delay from the Academic Senate. She reported that the Academic Senate discussed the Facilities Master Plan and decided to continue the discussion at a further date in order to get some clarification on noted inaccuracies on the room utilization numbers, both in hours and capacity.	Send out like to current drafts of

	<p>G. Wood asked for clarification on the future plans for the west field/old aquatic area. Sue explained the process that needs to be followed and what is to be expected in terms of dollars for “big ticket” items. She said that at this point in time they don’t feel that there needs to be a clear cut plan, because those ideas can change if the money does become available.</p>	
<p>6. Guided Pathways Update – <i>Discussion</i></p>	<p>P. Briggs said that there has been a steering committee that has been meeting regularly and also had a big roundtable discussion and asked someone from that group to give an update on how Guided Pathways has been coming along on the campus.</p> <p>G. Jones said that he’s been working with an instructor from the English department. They are looking at creating a website that will make it easy to use a Guided Pathways method with the help of possibly 3SP funding. He is hoping to work with them and to help coordinate. He just started working on it, so he’s not sure how that will work out, but they are looking at other college websites for ideas and will keep the committee updated on that.</p> <p>L. Morales said that the Academic Senate met and approved the self-assessment and made a commitment to move forward for one year with the stipulation that faculty be in the lead of the curriculum and program development and things related to faculty and collaborating with a cross functional team. The second deadline they are working on is March 30th. The group formed to work on the plan involves 9 Faculty, 4 Classified, 4 managers, and 1 student. The 9 Faculty will come from each of the divisions including Curriculum and Professional development. They will be having a meeting on Friday, March 2nd as the newly formed Cross-functional Team. In the meantime, a sub-committee was formed and involves Arlene, Lydia and Philip to outline the plan and work as a team to fill it in. The next roundtable event is scheduled for March 12th.</p> <p>The group will also attend an IEPI workshop to have the plan done by March 30th.</p>	

	<p>K. Hoffmans thought it important to note that the original committee was dissolved because not enough information about Guided Pathways had been shared appropriately, so the need to start fresh was necessary. The hope is that the conversation will expand in the next year with the right amount of representation from the different groups on campus and really engage in the process to help VC envision what it can look like moving forward.</p>	
<p>7. Making Recommendations Taskforce Update – <i>Discussion</i></p>	<p>Handout distributed – Making Recommendations Document Taskforce Update.</p> <p>P. Briggs explained the handout. He gave a brief update for the purpose of forming the taskforce.</p> <p>They have met a few times and have done a lot of information gathering. Mostly looking at and addressing the committees that VC actually has, what the charges are of the committees, what the membership consists of, what an advisory group is versus what a council is, etc. They had some broad discussions about what they wanted this document to look like, what it was missing and what types of things it needed to contain.</p> <p>The first thing they did was look at the top three committees’ structures. They noted some inconsistencies of the voting membership and developed the handout.</p> <p>The back of the handout shows what the taskforce is proposing as a solution to the discrepancies.</p> <p>J. Robinson added that it was the first attempt at cleaning up the document and have quite a bit to go, but the handout really just covered the first couple of pages. This was just what jumped out at them first, so they thought they would address it from the start.</p> <p>C. Borjorquez asked if it should be included that Student representation is appointed by student government so that it is memorialized somewhere.</p>	

	<p>A conversation then ensued regarding the representation of students on the committees and why there is such a low number on each committee. The question was raised to the student present. His comment was that some committees are intimidating and student representatives would appreciate a friendlier invitation to feel comfortable attending committee meetings. Along with that, is the fact that their class schedules are really full and could also factor into their absences on these committees.</p>	
<p>8. Classified Co-Chair – <i>Action</i></p>	<p>P. Briggs reminded the committee that this agenda item was discussed at the last meeting and the other two committees have approved this model of having the Classified Co-Chair model on each committee, so he asked for a motion to establish the position on this committee.</p> <p>G. Wood commented that it was a historic moment.</p> <p>T. Harrison commented that at his last visit to Sac City College regarding this topic, that it was a very positive part of the accreditation process and was well received.</p> <p>P. Briggs recommended that the Classified Senate appoint the Co-chair. G. Wood to put on agenda for CS April meeting.</p>	<p>G. Wood moved to approve Classified Co-Chair model.</p> <p>J. Robinson seconded.</p> <p>No opposition and motion was approved.</p>
<p>9. Committee Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. ASVC Jessica Perez or designee b. Academic Senate Lydia Morales c. Classified Senate Gabi Wood d. Budget Resource Committee Mark Pauley, Cathy Bojorquez e. Student Success Committee Damien Pena, Bea Herrera 	<p>ASVC – Mark reported that they are trying to get the clubs to get proposals in, since they do have a cutoff date. Trying to stay on track with what they are doing. ASVC is focusing on their advertising with Feed a Pirate program and making it the best they can to bring it out and get connected more with students.</p> <p>‘A. Rodriguez added that they are enjoying working with students and are looking to expand the pantry, but some things to look at is sustainable and scheduling. Relying on volunteers is complicated. A student survey was sent out and they received 819 responses within a couple of minutes. The food pantry is open to the public. The food pantry hours are not meeting their needs.</p> <p>AS-L. Morales reported that she had already talked about Guided Pathways. Other than that, they talked about staffing</p>	

f. College Outcomes Group
Nathan Cole, Asher Sund

g. Accreditation Advisory
Kim Hoffmans, Eric Martinsen

prioritization. They just finished it before this meeting. It was challenging, but they got it done.

CS-G. Wood reported that she is currently serving as President and Vice President for the Classified Senate as per the Bylaws. She said that they are hanging in there and getting what they can do. It is not a happy time for them right now and have started the nominations process to fill the Presidency. Due to restrictions of release time the previously elected President stepped down. G. Wood asked that anyone interesting in the position to contact her. She will not extend the nomination period. The last day to submit names is March 9th.

BRC-Designee, W. Cowen reported that C. Borjorquez gave a budget report and review current allocation model. Also shared program review information and talked about how to share information to the campus.

SSC-L. Wright reported that they had a good meeting. They talked about how they will review requests. She feels that they are getting more and more organized. By April, the money should all be decided on and spent.

COG-P. Briggs reported that Asher Sund is the new facilitator for the Spring. He is stepping in midstream so he is still learning all of the processes. The Phase Two of the Review, Reset, Reflect year was unveiled at the department chair meetings. The idea is to take a step back and review the quality and content of the SLOs and then to also take a step back to see where we can streamline the process.

Accreditation Advisory-K. Hoffmans reported that they have had wonderful help from the workgroup and advisory groups. The follow-up report is up on the website along with the links to all of the evidence. She will do a final check and send it off on Friday. She also gave other accreditation news regarding the nursing program. They received two accreditations lately and were told that they were granted continuing approval. They recently had a

	cite visit from the CAN. They had no non-compliance issues and this body is very rare to make commendations, but the commendation that they made was so impactful that she felt that everyone should know.	
10. Adjournment	Meeting Adjourned @ 4:43 pm Next Meeting: Thursday, March 22, 2018. Originally scheduled meeting was re-scheduled for the week before, because of Spring Break.	

DRAFT