College Planning Council Minutes

February 22, 2012

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Multidisciplinary Center West (MCW)-312

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 pm.

Attendees:

Bransky, David – Asst. Dean/Student Services

Callahan, Michael – Institutional Research

Calote, Robin - President

Carrasco-Nungaray, Marian - Counseling

Cowen, Will – Athletics

Douglas, Robin – Supervisor/Child Development Center

Garcia, Jenna – English

Gardner, Ty – Biology

Gorback, Karen – Asst. Dean/CTE and Community Education

Haines, Robbie – Academic Senate Secretary

Hajas, Sandy – Supervisor/Learning Resource Center

Harrison, Tim – Dean/Communication, Kinesiology, Athletics, and Off-Site Programs

Huddleston, Gwen – Dean/Distance Education, Professional Development, Social Sciences,

 and Humanities

Hull, Becky – Past Academic Senate President

Jones, Grant – Supervisor/Technology Support Services

Keebler, David – V.P./Business Services

Kumpf, Dan - Mathematics

Lange, Cari – Academic Senate Vice-President

Lara-Cruz, Christopher – ASVC

Lugo, Victoria – Dean/Student Services

Melton, Sandy – Nursing

Moskowitz, Bob - Art

Muñoz, Paula – EOPS

Nielsen, Peder – Classified Senate President

Pauley, Mark – Academic Senate Treasurer

Sanchez, Ramiro – EVP/Student Learning

Scott, Kathy – Co-chair

Sezzi, Peter – Co-chair

Tovar, Antonio - ASVC

Minutes: Beth Doyle

1. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

1. Announcements/Information Items
* Accreditation Update

Sezzi reported on the Consultation Council meeting he had attended. Sezzi said he really couldn’t tell how/what the outcome of the meeting was. Sezzi said that there is plenty of desire to help the district get through this.

Calote was at Consultation Council also and she didn’t have a sense of where it will go from here. She said things need to be done quickly and it needs people to help drive it. It’s hard not to feel in control of the situation. Calote said when you look at the recommendations, there are pretty concrete things that are not difficult to do. It’s just not within our (Ventura College) power to do them.

Lara-Cruz asked if there is anything that could be done at the campus level to light a fire under the Board. Nielsen said that the ASVC should show up and go to the meetings because ASVC has the vote.

K. Scott asked if the report that will be submitted in March is going to be written by the District. Calote said that Chancellor Meznek indicated he would write the report and present it to the Board.

Calote said the most serious recommendation concerns Strategic Planning. The Board has broad goals but no system in place.

Hajas asked if the Board meeting later this evening will be about the seven recommendations. Sezzi responded that it would be about the Commission Concern. Sezzi said there is a facilitator coming in to facilitate this meeting with the Board.

Carrasco-Nungaray asked wouldn’t it be a bold move for the three college Presidents and the Senates to ask that the Chancellor leave now. Calote said the Commission Concern is not about the Chancellor; it is about how the Board understands their role, i.e., if a Board member moves outside of their realm, how should it be handled.

Haines mentioned that it has already been 2 to 3 weeks since we were put on probation and the Board is just now meeting.

Lara Cruz asked if the board would discuss their role at the time they address the Commission Concern. Sezzi responded that at the Board’s ad hoc meeting last week and tonight they (the Board) are going to try to determine what they can and can’t do.

As far as SLOs go and the other recommendations previously given to the college, K. Scott reported that Ventura College did do what we were supposed to do. Regarding the college’s efforts at addressing the Commission’s recommendations, Calote said the Accrediting Commission’s wording wasn’t generous to us but was sufficient. We need to continue to do good work.

* Pertinent committee reports
	+ BRC

Pauley reported that the BRC has instituted subgroups that are reviewing reduction in budget. They are also working to be more specific with the functionality of the subgroups. Keebler said the Board gave them direction as far as planning for FY13, an $8 million reduction district-wide. There is a sense that by doing the $8 million reduction for FY13, if the tax initiative passes, we’ve cut $2 million too much. If the tax initiative fails, then we are $4.2 million short. Ventura College’s portion of the $8 million is $2.5 million.

* + Senate

Sezzi reported that the Senate discussed the core measures of Institutional Effectiveness. Also, they had a presentation from Alma Rodriguez and Daniel Aguailar about the massive changes that are happening in Financial Aid. At the end of each semester, Sezzi will remind faculty how important it is to post their grades quickly.

* + SLO Committee

Gardner reported that the SLO committee finalized Institutional Level Student Learning Outcomes and presented them to the Senate with concerns from one department (English) regarding one of the SLOs. Gardner said the committee is expecting Senate to give some final wording for the catalog.

K. Scott mentioned that the college is expecting to purchase TracDat for SLO and Program Review management. TracDac will help end the excessive number of forms. Gardner said from the faculty perspective, it will be a major improvement. Also, it is a web-based program. Keebler said it is a very good program but at the back end, we will have to load it with data. Carrasco-Nungaray asked if it will work at the Student Services level, and K. Scott said it will; we specifically chose a program that would fit what we need it to do, and that includes the services. The other program we considered did not have a component for services. K. Scott stated that TracDat will require a certain amount of training. She also said we are waiting to hear from Moorpark College because if they also want to purchase it, we will get a better deal. Nungaray asked if it is tied into the budget allocation form and K. Scott said it is.

1. Action Items
2. Approval of Minutes: January 25, 2012 – Carrasco motioned to approve the minutes, Pauley seconded with one abstention.
3. Core Indicators of Effectiveness/”Framework for Student Success”

K. Scott stated that when the accrediting team was here, they asked us how we know when we are effective as an institution, and we had four different answers. K. Scott said we must have core indicators.

Sezzi handed out a draft of the Ventura College Core Indicators of Effectiveness. Sezzi reported that the Senate, at its last meeting, decided to go with the Bakersfield core indicators that were handed out at the previous College Planning Council meeting and make changes accordingly. The Senate made the changes more specific to our college.

Calote asked about #8 (FTES/FTEF Productivity Ratio). She would like to remove “to meet or be lesser than.”

Callahan mentioned that there are no success rates on the list, and Sezzi said the Senate wanted to go only with retention.

Carrasco-Nungaray said she would like to see some type of text referring to Student Services. Calote mentioned that there seem to be some inconsistencies, i.e., #10 (GE Institutional Learning Outcomes) doesn’t fit the pattern of the other core indicators. K. Scott and Sezzi will relook at the document. It will also need to go back to the Senate. If possible, it will be revised and sent out to the committee before the next meeting. Ultimately, the CPC will need to vote on it.

Carrasco- Nungaray asked what type of survey we will use to measure student satisfaction. K. Scott responded that we are planning to administer the CCSSE this semester and also could consider putting together an internal survey in the future. It was suggested that the phase “on both instructional and student support services) be included after the “surveys administered at VC.”

Calote mentioned that it seems odd not to have student success in the core indicators. Gardner said the difficulty is in setting the goal. K. Scott noted that student success needs to be included because it is the other side of retention. Both need to be considered.

Further in relation to student success, K. Scott reported on the Title V grant proposal that is being submitted soon. She discussed the hours spent with the grant consultant, who advised the college to focus on transfer instead of institutional effectiveness because it would make the proposal more competitive in what is expected to be a very tough competition. The intention is to track transfer velocity. Other areas that the grant will focus on will include professional development, supplemental instruction and other support services for key GE courses with low success rates, and additional hours for counseling in the transfer and career center.

P. Munoz noted that our students are having a difficult time transferring right now because of cutbacks at the universities. She said that it would be better to measure students who are eligible for transfer. K. Scott said that we must track things that are easily measurable and asked if this is something Michael Callahan can track.

Carrasco-Nungaray mentioned that we have to be very cognizant of how we are going to measure. The most significant measure of success involves the development of an “ed plan.”

Lange said a lot of it has to do with culture. Just by looking at classes and adding SIs you are not getting to get at the root of why Hispanic students aren’t doing as well. Lange recommends tutoring all the time to her students but she believes that many Hispanics do not use the Tutoring Center.

Scott said whatever is put into the grant needs to have a clear basis for measurement. The grant

Is very competitive this year; only 14 will be awarded nationwide.

Callahan reviewed his chart of success rates in high risk barrier courses.

Lara-Cruz suggested a Transfer Academy.

K. Scott handed out the Tutoring Center Survey. She said there is a very good success rate with Hispanic students at the Tutoring Center; 47% of the students who seek tutoring are Hispanic. Pauley said his students went to the Tutoring Center but were told there wasn’t a tutor available.

1. Discussion Items
* Program review report and process revisions

Sezzi asked if anyone had any comments on the report. It was decided that the committee members will look over the report and discuss at the next CPC meeting. K. Scott wants to address the concerns raised by faculty, administrators, and staff. Sezzi said any changes to Program Review will have to go through Senate. K. Scott said if anyone wants to be on any of the Program Review Subcommittee to let us know.

* Institutional effectiveness data

K.Scott said we will try to bring some data every time we meet.

1. Other

Nothing else was brought up.

1. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37.