

**COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL (CPC) MEETING MINUTES
 VENTURA COLLEGE
 Wednesday, October 28, 2015
 3:00 - 4:30 p.m.
 MCW-312**

Present: Greg Gillespie – Co-Chair, Alex Kolesnik – Co-Chair, Phillip Briggs, Marian Carrasco Nungaray, Ralph Fernandez, Bill Hart, Grant Jones, Bob Moskowitz, Debbie Newcomb, Robert Sánchez (ASVC), Tim Harrison, Jack Bennett, Patty Wendt, Michael Callahan, Rebecca Russell, Robin Hester, Peter Sezzi, Dan Kumpf, Joanna Ohide (ASVC), Sandra Melton, Lynn Wright, Karen Engelsen, Kathy Schrader, Robin Douglas, Jenifer Cook, Peder Nielsen

Absent: Colleen Coffey, David Bransky, Eric Martinsen, Gwendolyn Lewis-Huddleston, Jay Moore, Kimberly Hoffmans, Mark Pauley, Mary Jones, Pamela Yeagley, Rachel Marchioni, Raeann Koerner, Will Cowen

Recorder: Felicia Torres

Agenda Item		Action Due & By Whom
A. Comments 1. Public	Meeting was called to order @ 3:05 pm No public comments made. Joanna Ohide, ASVC Treasurer, introduced herself and said that she was joining the meeting as a guest.	
B. Action Items 1. Co-Chair	Motion to approve the assignment of Co-Chair Motion to Approve – Bob Seconded – Debbie Motion passes	
2. Approval of minutes – September 30, 2015	Per Debbie, her corrections were forwarded to Felicia; Greg asked that she send them to Laura because she was the recorder at previous meeting. Motion to update and approve minutes for September 30 meeting – Peder Seconded – Lynn Motion passes	

Agenda Item		Action Due & By Whom
<p>3. Approval of SSSP Plan</p>	<p>Karen distributed the “SSSP Plan –Summary” and “SSSP budget comparison/SSSP Funding History” handouts. She briefly explained the information contained in each handout and gave a brief summary. She pointed out the fact that the amount has increased dramatically, but wanted to caution those interested that the SSSP is a student services initiative and pays for activities for new students and struggling students and yet doesn't represent all of the needs of the student. The SSSP plan has very stringent guidelines for how the money is spent and it's important that she put that out there. Karen would like to work with Rick to get the word out to students and would like to have a big campaign to reach evening students, because they need to know what services are out there for them. Karen went on to further explain some of the other line items. She pointed out that “early alert” is the biggest initiative that needs to be worked on. She talked a little bit about the match, because the plans says that we have to demonstrate a portion of what we are spending. Karen did say that the SSSP plan is supposed to follow the best practices plan, but is not sure that this campus is ready to move forward with the plan the way it is. The plan is scheduled to go to the next board meeting on November 20th. Dr. Gillespie briefly explained how CPC reviews these plans to move them forward and wanted to make sure that the committee was clear on how the CPC needs to be involved in the process.</p> <p>Marian asked that there be clarification in the plan in terms of what had been discussed in a meeting within the Student Services department before moving it forward to the Senate. She specifically asked that Karen add and delete the recommendations from the Student Services Division: remove the 5th Counselor Assistant, Add a full-Time Career Center Counselor/Coordinator, and Full-time General Counselor.</p> <p>Motion to approve the plan – Marian Seconded – Peder</p>	

Agenda Item		Action Due & By Whom
	<p>Discussion: Concern was raised, where a member asked, “with us approving, will this create a division amongst the committee and the Senate”, to which Karen stated that she believed the Academic Senate is fine with the concept and she feels that the Academic Senate wanted to see the budget. Marian then thanked Karen for her intent on transparency and feels it’s a good plan and would like to support the approval of the plan, because time is of essence for submitting it to the Senate. Peder then made clear some of his concerns and the problem with it being approved here and possibly not passing the Academic Senate. Marian then called to question.</p> <p>2 Abstentions (??) Motion passes</p>	
<p>4. Approval of Student Equity Plan</p>	<p>Phil distributed the SE timeline handout. He said that the purpose for the areas listed was to look at the areas that are not performing as well as others and closing those gaps. It was noted that some populations on campus are performing better than others and some are not. He said that the state said to plan for a 70% increase in funds for the coming year. Looking at the sheet, the plan is to take those interventions listed on the sheet and fund all of them.</p> <p>Marian stated that there has been some discussion regarding the duplication of effort within the committee and the processes. She also stated that there has been discussions about inequities and concerns with the way the money is being spread out among the groups and that there is the feeling of the need to get on the same page within the different communities.</p> <p>Phil then explain the way the funds were evaluated by the SE committee and where the committee was in the process. He also explained how certain funding efforts were looked at prior to his</p>	

Agenda Item		Action Due & By Whom
	<p>appointment as co-chair and agreed that more conversations need to continue throughout the campus.</p> <p>Other concerns were brought forward and some suggests were made as to how to move forward with the plan in the upcoming year. Tim suggested making a standing action to report out to this committee to review the processes and stated his support of the concerns that were brought forward.</p> <p>The SE plan will be going to the Board for a first reading and there may be changes to it if the BOG has questions.</p> <p>Motion to approve SE plan – Marian Seconded – The tech people, Grant and Rebecca</p> <p>Discussion: Marian moved to approve, call to question</p> <p>2 Abstentions – Peter and Patti Motion passes</p>	
<p>5. Approval of “Making Decisions at Ventura College” Document</p>	<p>Alex gave an update on where the draft is with the Academic Senate. He said that the snapshot of the timeline is that it started in March, during the college forum last year, and based on feedback received, the committee structures had not been changed in the document. Working with the Classified Senate, roles were identified and some modifications were made at the beginning of Fall semester. Tim stated that after discussion they decided that they wanted to go back to the older model. More discussions followed regarding the Making Decisions document, and with guidance from the group they got it to a somewhat workable document.</p> <p>Greg asked that any further changes to the document be sent to Laura to have them incorporated into the document. He would like to have it completed by the Spring semester. Peter asked to clarify</p>	

Agenda Item		Action Due & By Whom
	<p>that the one that we are reviewing includes committee descriptions minus the charges and memberships.</p> <p>Motion to approve Making Decisions, absent the charges of the committees – Peter Seconded – Peder</p> <p>1 Abstention – Patti Motion passes</p>	
<p>C. Discussion Items 1. Committee Reports</p>	<p>Committee Reports:</p> <p>a. <u>Academic Senate</u> – Alex Kolesnik Gave an update on Academic Senate</p> <p>b. <u>Classified Senate</u> – Peder Nielsen Reported that the last meeting was a great meeting. Peder says that he finally has access to inform managers via email regarding Classified Senate information. He said that the process is starting to work better and getting more responses from managers. He announced the upcoming Thanksgiving potluck lunch and is working on finishing the mission statement to have it ready for accreditation. It may be a little late, but it's because it is being redone.</p> <p>c. <u>Accreditation Committee</u> Alex reported that the last meeting was a good meeting. They went through all the standards. The subcommittees are working to get all of their work done and hopefully will have rough draft ready for the committee that will meet during the first week of November. He said that they should be in the final stages to getting a provisional hired to work on the website. This person will work on following the links to make sure things are working well on the website. This person will be here 40 hours per week until the accreditation visit.</p>	

Agenda Item		Action Due & By Whom
	<p>d. <u>Budget Resource Committee</u> – Mark Pauley, Tim Harrison Tim reported that the committee is talking about total cost. He said that they would love for the categorical funding to come with money for infrastructure and it has been a challenge to work through the processes with executing the projects and finding dollars to cover the expenses with the new programs. There are scheduled maintenance projects and there will be a proposal for \$4.3 million in one-time money (unrestricted). A conversation is going on for unrestricted dollars and you may see them reporting out more often. The committee is setting aside \$5 million to replace all doors for a campus-wide lockdown and two-way intercom system. Those are just some of the big items being discussed.</p> <p>e. <u>SLO Committee</u> – Debbie Newcomb Debbie reported that they had a really good meeting and have workgroup creating a newsletter. It will be a great document for accreditation. They will also be launching something with service units and will offer some training in January for TracDat.</p>	
<p>2. Program Review Schedule – CPC Presentations on November 18</p>	<p>Peder expressed his thoughts about the CPC presentations. He asked the committee to consider extending the meeting time and possibly allowing at least 20 minutes per area to give their presentation, because in the past he felt that it was too rushed. He also stated that it's a big deal and there is a lot of money to consider. He suggested maybe using a template that all areas could use to allow the committee to compare apples to apples and to also help them move along more quickly.</p> <p>More discussion regarding the amount of time and how best to present initiatives for consideration was tossed around.</p>	
<p>3. BSI Plan Update – Lynn Wright</p>	<p>Lynn reported that action plans for the next couple of years are in progress. There is an action plan for faculty to go for training that meets the goals of basic skills. These faculty will present the outcomes at the end of the year to increase participation and tutoring. Another idea is to create workshops for all student like</p>	<p>Lynn to send BSI annual planning report for distribution</p>

Agenda Item		Action Due & By Whom
	the model that is used for math students. Lynn will send the electronic plan to Phil to send out to the committee.	to recorder for next meeting.
4. Planning Timeline Revision	Greg reviewed the handout with the committee. The handout was stapled in the wrong order. Looking at the information, he said that it makes more sense to have the process in a timeline at a ten year cycle instead of each 3 years for accreditation purposes and get everything in line with processes moving forward. He asked the committee to review the handout to bring back for a vote at the next meeting, because it needs to get through CPC.	
5. IEPI and PRT Visit – Tuesday, November 2 6. Achieving the Dream Data Summit – Friday, November	IEPI and PRT Visit – Monday, November 2 Achieving the Dream Data Summit – Friday, November 6	
D. Announcements/Information Items		
E. Adjourn	Meeting adjourned @ 4:44 pm	
	Next Meeting: November 18, 2015	