



College Planning Council

MINUTES for Friday, March 10, 2017		10am-12pm	Cravens Multipurpose Room
Members Present:	Joel Kinnamon, Christen Smith, Lisa Soccio, David George, Rick Rawnsley, Maria Jasso, Sarah Fry, Courtney Doussett, Andrew Johnson, Carl Farmer, Linda Emerson, Denise Diamond, Brian Koenig, Lauro Jimenez, Liliana Casas, Nick Meade, Arturo Delgado, John Ramont, Mary Lou Marrujo, Karen Tabor, Jessica Enders, Sheri Willis, Mary Anne Gularte, Pamela Ralston, Annebelle Nery, Lisa Howell, Pam Hunter, Daniel Martinez, Katie Chartier, Lisa Howell, Joseph Aguirre, Robert Holmes		
Members not Present:	Maria Herrera, Amanda Phillips		
Guest(s):	Jeff Larson, Michelle Gonzales, John Spevak, Leslie Young		
Parliamentarian:	Carlos Maldonado		
Recorder:	Julia Breyer		

AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Roll Call: 10:00 am			
2. ACTION ITEMS			
2.1 Approval of February 24, 2017 Minutes			
DISCUSSION	None.		
CONCLUSION	Approved as presented.		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.2 Administrative Procedure 2410: Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (Adoption, Revision, and Deletion) – 2nd Reading			
DISCUSSION	Annebelle Nery motion to approve Administrative Procedure 2410: Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (Adoption, Revision, and Deletion) – 2nd Reading, seconded. There were no changes from the 1 st Reading. There were corrections based on CCLC recommendations.		
CONCLUSION	Motion carries.		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.			
2.3 APO Recommendation: Facilities Master Plan 2003-2015 Evaluation			
DISCUSSION	Annebelle Nery requested this item to be removed from the agenda because this was approved at the February 3, 2017 meeting.		
CONCLUSION	With no objections, the item will be removed from agenda.		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Remove item from agenda.		Julia Breyer	ASAP
2.4 Safety Committee Description – 2nd Reading			
DISCUSSION	Lisa Howell motioned to approve the Safety Committee Description – 2nd Reading, seconded.		

	There was a clarification regarding follow-up on ACT, as well as Dean Maldonado.		
CONCLUSION	Motion carries, unanimously.		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.			
2.5 DSPS Advisory Committee Description – 2nd Reading			
DISCUSSION	<p>Annebelle Nery motioned to approve the DSPS Advisory Committee Description – 2nd Reading, seconded.</p> <p>The committee description changes reflect the current titles and representatives. The changes were completed with DSPS interim director Paul McKinley and Dean Phillips.</p>		
CONCLUSION	Motion carries, unanimously.		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.			
2.6 APO Recommendation: Staff Prioritization Process			
DISCUSSION	<p>Annebelle Nery motioned to approve APO Recommendation: Staff Prioritization Process, seconded.</p> <p>The Prioritization Committee for the staff process had met regularly in the fall and spring. The size of the Staff Prioritization Committee is the same size as the Faculty Prioritization Committee of 12: 6 leadership appointed by the President, 4 faculty including the faculty co-chair, and 2 classified staff. The prioritization chart outlines the process. The process begins with the PRU then to the programs/depts., deans, VPs, the Staff Prioritization Committee, and finally the President. The committee will only prioritized the high lists from the VPs.</p> <p>President Kinnamon expressed his appreciation for the workgroup who developed the prioritization process.</p> <p>VP Howell motioned to amend the recommendations, seconded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strike out “classified staff” in Item #2. The Budget Subcommittee’s general role is to estimate revenue projections for the upcoming year to determine total funds available to be considered, including staff positions. • From the experience of the Faculty Prioritization Committee, Christen Smith recommends to have a faculty member from each of the five schools on the committee. The membership includes only four faculty. This omits one school. It creates a lot of suspicious if one school does not do as well as the others. The five faculty on the Faculty Prioritization Committee are defined and does not allow members to be selected from the schools. The current process includes a pre-meeting to clarify expectations and the members’ roles. It is understood that each member is reviewing the needs of the college and not representing a particular school/area. The assessment of the 		

	<p>Faculty Prioritization Committee is underway. This is a recommendation for the next cycle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item #8: Once the committee has prioritized the staff list, CPC will have an opportunity to see the high, medium and low lists from the executive units. <p>With no objections, the amendment carries.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Motion carries, unanimously.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.		
2.7 APO Recommendation: Equipment Prioritization Process		
DISCUSSION	<p>Annebelle Nery motioned to approve APO Recommendation: Equipment Prioritization Process, seconded.</p> <p>Both the Staff and Equipment Prioritization recommendations came out of APO's pervious recommendations for the PIE Handbook. There were not many changes due to the timeline. APO's Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Equipment Prioritization to occur after Perkins funding announcement. This allows the list to be clean up after Perkins for Equipment Prioritization. For 2017-18, the college to consider an allocation model at the executive level for funding equipment needs. If recommendation #2 is not considered, each areas submit a finite number or dollar amount of equipment requests. The list has gone from 100 to 500. This is not a reasonable amount of requests to organize. The workgroup will reconvene in the fall. The make-up of the workgroup may change and will be determined then. <p>The high lists are prioritized into high, medium, and low. Clickers will be used. The committee are the Executive leadership, deans, Senate executive, department chairs, and one classified staff (appointed by CSEA).</p> <p>Definitions ranking High, Medium and Low:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High are usually safety standards or items needed to teach course Medium are items that will improve programs Low are items the course/programs can do without 	
CONCLUSION	Motion carries, unanimously.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Send definitions of High, Medium and Low to faculty.	VP Nery	
2.8 EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs Advisory Committee Description – 1st Reading		
DISCUSSION	<p>VP Nery motioned to approve EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs Advisory Committee Description – 1st Reading, seconded.</p> <p>The committee description has not changed except for changes made to reflect current titles of positions.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Motion carries, unanimously.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.		
2.9 Deactivation of AP 1100 Title – 1st Reading		

DISCUSSION	VP Nery motioned to approve Deactivation of AP 1100 Title – 1st Reading, seconded. There is a board policy which restates AP 1100. This AP is not mandated by CCLC. The request is to reactive AP 1100 Title.		
CONCLUSION	Motion carries, unanimously.		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.			
3. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS			
3.1 BP 1100 The Desert Community College District			
DISCUSSION	Through the review process of board policies, the BP 1100 is an information for CPC review. There are no changes.		
CONCLUSION	None.		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.			
3.2 BP 1300 Legal Authority			
DISCUSSION	BP 1300 is in cycle for review. There are no changes.		
CONCLUSION	None.		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.			
3.3 Educational Master Plan Data Portfolio			
DISCUSSION	<p>VP Ralston sent emails to the college on the Educational Master Plan update. The Collaborative Brain Trust conducted listening sessions and community forum. CBT shared preliminary findings:</p> <p><u>External scan data of the entire Coachella Valley:</u> fast growth rate population, large Hispanic population, medium income household below Riverside County, high percentage of families living below poverty level, graduation rate is higher than county and state averages, high school students are UC and USC unprepared, and capture rates of high school graduates to college</p> <p><u>Labor market analysis:</u> the US Bureau of Labor Statistics is the government agency that collects data from employers. It's the best data for where the jobs are, the medium wages, how many openings, etc. Since 80% of COD students remain in the Coachella Valley, the labor market data focused in the valley. Base on a search of job openings, most occupations require a post-secondary non-degree award (certificate). The registered nurse has the highest job openings. This does not include other occupations such as entrepreneurs. The next steps is to identify the gaps; which programs are we offering and not offering based on the occupations in the valley.</p> <p><u>Internal scan (student and staff):</u> This is data about COD students. FTE growth is not as high as headcount. This is partially due to students enroll in a few classes or non-credit classes. There has been a large increase of Hispanic students. There is a big increase of students living in the east and west valley. COD increased degrees and certificates</p>		

	<p>awarded. Lower success rate in the 19 or younger, retention is really good for 19 or younger and dips for 20-34 year olds. Retention and success by ethnicity is lower for African American and Hispanic students. In the last five years, African American and students identified as other, their retention and success rates have declined.</p> <p><u>EMP survey</u>: 552 responded to the survey. Students represented 30% of the respondents. The survey response can be found on the EMP page on the college website.</p> <p>There were three other surveys conducted with reports: Outcomes and Assessment Committee, Program Advisory Committee, and K-12 consortium. These reports can be found on the EMP page.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Questions and comments should be made to VP Ralston and Mary Lou Marrujo. They will forward the feedback to CBT.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.		
3.4 Strong Workforce Steering Committee Proposal		
DISCUSSION	A clean version was prepared for CPC today however the committee would like to review again. This item is tabled.	
CONCLUSION		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.		
3.5 End Users Data Subcommittee		
DISCUSSION	The subcommittee has taken on the institutional set standards and IEPI goals. The goals will be developed with the Outcomes and Assessment Committee (OAC). They will disperse the information to their schools and gather feedback.	
CONCLUSION	The information will be brought to CPC in April for discussion and feedback.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None.		
4. Adjournment: 11:15am		
Next Meeting: Friday, March 24th, 2017 10:00-12:00 PM		Location: Cravens Multi-Purpose Room