

MASTER PLANNING – TEAM A

MEETING MINUTES

June 2, 2017

CS 177

Present: Ed Karpp (Chair), Emin Azarian (ASGCC), Roger Bowerman (Guild), Tina Andersen-Wahlberg (Admin), Sevada Chamras (Joint Faculty), Keith Conover (Joint Faculty), Anthony Culpepper (Admin), Andrineh Dilanchian (CSEA), Marc Drescher (Admin), Agnes Eguaras (Administration), Daphne Dionisio (Manager/Confidential), Mike Dulay (Joint Faculty), Colleen Gabrimassih (ASGCC), Glenn Gardner (Joint Faculty), Nancy Getty (Joint Faculty), Lourdes Girardi (Joint Faculty), Eric Hanson (Admin), Emelyn Judge (Joint Faculty), Zohara Kaye (Guild), Deborah Kinley (Admin), Beth Kronbeck (Joint Faculty), Rick Perez (Admin), Alfred Ramirez (Admin), Toni Reyes (Admin), Michael Ritterbrown (Admin), Piper Rooney (Senate), Scott Rubke (Joint Faculty), Liz Russell (Joint Faculty), Paul Schlossman (Admin), Rory Schlueter (Joint Faculty), Monette Tiernan (Joint Faculty), Paul Vera (Joint Faculty), David Viar (Admin), Andy Young (Senate), Jan Young (Joint Faculty), Teyanna Williams (Admin)

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova (CSEA), Troy Davis (Joint Faculty), Sarkis Ghazarian (Joint Faculty), Jon Gold (Joint Faculty), Peter Green (Joint Faculty), Robert Hill (Admin), Michelle Mora (Admin), Narbeh Nazari (CSEA), Elmira Nazaryan (Admin), Deborah Robiglio (Joint Faculty), Pamela Rosas (CSEA), Jan Swinton (Admin),

Guest: Meg Chil-Gevorkyan, Connie Lantz, Andra Verstrate

Quorum: 35/47 Voting Members

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by Ed Karpp at approximately 1:00 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes:**

- I. The Minutes of May 12, 2017 were reviewed.
  - a. ***It was MSC (Schlueter/Dulay) that the Minutes from May 12, 2017 be approved.***

**Old Business:**

- II. Review of Strengths and Weaknesses
  - a. Team A discussed internal strengths and weaknesses.
  - b. Strengths Included:
    - i. The college offers options supporting basic skills progress, including fast track Math and English as well as English courses paired with Library courses and contextualized English courses.
    - ii. The college has established CTE pathways through its pathways partnership grants.
    - iii. The college has a potentially strong brand.
    - iv. The Sierra Vista Building will offer a one-stop center for many student services.
    - v. Measure GC provides 320 million dollars which will allow the college to upgrade facilities and infrastructure.
    - vi. The college is working on clarifying pathways for course options leading to certificates, degrees, and transfers.
    - vii. Noncredit offerings are in high demand.

- c. Weaknesses included:
  - i. Placement system and multi-level remedial course sequences may be discouraging students' persistence.
  - ii. We do not offer enough programs/certifications that meet the needs of employers in the community.
  - iii. The college does not offer a lot of online courses and sections or student services relative to some other colleges.
  - iv. Students get the runaround by being sent from one office to another without an integrated system to give correct information to students or are referred to the wrong office.
  - v. Latino and African-American students have weaker outcomes than other student groups, including lower degree and certificate completion.
  - vi. Facilities for Noncredit, including parking, are insufficient.
  - vii. A low number of noncredit students transition to credit although we do get noncredit students taking credit courses.
  - viii. There are too many siloed efforts for recruitment and retention.
  - ix. Classroom space is not conducive to learning.

### **New Business:**

- III. Opportunities and Threats (External)
  - a. Team A broke into groups to identify external opportunities and threats.
  - b. Opportunities include:
    - i. Expansion of community/private partnerships that may provide more CTE opportunities.
    - ii. Increase in dual enrollment partnership.
    - iii. Partnership with local CSU for reverse transfer.
    - iv. Having performance based funding would allow for the possibility for more efficient and effective programs. There is a possibility that it can lead to creativity, motivation, restructuring, etc.
    - v. Utilizing Main Campus resources for Noncredit overflow.
    - vi. Growth of online offerings and services.
    - vii. Incentives for faculty to create innovative ways for online learning.
    - viii. Use of Measure GC funds for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning.
    - ix. There is an opportunity to incorporate competency based education where appropriate.
  - c. Threats included:
    - i. LA Mission Satellite College Campus
    - ii. Promise Programs being implemented by other colleges.
    - iii. Negative/Federal trends affecting enrollment, financial programs, etc.
    - iv. Having a performance based funding situation can limit funding and impact the ability to provide services.
    - v. Lack of basic skills in technology. We should consider offering workshops for students, staff, and faculty.
    - vi. Existing technology infrastructure might not be able to keep up with what we want to do.
    - vii. Anticipated cuts to Pell Grants.
    - viii. Public perception of the value of a Community College education.
    - ix. Other colleges have larger Distance Education offerings.

- IV. Discussion of Structure of Institutional Goals for IMP – Guided Pathways pillars as individual goals or possibly one goal.
  - a. Goals structured around Guided Pathways Pillars as individual goals was determined as the best way to structure the Goals of the Master Plan.
    - 1. Goal 1: Clarify Pathways
    - 2. Goal 2: Enter Pathways
    - 3. Goal 3: Remain on Pathways
    - 4. Goal 4: Ensure Learning
    - 5. Goal 5: Operational Effectiveness
  
- V. Development of Draft Institutional Goals.
  - a. The Team broke into groups to discuss potential Institutional goals for the IMP.

Next Meeting: TBD

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui