1.0 Call to Order and Introduction of Substitutes
None.

2.0 Review of Agenda
Add the decision making cycle discussion.

3.0 Oral Communications
None.

4.0 Management Dialog
None

5.0 Foster Youth Donation/Planning
Dennis reported that a donor has contacted the Foundation and is willing to give a substantial amount of money to start a foster youth support program. There are approximately 100 foster youth on campus and only 17 have made it through the financial aid process or received the Chafee grant. The donor would like to set up a program to help the other 80+ foster youth students through the financial aid process and get them through college. The proposed annual donation is somewhere between $50,000 and $100,000.

Dennis also reported that a donor has offered to buy furniture and computers for the newly opened Veterans Center.

6.0 Second Harvest Update
A number of campus representatives attended the Second Harvest Food Bank Holiday Food Drive kickoff luncheon and reported that the community is coming together to support the annual event. The college is preparing for its involvement, and the Student Senate has ordered barrels. The college goal is 40,000 lbs.

7.0 Accreditation Plans to be Completed
Renee provided an update on the previous accreditation’s self-identified plans. Out of the 49 plans 22 have been completed, eight deferred, and 15 are in progress. Renee stressed
that the college needs to complete the 15 that are in progress and determine if the college is going to abandon the eight that have been deferred due to budget and time constraints. Renee reiterated that 49 are too many and the college needs to be conscious not to do that again in the upcoming self-study.

8.0 Decision Making Cycle
CPC reviewed the latest version of the draft college decision making cycle. CPC members commented that the chart does not reflect the Senate’s role and suggested edits. CPC agreed that once the edits are made the cycle is complete.

9.0 Review of Legislative Staff Visit
Brian thanked all who participated in the visit. Attendees had mixed opinions about the purpose and outcome, but agreed it was good visibility for the college.

10.0 S4C Update
Brian said building the coordination between high schools and community colleges seems obvious but does not always happen. County high school English and math teachers met with college faculty twice last year and there were good discussions about aligning curriculum. Cabrillo English faculty is continuing to meet with local high schools. Wanda said Cabrillo’s Math Department continues to talk about their findings and everyone is beginning to be on the same page. Brian said there was an encouraging first meeting with Foundation representatives to discuss the possibility of fundraising for first year scholarships. Brian also reported on a recent Gates/Hewlitt Foundations conference call, and that is seems as if the two foundations are shifting their focus to k-12/college alignment which fits well with S4C.

11.0 CMP Goal D2a: Classified and Confidential Staffing Overview
Brian began the conversation by summarizing past practices and asked CPC what they felt worked and did not work in the previous processes. CPC had a lengthy discussion about the classified staff prioritization process. Those who supported the process said that the college only went through it twice, and the process was not given enough time to become more efficient. Other felt the process was labor intensive with few results. Comments from the conversation include:

- There is a desire for a much broader dialog about where there are areas of need across campus. There should be a broad shared governing committee. IT is not just about where the positions need to be filled but what is the temperature reading.
- You have to figure out your needs before you figure out reallocation.
- There is a lot of value in looking at some of the college’s processes and reviewing what is done in an efficient and effective way, and look at staffing from there.
- The classified staff prioritization process was at the downturn of funding. People brought forward 65 positions when there was funding for between 4 and 10 positions.
- Reviewing the needs across campus is valuable regardless of the resources.
- The process was labor intensive. Managers were required to give presentations about positions.
- In terms of efficiency how do we re-evaluate considering the time and resources it takes?
- We should take the current processes and start a new one that has a broad representation of campus constituencies that discuss the issues as a group.
- The most difficult conversation is about need where there is no new resources, which department needs the least. Moving resources is really hard.
• The Senate developed the faculty prioritization process by putting together a team who jointly developed a method for analyzing information.
• It would be useful to form teams around critical processes to look at how we do that more effectively and efficiently with the resources we have.
• There are hiring and reduction processes for faculty. We are asking for the same thing for classified. We need to address needs based on what we have.
• There seems to be a desire to minimize this process and make it smaller than it was before, but when you talk about assessing resources you really need to get input from the bottom up in order to assess it. It is very difficult to put together a broad oversight committee without getting information from the bottom up.
• I caution against wanting to minimize this and not gather information in a thorough manner. We need a process and an archive. We need to be able to see patterns.
• I remember the past process as being labor intensive and then not a lot of positions came through, so people felt their work was for naught.
• I would like to see three committees: SPRAC, the Classified Staff Prioritization Committee and a new committee.
• There are differences between assessing faculty and staff workload. Faculty workload is more measureable.
• There needs to be a streamlined process that is not hurried. The committee needs to meet regularly and work collaboratively.

CPC agreed to continue the discussion at its next meeting.

12.0Change Management Discussion
Table due to time constraints

13.0Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.