

OXNARD COLLEGE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF PEPC Tuesday, January 26, 2010

2:30 P.M. at President’s Conference Room
Oxnard College Mission Statement

The meeting formally started at 2:45 PM.

In attendance:

Name	Sign In	Department
Erika Endrijonas	X	EVP – Co-Chair
Robert Cabral	X	AS President – Co-Chair
Gwendolyn Lewis Huddleston		Dean
Floyd Martin	X	Dean
Carmen Guerrero	X	Dean
Carolyn Inouye	X	Dean
Ishita Edwards	X	Social Science
Yong Ma	X	Science
Mati Sanchez		Performing Arts
Christine Morla		Fine Arts
Patricia Mendez	X	Child Development
Kim Karkos	X	Child Development Ctr.
Hussein Fahs	X	Math
Mary Pinto-Casillas	X	BUS/CIS/CRM/LA/TV
Paul Houdeshell	X	Fire Tech
Christine Tafoya	X	Dental
Jim Merrill	X	Letters
Jonas Crawford		Athletics
Alex Lynch		Technology
Graciela Tortorelli	X	PE/HED
Ana Maria Valle	X	EOPS

(X – indicates attendance)

Discussion and Approval of the Minutes of the 11/24/09 meeting:

There was a discussion about the committee membership and the minutes of the 11/29/09 meeting prior to the approval of the minutes. Carmen G. suggested that in the membership list next time Gary Morgan should be replaced with Paul Houdesell for Fire Technology, and Television and Child Developments should be added to the membership list. Graciella wanted to know where Athletics fitted. Is this the PEPC or the PEPCI? Last Spring it had been decided that Student Services would have its own review and planning process, therefore this body would conduct the review and planning of the instruction side only. After some discussion it was decided that though according to the shared governance documents Student Services was to be a part of PEPC, the composition of this body was in transition toward PEPCI, and the governing documents would be updated accordingly. Erika: It should be recorded that we decided that the revised document would be the one that would be recorded, and Jim will refer to the revised document in the accreditation report. It was recognized that a separate process needed to be developed for the Administrative and Student Services. The minutes of 11/24/09 were approved. Motion to approve was made by _____, seconded by _____ (Mary Pinto Casillas?)

PEP Report Feedback Process:

Robert Cabral (Academic Senate President) and EVP Dr. Erika Endrijonas explained the PEPR feedback process. Departments may be represented by the Division Deans and the Department Chairs. If the PEP Report was prepared by a faculty, that faculty member could be present as well. According to Young Ma, for the Science PEPR feedback all six of them (I assume she meant Dean, Chair and 4 faculty) showed up. Young said that because of the STEM grant she was happy to have data that showed the number of undecided students at the in the beginning, and how at the end many of these students had transitioned to declared Science major. Ishita Edwards asked Young where she got this data as she would be interested in such data also, and Young said that Dean Floyd Martin had given it to her. During the feedback Robert and Erika may ask questions and seek clarifications, and there would be open dialog. If some revisions are requested, these would be clearly communicated with a deadline for re-submission of the PEPR with the revisions. This process now replaced the dyads and triads of the previous two years. There was some discussion regarding the merits and demerits of this new process as compared to the

process during Darla Cooper's time. Christina Tafoya (who had completed the process for Dental Hygiene in December 2009) said that she found this current process much clearer and easier than the one that was followed in the previous year. Paul Houdesell and Mary Pinto Casillas also indicated that it had been a positive experience since they had been able to get immediate answers to their questions in this dialog. Mary said that since she was not familiar with some of the areas in her department, she brought the discipline faculty with her to the meeting. Robert said that is what Social Science would be doing also. Someone (Dean Carmen Guerrero?) asked about scheduling of feedback meetings and how much time would be assigned to each department or discipline. Robert referred to the schedule from the Social Science department where half hour slots were assigned to specific disciplines within the department. Several available time slots were announced: Feb ? 9-1, Feb 15, Feb 19, Feb 22 and March 2 1-5.

Jim Merrill wanted to know what would follow after the meeting with Erika and Robert. Erika and Robert explained that during the dialog some revisions and changes may be suggested and that it would be requested that the revised PEPR with the resource requests (if there was one) be resubmitted within a deadline. After considering alternatives such as putting the PEP reports on CDs and giving PEPC members the CDs, it was decided that the revised PEPR would then be posted on the PEPC section on the college website. Members of PEPC would review these posted reports. PEPC would meet again on February 9 at 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM and there would be an open discussion about the PEPR. CUDS also had a meeting scheduled for Feb. 9, but CUDS Chair, Mary Jones, would be informed about the urgency of this additional PPC meeting. The PEPC members would then make recommendations. After the discussion, some method of prioritization of the resource request would be decided. (Nothing in my notes about whether or not we decided how the resource requests would be prioritized.) Erika also added that under this process the Departments would be setting their own goals, and PEPC would only be making recommendations. In April-May the process would be completed and “we would close the loop.”

Carmen said that though the Perkins projects had been placed in the PEPC process, these were subject to different rules and standards, and therefore should not be a part of this process. Also, PEPC still need to decide where Television and Child Development belonged, since neither had had to submit PEP reports.

Resource Requests and Hiring Prioritization:

The resource request discussion dovetailed into hiring prioritization. Erika raised the issue that the hiring prioritization that had been made at PEPC in March 2008 and recommended to PBC, should probably be revisited in view of such changed circumstances such as the announcement in May '08 of the transfer of History instructor Scott Corbett to VC. A lively discussion followed as to whether or not the revision of the prioritization list of March 2008 was appropriate, given that it had been determined by the PEPC process. Jim argued that if he suddenly announced his retirement later this Spring, after a prioritization list had been forwarded by PEPC to PBC, should the prioritization list be revised? Had the situation changed so completely that we needed to update the old list? Erika pointed out since in this case Scott had announced his transfer in May 2008, and we were concerned with hiring for the academic year 2010 -2011, it was meaningful to revisit and review that list in view of the new facts. This meant that in the last few years Social Science had lost two History instructors: the late Dr. Sarafian and Scott Corbett and that was a major change. The District was required to maintain its FTO (full time obligation) or face fines from the State. Carmen raised the issue of replacing Gary Morgan in Fire Tech, and Erika explained that that was a different issue and already apportioned for. Carmen also added that in Business the position that opened up when she became a Dean had also not been filled. Erika said that the old list would not be abandoned; it would merely be reviewed, and if it was decided that the new situation merited it being revised, then it would be revisited. Dean Carolyn Inouye added that we should honor the process but recognize the changing circumstances. Dean Martin suggested that we use the dot method that was used last year by PEPC to determine hiring prioritization.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 PM.
(PEPC notes maintained by Ishita Edwards)