Call to Order
Meeting called to order at 1:39 PM.

I. Approval of Agenda
   i. Unanimous consent to discuss the “Food Truck” topic as the first item of unfinished business.
   ii. Change presenter of “Planning and Evaluation Follow-up” topic to Robbie Barker.
   iii. Change presenter of “Recommendation on Student Success Targets” topic to Cristian Martinez Contreras.
   iv. Motion by I. Clarke to approve agenda as amended. Second by S. Atkinson-Alston.
       Approval of agenda by consensus. 
       (Action Item 1)

II. Approval of Minutes (4/28/2014)
   i. Motion by P. Morales to approve minutes as written. Second by J. Lopez.
       Approval of minutes by consensus. 
       (Action Item 2)

III. Public Comment
   i. The CPC acknowledges Dr. Bill Loiterman’s achievement on receiving the Golden Apple Award.
      The award was presented by the Lomita Chamber of Commerce.

IV. Unfinished Business
   A. Food Truck (P. Morales)
      i. P. Morales – A forum was held last week regarding the food truck’s presence on campus. Students on both sides of the issue voiced their opinions. Well attended by Culinary Arts students.
      ii. Pres. Herzek received over 200 written opinions about whether the food truck should remain on campus. In addition to the written comments, 131 checked that they wanted a food truck and 57 were against. The remainder checked both yes and no.
      iii. Many guests are in attendance. Approximately 20 Culinary Arts students and 11 other student guests. The Committee will hear comments from 3 Culinary Students and 3 students in favor of keeping the truck.
      iv. The three Culinary Students to speak were Deseree Majdali, Marissa Silva, and Callan Flowers. They addressed the following topics:
a. Food truck conflicts with lab times, which has led to lowering their production levels. There was not appropriate communication between administrators and the Culinary Department. How is the money earned from the truck being utilized? Feel that the truck’s presence is in violation of the LACCD Board Rules (General Terms and Conditions for using District Facilities). Suggests having the food truck during off-hours only, such as weekends and evenings. First semester students feel that the food truck is interfering with their learning.

v. The three students to speak in favor of the food truck were Gabriel Razo, Bobbie Gibbs, and Nicholas Peralta. They addressed the following topics:
   a. A petition in favor of keeping the food truck has nearly 800 student signatures. Felt that some Culinary Arts students were rude at the forum event. The food truck is meeting a need for increased choice. Some students are dissatisfied with the food and service in the Cafeteria. Food truck owner is willing to donate eight $500 scholarships to LAHC students.

vi. A. Tomlinson – Provided details about the truck. It was here under a 14-day Civic Center Permit, which has now expired. She followed all District policies and procedures. The issue was brought to CPC earlier in the semester. The college must decide whether the food truck will be invited back. Details about the amount of money earned are not yet available. Campus profits from the truck will go into the General Fund.

vii. F. Herzek – LACCD has been exploring options for standardizing food services across all nine campuses.

viii. A conversation regarding the need for better communication between departments. This situation may have been prevented if all parties had adequate information. ASO representatives had not been informed, nor had Culinary Arts.

ix. President Herzek will make the final decision. Our job as educators is to help our students learn from this situation. He asks all interested students to work with ASO in order to comprise, and develop a final proposal that meets the needs of all students.

B. College Prioritization Process (S. McMurray & J. Stanberry)

i. J. Stanbery – We must complete the 2014–2015 Annual Plan. This includes prioritizing each cluster’s “Part D” priorities. Discussion of a proposed motion that he had distributed at the April 28th CPC meeting.

ii. Review of the process utilized in 2012 and 2013. We can utilize one of two strategies: either vote on every priority across the three clusters (long ballot), or vote only the top priorities of each cluster (short ballot).

iii. Comments in favor of using a long ballot included:
   a. The chance to learn about every area of the campus.
   b. The Committee’s responsibility to make planning decisions.
   c. A complete list is needed for the Planning Manual.

iv. Comments in favor of using a short ballot included:
   a. Likelihood of increased participation by voting members.
   b. Reduces the amount of information needed to make an informed decision.
   c. Low priority items will not likely be funded, so why spend the time voting on them?

v. Discussion on how the ballot should be formatted and the type of information included.

vi. Voting members should be allowed one week to submit their ballots.

vii. F. Herzek – Suggests using several priority tiers, which allows all items to be addressed.

viii. Motion by S. Atkinson-Alston to extend the meeting by 30 minutes. Second by C. Diaz. 
Motion approved by consensus. (Action Item 3)

ix. B. Villalobos – Fewer ballot items allows for more meaningful prioritization decisions. It becomes easier to make an informed decision.

x. N. Barakat – Likes the idea of voting only on the top five items from each cluster, but placing all other priorities into tiered categories.
xi. Motion N. Barakat to establish four tiered categories from Part D of the unit plans. The first tier, which will be voted on, will consist of the top five priorities for each cluster. Each additional secondary tier will include the next ten priority items from each cluster. Secondary tiers will not be voted on or ranked at this time. Second by E. Joiner. **Motion approved by consensus.** (Action Item 4)

C. Planning Evaluation Follow-up from February 6th Retreat (Robbie Barker)
   i. Institutional Effectiveness has been evaluating the campus planning process. The findings were synthesized in a 54-page document, which includes recommendations.
   ii. Description of several recommendations.
      a. Although CPC is an important part of the planning process, there is no advisory body that oversees how it plans. Proposes an advisory committee to oversee the planning process for CPC.
      b. Proposes bringing back the President’s Cluster Committee, which was active until 2010.
   iii. R. Barker will send the document to CPC members via email today.
   iv. This item will be added to the CPC agenda for June 2nd. Members should come prepared to ask questions.

V. New Business
   None

VI. Reports
   A. President’s Report
      i. Congratulations to:
         a. Avery Bivinetto and Marco Marufo’s election victory as ASO President and Vice President
         b. Joseph Lopez on his acceptance to CSU Long Beach
         c. Patsy Morales on her acceptance to UC Irvine.

   B. ASO

   C. Special Committees/Task forces
      1. Web Standards
      2. Student Success Umbrella/AtD
         a. Data Sharing Regarding AtD – Due to time constraint, this item will be tabled until the June 2nd meeting.

   D. CPC Standing Committee Reports:
      1. Academic Affairs Cluster Committee
      2. Student Services Cluster Committee
      3. Administrative Services Cluster Committee
      4. Budget Committee
      5. Human Resources Committee
      6. Work Environment Committee
      7. Staff Development Committee
      8. Technology Advisory Committee
      9. Student Success Evidence Committee
         a. Recommendation on Student Success Targets – Due to time constraint, this item will be tabled until the June 2nd meeting.
10. Committees of Academic Senate

VII. Good of the Order

VIII. Adjourn
Meeting adjourned at 3:33 PM.