

**EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE
MINUTES
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2010
10:00 A.M., BOARD ROOM**

Present:	Michael Heumann	Val Rodgers	Suzanne Gretz
	Efrain Silva	Kathy Berry	Frances Beope
	Jose Ruiz (new HUM Chair)	Taylor Ruhl	Dawn Chun
	John Lau	Lianna Zhao	Tina Aguirre
	Travis Gregory		
Absent:	David Drury	David Zielinski	Jan Magno
	Ted Ceasar	Mary Lofgren	Jose Lopez
	Victor Jaime	Toni Pfister	James Patterson
	Jesus Esqueda	Robin Ying	
Guests/Visitors:			
Recorder:	Linda Amidon		

Reports, discussion and action included the following:

- SLO Plan Subcommittee Report: Toni Pfister, Subcommittee Chair, was absent but had submitted the attached report. Kathy Berry reported she had discovered that some SLO sections of the comprehensive program reviews are incomplete.
- Marketing Plan Subcommittee Report: Chair Bill Gay was absent. Efrain presented a draft marketing plan prepared by Bill Gay.
- Facilities Plan Subcommittee Report: Chair John Lau reported that the subcommittee will meet next week. He noted that the facilities plan report is a short list of requests/needs. He expressed concern regarding prioritization of the needs, and acknowledged it would be necessary for the subcommittee to develop a process to evaluate the identified needs.
- Technology Plan (Administrative) Subcommittee Report: Chair Robin Ying was absent; no report given.
- Technology Plan (Instructional) Subcommittee Report: Chair Val Rodgers submitted the attached report. Subcommittee member Dawn Chun provided a brief description of the process used to evaluate and rank the identified instructional technology needs. Val stated that committee primarily looked at the impact upon students in prioritizing the technology needs.
- Professional Development Plan Subcommittee Report: Chair Travis Gregory reported that he had met individually with Ted Ceasar, David Zielinski and James Patterson, and that they would be meeting as a group next week. He expressed confusion with regard to linking professional development with the flex program. Kathy recommended that since flex is negotiable the subcommittee should not consider flex when evaluating the professional development needs. She suggested that the subcommittee mention in its report that it is investigating a flex program.
- Staffing Plan Subcommittee Report: Chair Suzanne Gretz reported that the subcommittee had met twice to evaluate the staffing requests included in both the APRs and CPRs. The subcommittee will continue its review of the staffing needs and complete its report by next week. The subcommittee discovered that many programs did not include staffing needs, and members surmised it was because programs assumed

the positions would not be funded due to budget constraints. Kathy requested that the committee return the program review documents to those programs for which staffing needs had been previously identified (i.e., faculty positions identified and prioritized by the C & I Committee), and that all open positions identified be included in the report. Suzanne explained that in order to go forward a staffing planning process must be in place, and the process will require input from several people.

- Kathy reminded subcommittees that they are to review both the annual and comprehensive program reviews in order to obtain a snapshot of present and future needs. The detailed rationale for future needs in the annual program review are included in the comprehensive program reviews and are backed up with data. To emphasize the need for supporting data, Kathy related the Commission's comments in its evaluation of the self-study regarding the new building: While there was emotional sentiment supporting the need for the building, there was no raw data such as fill rates, space utilization, etc., to support the need.
- The committee discussed the process of prioritizing identified needs. John Lau noted that labor negotiations would be a key to this aspect of the planning process. Kathy described the prioritization process: The Fiscal Planning and Budget Committee would decide, for example, that only the first five items ranked, or identified as "category 1", would be funded, and that nothing below or outside of these categories would be funded due to budget constraints. (The Educational Master Plan defines the categories based on the goals of the college.) In addition to identifying the priorities, the Fiscal Planning and Budget Committee must also define the process for funding, or how to marry funding with priorities, which is the basis for resource allocation.
- An evaluation of the program review and planning process by the committee resulted in the identification of concerns and issues with the program review process, suggestions for addressing those concerns and issues, and questions, which included the following:
 - All comprehensive program reviews must include staffing and facilities needs.
 - Since the CPR authors aren't familiar with construction costs, criteria from expert areas such as business services and human resources are needed.
 - Plan subcommittee reports should be standardized (the Instructional Technology Plan Subcommittee Report format was recommended).
 - Each plan subcommittee should review the plan report generated from the program review Web application and determine if it meets the subcommittee's needs;
 - Should routine costs be included in the annual program review plan reports, since the items are needed to maintain programs?
 - The plan reports should reflect new, one-time expenses.
 - A section should be included in the APR Web application that allows programs to include staffing needs even though positions cannot be funded.
 - Identify short-term and long-term needs in APRs.
 - How to marry faculty needs with staff needs?
 - Data in the plan reports is not organized in a way that can be analyzed;
 - A tremendous step forward has been made in the program review process;
 - Include an evaluation of the process in the plan subcommittee reports that identifies not only issues, concerns and challenges discovered but also improvements and progress made.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. The next meeting will be held February 26, 2010, at which time the committee will receive and review the remaining plan subcommittee reports.