



# IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Minutes**  
**Friday, October 10, 2014**  
**9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.**  
**Board Room**

| Committee Members |                      |   |                        |
|-------------------|----------------------|---|------------------------|
| ✓                 | Tina Aguirre         |   | Todd Finnell           |
| ✓                 | Nicholas Akinkuoye   |   | Bill Gay               |
| ✓                 | Linda Amidon         | ✓ | Daniel Gilison         |
| ✓                 | Trini Argüelles      |   | <i>Rick Goldsberry</i> |
|                   | Craig Blek           | ✓ | Carol Hegarty          |
|                   | Susan Carreon        |   | Michael Heumann        |
| ✓                 | Jose Carrillo        |   | Frank Hoppe            |
|                   | Ted Ceasar, Co-Chair |   | Victor Jaime           |
|                   | David Drury          |   | John Lau               |
| ✓                 | Gaylla Finnell       |   | <i>Jose Lopez</i>      |
|                   |                      |   | <b>Recorder</b>        |
|                   |                      |   | ✓ Carol Cortés-Ramirez |
| Guests            |                      |   |                        |
| ✓                 | Mary Carter          | ✓ | Suellen Gonzalez       |
| ✓                 | Analise Espinoza     | ✓ | Martha Garcia          |

**I. Call To Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Dean E. Silva, Co-Chair.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes for September 26, 2014 were approved unanimously as presented (MSC-S. Lopez/G. Finnell).

**III. Program Review Status Update**

E. Silva reported that Program Review is still running with a few difficulties. There's a problem with the aligning. J. Carrillo stated that there has not been a good turn out to the trainings he has provided. He added that he has been working with individuals that have large amounts of accounts to deal with – lots of manual inputting. L. Amidon stated that in defense to the secretaries, they were trained to input data and not budget accounts. E. Silva asked for an update. L. Amidon reported that all standards are done in the academic areas but she still needs to see where they stand. J. Carrillo reported

that Service Area Program Reviews are about 90% but wasn't sure on Academic Program Reviews.

#### **IV. EMPC Self-Evaluation**

E. Silva presented the working draft of the EMPC Self-Evaluation to the Committee.

The following suggestions were discussed to be included:

Major Committee Accomplishments & Achievements in Past Year: Per T. Aguirre: Revised and updated mission; per G. Finnell: Reviewed and revised Strategic Plan; as an accomplishment: per E. Silva: combined Strategic and Educational Master Plan. G. Finnell added that she could send out the Survey Monkey results from Distance Ed.

Major Obstacles/Problems with Committee Function: per B. McNeece: Lack of participation from both committees.

Recommendations for Improving Committee Process/Efficiency: per N. Akinkuoye: Work on campus committees, evaluate meeting dates and times as to not conflict with faculty.

Review of Goals from Previous Year: N/A

Committee Goals (If Appropriate) for Coming Year: It was discussed on the procedure to formalize EMPC as a Standing Committee. E. Silva will look at the procedure and report back to the Committee. Goal #1: Add statement after mission.

E. Silva stated that a clean copy of the EMPC Self Evaluation will be presented at the next EMPC Meeting.

#### **V. EMPC Mission Statement**

E. Silva asked for volunteers to help draft the EMPC Mission Statement. B. McNeece and J. Carrillo volunteered to work on the draft. E. Silva stated that per V. Jaime, the Vision needs to be linked to an Institutional Goal, which would also include input from the community (Visioning Presentations).

#### **VI. Program Review Frequency**

E. Silva stated that the Program Review is set to be done on an annual basis. There was a discussion to include if it should be done annually instead of a 3-year cycle for effectiveness. N. Akinkuoye shared that in previous areas that he has worked, they were on a 5-year cycle and then continue with a yearly review. C. Hagerty expressed her concerns on the pros and cons on an annual review. She suggested to have a 3 or 5 year review in order to look at the data trend. J. Carrillo stated that the data acquired is supposed to be used to delete/increase programs. D. Gilison expressed his concern over no action being taken on those Program Reviews that have been submitted. T.

Aguirre shared that the ACCJC asked that a review be done every year or every 3-years. We are supposed to re-evaluate Program Review Spring 2017, which will be the true finish of the cycle. She added that maybe then we can see if we can do the review yearly or 3/5 years.

E. Silva stated how we can take the model currently being used in CTE in assisting with Program Review. Discussion followed.

**VII. Other**

Program Review for Service Areas – a discussion followed on the confusion on Service Area Outcomes and Goals and Objectives for data provided for SPOL. There needs to be direction/guidance. T. Aguirre stated that Service Area Outcomes need to be there. N. Akinkuoye added that it all needs to be tied to Institutional Effectiveness. L. Amidon expressed here concern that Service Area Outcomes were not done because the process was changed. A discussion followed to include the reason to have Service Area Outcomes.

**VIII. Next Scheduled Meeting**

Friday, October 31, 2014, at 9:00 a.m., in the Board Room

**IX. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 a.m.