

**EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE
MINUTES
FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 2009
10:00 A.M., BOARD ROOM**

Present:	Efrain Silva	Becky Green	Melani Guinn
	Taylor Ruhl	Ted Ceasar	Val Rodgers
	Victor Jaime	Jan Magno	Jesus Esqueda
	Frank Rapp	Allyn Leon	Jose Lopez
	David Zielinski	Frances Beope	David Drury
	Kathy Berry		
Absent:	Dawn Chun	Gonzalo Huerta	John Lau
	Mary Lofgren	Lianna Zhao	Melani Guinn
	Michael Heumann	Suzanne Gretz	Tina Aguirre
	Toni Pfister		
Guests/Visitors:			
Recorder:	Linda Amidon		

Reports, discussion and action included the following:

- Part 1/Annual Program Review Subcommittee Reports. Subcommittee Chair reports were provided as follows:
 - Staffing and Compliance: Val Rodgers reported that the subcommittee had met twice, and she submitted a written report on the subcommittee's recommendations, which includes a summary of the program review requests for staffing (see attachment). Generally, the subcommittee recommends: (1) addendums to program reviews to address position reclassifications and position vacancies created by unexpected retirements or resignations of faculty and staff; (2) procedures for merging the EMPC with Academic Senate, Faculty Replacement Committee, Reclassification Committee, and other committees that deal with staffing prioritization, replacements, and reclassification; (3) that decisions for determining actual funding of positions be based on a District fiscal resource allocation plan; (4) procedures for eliminating from a ranking those positions responsible for certain tasks that could be completed by existing staff or tasks that are already included in a job description. Val explained that the subcommittee could not effectively prioritize its recommendations because the criteria to do so does not currently exist. The subcommittee proposed a combination of the Thaw Committee evaluation criteria, the "Ponce Method," and program reviews as sources for development of the evaluation criteria.
 - Professional Development. Ted Ceasar reported that Gonzalo Huerta had developed a prioritization list of the program review requests for professional development, but the subcommittee has not met to review and discuss the data.
 - SLO's. Frank Rapp reported that he and Toni Pfister SLO Coordinator had met, and he submitted their written report (see attachment). The report reflects that while all instructional and non-instructional programs have become engaged in the SLO process this engagement is not reflected in the program reviews. All non-instructional programs have written SLO's and are assessing them; instructional programs have identified SLO's for more than half of all courses. Several instructional programs had requested monies for staff development for SLO's, but no non-instructional programs had requested any. Monies were requested for data management equipment, staff to assist with the assessment process, and staff development. The subcommittee recommends: (1) revision of the SLO section of the program review form with clear instructions for completing it; (2) clear directions for aligning a program's SLO needs for equipment, staff, staff development, etc. with its budget.

- Marketing. Efrain reported that while the subcommittee has not been able to meet, Ted Ceasar wrote a narrative of the program review marketing requests, which Efrain converted to a matrix (see attachment). Three commonalities were noted in the program review requests: brochures, including program information in the class schedule, and program Websites. Efrain will submit the subcommittee's recommendations including costs.
- Facilities and Compliance. The subcommittee membership composition was changed (Allyn Leon replaced Lianna Zhao). The subcommittee plans to meet next week.
- Part 2/Comprehensive Program Review Subcommittee Report. Suzanne Gretz reported that the subcommittee had not completed its review of the program review documents. So far the subcommittee has found very large discrepancies and inconsistencies between Part 1 and Part 2, which it attributes to lack of training. The subcommittee also found that programs either did not include data in the program reviews, or if data was included the trends identified in the data were not represented in the program review. This raised two questions: (1) do the programs have data, and (2) is the data appropriate? The subcommittee's review to date identified that (1) the data provided to programs should be customized to a certain extent, and (2) the review periods (past, future, present) must be defined and clarified in the program review form.
- Budget Section of Part 1 of Program Review. Melani reported that a task force had been established to look at the budget process. Taylor Ruhl questioned the direction given to him by Carlos Fletes Director of Fiscal Services, which was that he could not develop his budget without an approved program review. This issue prompted questions regarding the program review process and recommendations to address the issue. The recommendations included having program managers sign off to acknowledge completion of its program review; having program managers review the program review budgets with their supervisors; having the vice presidents and the president review the program reviews before they are submitted to the EMPC. It was also recommended that programs should not get into fiscal restraint when completing program reviews. Instead programs should determine the educational priorities; that is, identify what programs need, and the funds requested should reflect realistic estimates. It should be up to fiscal planning to determine the funds source. The committee was reminded of the two components of program review: (1) "this is what we need", and (2) "what can we afford for the future (i.e., budget)?"
- Educational Master Plan and Committee. Kathy Berry pointed out the need to address the question, "Why are there a fiscal planning committee and a curriculum instruction committee if the Educational Master Plan Committee prioritizes program requests?" The committee recognized that when it comes to the point of writing the Educational Master Plan, it needs to look at eliminating the old way of doing things and instead consolidate old and new processes. The committee also recognized the need to expand the EMPC to include classified employees and classified managers, and to have adequate representation on the EMPC's various subcommittees. Discussion took place regarding how and when to complete the EMP. It was noted that the EMP must be completed before the budget development process begins; and summarization of the Part 2/Comprehensive Review must also be completed. The SLO deadlines must also be taken into consideration. Suzanne Gretz stated that her mother is a professional writer and she is willing to assist in writing the EMP, either as a volunteer or as a paid consultant.
- Next Meeting. The EMPC will meet next on March 20 at 10:00 a.m. Kathy Berry stated that she would be out of the office that day and asked Jan Magno to chair the meeting.

Adjournment: 11:00 a.m.