

Educational Master Planning Committee (EMPC)
Friday, October 7, 2011, 9:00 a.m.
Board Room

ATTENDEES

Members:

X	Alfredo Cuellar		Becky Green	X	Bill Gay		Brian McNeece
	Bruce Seivertson	X	Carol Hegarty		Cathy Zazueta	X	Daniel Gilison
	David Drury		David Zielinski		Dawn Chun	X	Trini Arguelles
	Ed Wells	X	Efrain Silva		Rick Castrapel		James Patterson
X	Janis Magno		John Lau		Jose Lopez		Jose Ruiz
	Kathy Berry		Krista Byrd		Kseniya Kareva	X	Rick Castrapel
	Michael Heumann		Rick Goldsberry		Trini Arguelles		Suzanne Gretz
X	Taylor Ruhl	X	Ted Ceasar	X	Terry Norris		Tina Aguirre
X	Todd Finnell	X	Toni Pfister		Travis Gregory		Alberto Izarraraz (ASG)
	Valerie Rodgers		Victor Jaime		Vikki Carr		Jessica Waddell

Guests:

None

Recorder:

Linda Amidon

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Dean Taylor Ruhl, EMPC Co-chair.

AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION

1. Minutes of September 9, 2011, Meeting

- M/S/C Castrapel/Gilison to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2011 EMPC meeting as presented.

2. Establish Committee to Review General Goals

- A committee was established to determine the goals for the next program review planning cycle. Committee members include: Travis Gregory, Dawn Chun, Trini Arguelles, Norma Nunez, Rick Castrapel, Todd Finnell, Terry Norris, and Bruce Seivertson (committee chair).
- The committee is also charged with the following: (a) tie goals and objectives to the Educational Master Plan; (b) look at ways to measure progress; (c) make recommendations to the EMPC.

3. Program Review Training Update

- EMPC Co-chairs are in the process of soliciting volunteers to provide campus-wide training on the annual and program review processes; they currently have two or three possible leads. They hope to report on the status before the end of the month.
- Co-Chair Ruhl proposed that training take place during the last week of October at a Management Council meeting, and that program heads and program secretaries be invited to attend. He asked EMPC members to remind program heads in their areas to begin the prep work for developing their budgets.
- The budget guidelines and applicable data from the Business Office are needed before the annual program review budget process can begin. Although he's resigning, Omar Ramos will be available to prepare the annual program review web application for program heads to enter their budgets.
- SLO Coordinator Toni Pfister asked that training also be provided on how to tie SLOs into comprehensive program reviews.

4. Resource Committee Timeline

- Co-Chair Ruhl reminded members of the role of the resource committees and described the approval process for the Educational Master Plan:

- After completion of annual and comprehensive program reviews, each resource committee reviews all program review reports, prepares a report of its findings, and makes recommendations to the Educational Master Plan Committee for inclusion in the Educational Master Plan.
- The Educational Master Plan is forwarded to the various shared governance groups before it is submitted to the Board for certification.
- Co-Chair Ruhl asked Resource Committee chairs to remind their respective resource committee members of their role and participation on the committee.
- Co-Chair Ruhl reported that College Council approved the Staffing Committee and that membership is pending. EMPC member and Senate Vice President Daniel Gilson reported that Academic Senate discussed the proposal and tabled the item due to certain issues; he anticipates Senate approval at its next meeting.

5. Other Items

- Interim VP of Student Services Jan Magno identified annual assessment of SLOs and Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) as a missing piece in the annual program review process. She noted the need to assess outcomes annually because they tie to annual program review resource requests. VP Magno recommended that all programs review its program data on an annual basis and that SAOs are due annually by September 1.
- Co-Chair Ruhl requested EMPC authorization to include costs for software licenses in the annual program review web application. He related the recent issue concerning the software program, Turnitin: Although several departments use the program, the cost of the software license was not included in the annual program review budget for 2011-2012. Additional issues were identified in the discussion that ensued, including the following, which Co-chair Ruhl will refer back to EMPC at a future meeting.
 - How to determine the program responsible for including the cost in its annual program review budget.
 - How to transition from categorical funding to district funding (Turnitin was purchased with Title 5 ACCESSO grant funds).
 - If software is a long-term commitment, programs need to flag the expense in their program reviews so it becomes a part of the plan.
 - A flaw in the annual program review process is that the district focuses on general fund expenses; the Turnitin software issue is a result of that.
 - Categorical expenses that become operationalized need to be reviewed.
 - If grant-funded items become operationalized, it should be the responsibility of the grant to plan how these expenses will be handled when the grant ends.
 - All programs that use Turnitin should include the expense in their program reviews. Distribution among the programs should be based on percentage of use.
 - Software licenses should be centralized under Information Technology.
 - Need visibility for long-term commitments.
 - There should be a checklist for every grant that addresses areas that need to be communicated to campus, in order to determine how to plan for future commitments.
 - It is more an issue of communication.

6. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 a.m.
- The next meeting: November 18, 2011, 9:00 a.m., Board Room.