

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

Attendees:

Jan Magno	Jose Ruiz	Robin Ying	Tina Aguirre
John Lau	Kathy Berry	Taylor Ruhl	Val Rodgers

Absent:

David Drury	David Zielinski	Dawn Chun	Efrain Silva	Frances Beope
James Patterson	Jesus Esqueda	Jose Lopez	Lianna Zhao	Mary Lofgren
Michael Heumann	Suzanne Gretz	Ted Ceasar	Toni Pfister	Victor Jaime

Guests:

Gloria Carmona

Recorder:

Linda Amidon

Discussion/Information:

The EMPC evaluated the annual program review (APR) and comprehensive program review (CPR) processes and their effect on the Educational Master Plan. Discussion and recommendations included the following:

- Kathy Berry provided a summarization of the instructional area comprehensive program reviews (CPR) received to date. She related the difficulty she had in determining the staffing and technology needs in the CPR documents. She stated it would be necessary for departments to clearly identify such needs in the future. Kathy also noted that some individuals are unsure of what to do with the data provided for the CPRs. She recommended that expectations regarding the data should be included in the program review forms.
- Jan Magno stated that Carol Lee, Articulation Officer, obtained forms for identifying staffing needs from another college. The forms would serve as a good planning tool for IVC since it is important that staffing needs be incorporated in both APRs and CPRs. She proposed that these forms could be attached to the APRs and CPRs. She explained that the forms quantify the needs specifically. Jan will present the forms for the committee's review at the next meeting. She shared her observation that there is a tendency for department heads to forget about everyday needs when completing the program reviews.
- John Lau, CBO, noted the need to differentiate, in the program review forms, between ongoing operational facilities costs and proposed new facilities needs. Recommendations to address this concern included adding a checkbox to the program review application form to identify an item as an ongoing operational cost, and having the Maintenance Director review the requests to determine actual needs involved with such the requests, such as custodial staff requirements, supplies, etc. John would also like for the plan reports to clearly reflect, for example, a budget for hiring X number of faculty and staff, and a justification for consultant needs. He noted the need for the Director of Fiscal Services to indicate specifically what he needs to see in the program reviews and plan reports.

- Kathy Berry reported that she and the president had contacted Barbara Beno of the ACCJC for clarification of the Commission's evaluation of the October 15, 2009 progress report. She stated that Barbara Beno acknowledged that the Commission should have made a visit to the college shortly after it received IVC's the progress report. Since a visit did not take place, the Commission would make a mid-term visit to the college.
- Describing program review as a continuous quality improvement process, Kathy noted the following:
 - the need to work on the program review forms, e.g., to include another category in the annual program review application for ongoing maintenance or maintenance agreements such as for software license agreements (Kathy related the challenges in locating documentation showing justification for the purchase of software such as Argos, Xtender, DegreeWorks, etc.);
 - the plan subcommittee reports on marketing, professional development, and facilities needs for 2010-2011 have not been submitted; Kathy extended the deadline for submission of all plan reports to April 2, 2010;
 - the EMPC is not ready to update the Educational Master Plan; the EMP is due by the end of March; EMPC members were asked to review the EMP in the meantime.
- John Lau expressed concern regarding whether the Planning & Budget Committee was still equipped to respond to the new planning environment. He noted that labor negotiations would impact the planning process; that the budget would exceed revenue constraints; and that if there's no money, he is struggling to see the point of the planning process. John sought EMPC's advice on how to address these issues. John's observations and concerns prompted discussion among committee members, which included the following statements:
 - the program review process does not take the budget into account; with regard to staffing requests, the Planning & Budget Committee would decide whether to replace instructors;
 - Planning & Budget and program review are two different processes; the Planning & Budget Committee develops the criteria and then looks at the program reviews, while maintaining a global picture; planning committees won't say how to fix the budget or how to negotiate, the President and Board makes those decisions; strategic planning looks at plans;
 - the Commission does not want to see no vision just because the college can't afford it; visioning does not take money; there must be a balance – there's a need for realism but the college must also have a vision;
 - the college's current planning process are a big improvement over previous processes;
 - the Educational Master Plan drives the budget; Planning & Budget Committee would determine what to fund;
 - the program review process would identify new, essential, and ongoing needs; a dialogue box should be added to the program review forms to allow programs to make requests for new needs (i.e., "if there are funds, this is what I need");
- Kathy noted that the reorganizations that take effect July 1 would impact the org assignments in the annual program review application. She discussed the need to establish a subcommittee to review and update the annual program review application beginning in April. Kathy recommended that the staffing budgets (salary and benefits) should be downloaded into the application; members discussed which department should provide this data – Human Resources or Business Services. Jan Magno indicated she would get the staffing forms mentioned earlier from Carol Lee and develop

something for the committee's review. Tina Aguirre recommended that all data needed for departments to begin the program review process next year for 2011-2012 should be provided by September 1, 2010.

- Kathy solicited volunteers to work on the Educational Master Plan update.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 am. The next EMPC meeting will take place April 16, 2010. EMPC members were asked to review the Educational Master Plan in the meantime.