

**EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE
MINUTES
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2008, 10:00 A.M., ROOM 203**

Present:	Kathy Berry	Tina Aguirre	Frank Rapp
	Victor Jaime	Melani Guinn	Taylor Ruhl
	Gonzalo Huerta	Val Rodgers	Mary Lofgren
	Jose Lopez	Michael Heumann	Ted Ceasar
	John Lau	Lianna Zhao	David Drury
	Frances Beope	David Zielinski	Robin Ying
	Suzanne Gretz		
Absent:	Allyn Leon		
Guests/Visitors:	Bruce Seivertson		
Recorder:	Linda Amidon		

The following discussion and action took place during the meeting:

- Kathy reported on the accrediting team’s preliminary findings regarding the Educational Master Plan, which were provided to Kathy and Dr. Gould in an exit interview, as follows:
 - The team found no benchmarks for program review and no evidence that the process was evaluated.
 - Although the district has identified at least one SLO for approximately 1% of courses offered, the team reminded the district that it is required to have SLO’s identified for 100% of its courses by October 2009.
 - The team found that more integration and benchmarks tied to resource plan with priorities, and an evaluation piece are needed in the Educational Master Plan.
- Kathy distributed a handout, “Sources of Evidence: Examples for Standard II,” and the committee began review of the examples of potential sources of evidence listed for instructional programs. Discussion included identification of data and materials as evidence for each of the following eight items reviewed:
 - 1, 2. Evidence that all instructional offerings are in keeping with the institution’s mission regardless of where and how they are taught: Chancellor’s Office approval of courses.
 3. Evidence of analytical reviews demonstrating that instructional programs are relevant to the interest, needs, goals, and aspirations of the students served by the institution: Data analyzed for program review, student surveys, and review of majors and certificates.
 4. Evidence that students are achieving stated learning outcomes: SLO’s, the ARCC, and VETEA targets.
 5. Evidence that the institution considers how instruction is delivered and how it assesses that delivery is both appropriate and current: Distance Ed evaluations and program review.

6. Evidence of the development of student learning outcomes and strategies for attaining those outcomes at the course, program, certificate and degree level: Revised instructional programs including the Anthropology Major, Multimedia Certificate, Fire Technology Major and Certificate, Disability Service Technician Major and Certificate, and the Journalism Major; and revised student services programs including Financial Aid, ASPIRE, and Adopt-A-High School, and the Probation Workshop. Examples of evidence for item 6 for student services included Financial Aid, ASPIRE, Probation Workshop, Adopt-a-High School.

John Lau, CBO, expressed concern regarding the timing of program review. He stated that if evidence was not needed for budgeting purposes, program review could take place in the summer; if needed for budgeting purposes, the budget process deadline is April 2009.

7. Evidence of assessment of student learning and program outcomes: Kathy stated that Toni Pfister, SLO Coordinator, is working on this.

8. Evidence of assessment of student achievement data: ARCC data which Dawn Chun provided to programs assigned to complete comprehensive program review.

The committee was directed to review the remaining items, review sources of evidence and submit evidence materials to the Academic Services Office.

- The committee reviewed and discussed revisions to the program review template. It was noted that a few items had been proposed for addition to Part 1 of the form since it was first distributed for use by divisions and departments. These additions included New Technology Needs, Technology Modifications/Issues, Student Learning Outcomes, Revisions in Curriculum and Courses.

Revisions proposed by members at today's meeting included replacing "rationale" with "evidence" where noted in the form; requiring justification for all expenses, old and new. John Lau suggested attaching detailed data for new and decreased expenses to the form for the Fiscal and Planning Committee to review. He also noted that data provided to justify new facility needs would be helpful for the modernization project. Another revision suggested – and Kathy noted this was found to be missing from the program review process by the accrediting team – was to add to the form, or to create another form, to include outcome evaluation showing what was funded, etc. (i.e., status). Kathy suggested that the evaluation be tacked on to the program review form; she read aloud from the document, Planning Strategy to Meet the Goal and Objective, and proposed incorporating similar language into the program review evaluation:

"Evaluation:

1. *Did this strategy involve other departments within your division/program?* () Yes () No
If "Yes" please specify: _____
2. *Did this strategy involve other departments outside your division/program* () Yes () No

Check the following that apply:

1. () *Yes, the strategy has been completed. Describe Accomplishments of Above Strategy:*
2. () *Yes, the strategy is in progress. Describe progress made so far (refer to your original description of strategy above):*
3. () *No, the strategy has not begun. Please explain:*
4. () *Yes, additional funds not yet built in budget funding is needed for 09-10 for this strategy"*

Frank Rapp suggested that the program review form committee reconvene to revise the form to incorporate the several changes recommended by the committee.

Suzanne Gretz shared with the committee how the Behavioral and Social Sciences Division is handling SLO's: A report was developed that includes all courses listed by program with the status of the SLO for each course. Kathy suggested attaching such a log of courses to the program review; she stated that Toni Pfister would be discussing this at the January 7, 2009 Student Success Workshop. She reported that a minimum of four SLO's must be identified for each course and program, including categorical programs.

With regard to marketing needs, committee members expressed concern regarding their lack of expertise in marketing; the lack of a marketing budget is also an issue. Kathy stated she would discuss funding for marketing needs at the next Executive Council meeting. Taylor Ruhl reported that Mike Nicholas, new Graphic Arts/Reprographics Coordinator, has met with Dr. Gould about creating a uniform marketing look for the college.

Kathy explained that compliance requirements must be stated for categorical and outside-accredited programs.

- Kathy informed the committee that Dr. Gould has requested a timeline for the entire process be submitted to him by next week. Kathy questioned whether there would be sufficient time to complete the process if resubmission of program review, both annual and comprehensive, was requested by mid January. Following discussion the committee agreed to January 15 as the deadline for program reviews. John Lau noted that if tied to the budget, the budget deadline is April.
- The committee agreed to meet Monday, December 15, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. Preliminary agenda items include review of the timeline, setting meeting dates for January and during the spring semester, and how to get everything done.

Adjournment: 11:38 a.m.