

Educational Plan Subcommittee
East Los Angeles College
Minutes

Tuesday, August 23, 2005

Present: Karen Daar, Suzette Morales-Guerra, Richard Moyer, Daniel Ornelas, Al Rios, David Beaulieu, Dean Athans, Renee Martinez, Dennis Villacorte, Kirk Olsen, Aria Razfar, R.C. Williams III, Cathleen Rozadilla

- I. **Call To Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Minutes:** M/S/P (R. Moyer/D. Beaulieu) to approve the minutes of the July 26, 2005.
- III. **Linking Budget with Planning:** The committee agreed that a process linking budget and planning, although not formalized, is already in place for the college. Currently, the process calls for all planning committees to report directly to EBPAC. K. Daar will now regularly attend EBPAC, Technology Plan and Facilities Plan committee meetings (she already attends the Program Review, Validation and Discontinuance committee) to allow more inter-connection among the other planning committees to the Educational Plan, and to ensure that EBPAC will be regularly informed of all EPSC recommendations and activities. All formal EPSC recommendations will first go to the EBPAC Budget sub-committee (an ad hoc group that focuses on financial discussions and is made up of 2 Senate reps, 2 AFT reps, the Vice-Presidents, 1 classified rep, and the fiscal manager). The EBPAC Budget sub-committee serves an educational function in giving financial information that can help expedite a request. Armed with budgetary support, the EPSC will then make formal recommendations to the president. The Vice-Presidents will also inform the President of any potential EPSC recommendations first in Cabinet meetings. The EPSC also discussed the need to create a prioritization system for EPSC recommendations to EBPAC. D. Beaulieu will circulate to the committee a list of educational recommendations (compiled from requests voiced at the Senate, Department Chair, Transfer, Matriculation and other educational committees) that was approved by the Senate in May 2004. K. Daar will circulate the list to the chairs of the main committees associated with the Educational Plan and ask for additional recommendations. She will then circulate a final recommendation list to the EPSC and call for a selection of three items to send to the EBPAC Budget sub-committee.
 - a. R. Martinez reminded the committee that currently there are other budgetary processes in effect at the college, including State Equipment Grants (wherein funds must be used for instruction) and Technology funds (wherein the funds must be used for software and hardware). Departments can also make requests directly to their Deans, and, in the past, often received everything they asked for. The Master Plan, she claims, links to systems that are already in place. She also reminded the committee that EBPAC does not get into Program Review functioning, i.e., checking the

equipment proposals, etc. Program reviews are primarily tools for the Joint Hires committee, State Equipment Grant proposals, VTEA, Deans, Vice-Presidents and other entities to make decisions on funding. She also suggested that all recommendations from the EPSC should be items that impact the entire college and its functioning (such as a degree audit system). Funding for such requests will most likely come from the 100 Budget.

b. D. Athans warned that the EPSC should not micro-manage departments nor impinge on their budgets. He also suggested that the EPSC be similar to the Curriculum Committee in that it should be blind to budgetary constrictions when making its recommendations. Instead, the EPSC can promote those ideas that are considered by the committee to be right things to do as an educational facility.

c. R. Moyer stated that there might be some benefit for departments, when interested in expanding or modifying a program, to also be armed with an endorsement from the EPSC that the request fits with the educational goals of the college. He also stressed that EBPAC may not have time to review the relevance of a recommendation, so it is important for the president to be informed about the recommendation before it goes to EBPAC.

d. K. Daar suggested that the EPSC should concentrate on more broader-ranging topics that affect the entire campus, and that the committee should agree on a philosophical stance on prioritizing recommendations.

e. D. Beaulieu reminded the committee that the college currently has five million dollars to spend on justifiable expenditures, and there is a need to start prioritizing. He also indicated that we are now clear on the process, so there is no need for a parallel structure. The current Educational Plan already has successfully led to the creation of goals and ideas on how to meet those goals including: expanding supplemental instruction (perhaps we need a new facility for that? A one-time expense? Where will it be?); library improvements (according to state staffing recommended levels, the college is way down in that East has only five full-time librarians instead of the recommended number of 10-11); or, as Gonzalo Mendoza suggested at the Technology Plan Sub-Committee, expand student email access and provide software to faculty to create class lists, etc. He also stated that EBPAC is misnamed, as it should be called the President's Advisory Committee or the Shared Governance Committee, for the group does not have time to look into the minutiae of the budget (this is why the EBPAC Budget sub-committee, which normally meets every Monday that EBPAC does not, was created).

e. R.C. Williams III commented that there are a wide variety of types of supplemental instruction, and perhaps the college should do a pilot of each type to determine which works the best.

f. R. Martinez stated that our new researcher could also analyze the data from newly enrolled students to see which types of supplemental instruction is working and increasing retention rates (the Writing Center,

the computers, or perhaps even both?) She also informed the committee that Gonzalo Mendoza recommended to the Technology Plan Subcommittee that the college would benefit from a data-driven software to expedite quickly software and hardware requests from faculty.

g. R. Moyer stated that we already have a model for the benefits of the PLATO system in Biology, which perhaps means a similar program would be useful in chemistry and physics courses. An extra laboratory hour incorporated into a course curriculum could also generate income to support the program, generate WSCH, and allow funding for lab assistants and additional software. He suggested that the college should institutionalize student tutoring.

h. D. Beaulieu added that the Biology program could also serve as a pilot for English since it had been using the supplemental laboratory hour for over three years, but still it is a department-driven prerogative to have control over their curriculum. Besides, there should also be an emphasis on supplemental instruction across the curriculum.

i. R. Martinez informed the committee that the college is also low in the state-recommended number of counselors and technicians. However, in the library, over the last few years, there has been an increase in purchasing. Also, all colleges in the District purchased the software Class Tracks to improve enrollment management.

j. D. Ornelas suggested for the committee to also look at counseling and VTEA support for the Career Center (and job placement). He added, that this is something that impacts success for all students.

IV. **Off-Site Education:** K. Daar, A. Rios, and R. Martinez informed the committee that the process for the application of South Gate to become its own center is halted until a new additional site is purchased (the current South Gate facility's 7-year lease expires in 2009.) R. Martinez stated that the South Gate educational plan should still be created, in parallel efforts with the main campus' Educational Plan, as the intent of the college is to make South Gate a center in the future.

V. **Educational Plan:** The committee reviewed the current educational plan and distributed assignments to review, distribute work (including contacting appropriate parties), and report to the committee on the status of action items listed under Goals 1-4. Assignments are listed below:

Action Items:

- 1.1 K.Daar will contact Shelia Goldstein, Julie Benavides, and Wendy Bass for comments.
- 1.2 Dean Athans, Dennis Villacorte, and Kirk Olsen
- 1.3 Kirk Olsen
- 1.4 Possible deletion
- 1.5 a and c--R.C. Williams III; b--already reviewed and presented to the committee by K. Daar
- 2.1 K.Daar and D. Beaulieu
- 2.2 K. Daar and D. Beaulieu

- 2.3 Richard Moyer
- 2.4 Already reviewed and presented to the committee by K. Daar
- 2.5 K. Daar and D. Beaulieu
- 2.6 R.C. Williams III
- 2.7 R.C. Williams III and Leonor Perez
- 3.1 a, b, d-f--R.C. Williams III will contact Armida Ornelas; c--Kirk Olsen
- 3.2 Cathleen Rozadilla
- 3.3 R.C. Williams III
- 3.4 a-c, h, n--R.C. Williams III; d--R. Martinez; e, g, i, k--D. Beaulieu; f--
Cathleen Rozadilla; j--R.C. Williams III will contact Jeremy Allred; l--K.
Daar will contact Daniel Judge; m--K. Daar will contact Shelia Goldstein;
n-o--R. Moyer and K. Daar
- 4.1 R.C. Williams III
- 4.2 R.C. Williams III
- 4.3 R.C. Williams III
- 4.4 Al Rios
- 4.5 Al Rios

Meeting adjourned 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Daar

EPSC Co-chair