

Educational Plan Subcommittee
East Los Angeles College
Minutes

Tuesday, July 26, 2005

Present: Karen Daar, Anthony Samad, Suzette Morales, Richard Moyer, Daniel Ornelas, Patricia Combes-Brighton, Al Rios, David Beaulieu, Leonor Perez, Dean Athans, Renee Martinez, Dennis Villacorte, Brenda Baity, Aria Razfar, Laura E. Ramirez, Shelia Goldstein, Alison Davis

- I. **Call To Order:** The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Minutes:** M/S/P (D. Beaulieu/A. Rios) to approve the minutes of the June 23, 2005 with the following changes: III--add "formally of" before each "State Chancellor's Office" and "CPEC"; change "Receiver" to LeFevre"; "John" to "Johns"; "Northwest" to "Northwestern"; and "Marquet" to "Marquette". III-d--change "12,000 students" to "12,000 student headcount". IV-a--change "none" to "few". VI--change "groups" to "individuals".
- III. **Linking Budget with Planning:** The committee discussed the need to link budget with planning, particularly since East now has greater access to its budget balance. The District will allow the college to have access to 25% of its 17 million dollar plus balance (to be used by July 1, 2006). The District must approve the use of anything more than the first 2 million dollars. The rest of the balance should be used for only one-time expenses. Faculty and classified salaries are already reflected in the budget, so the money can be used for other college needs. K. Daar, after reviewing the EPSC minutes from the past semester, listed requested items (including establishing online assessment and orientation, increasing computer technicians, increasing number of tutors and other ancillary support mechanisms for students, etc.) as possible EPSC recommendations to EBPAC. The committee further discussed whether or not the EPSC should be the main committee body to make formal educational recommendations to EBPAC.
 - a. R. Martinez informed the committee that East has the highest FTES in the District.
 - b. R. Moyer informed the committee that East is responsible for 19.3% of the District's FTES total.
 - c. L. Perez and B. Baity reminded the committee that at the college's last accreditation, the team recommended for a link to be made between planning and budget. The college needs to send an accreditation report that reflects that East had heeded the recommendation.
 - d. D. Beaulieu stated that the college already has a process in place (albeit informal) linking budget and planning. However, recommendations need to be prioritized with Senate consensus. He explained that many of the previous recommendations to use funds, including faculty hiring and hiring a VP of Student Services, resulted from faculty urging. The

EBPAC budget subcommittee (although not as active within the last year) was in fact prompted by a faculty concerned about finding more money in the budget. Although he agreed that the process should be formalized, he also expressed concern in that by doing so the current makeup of the EPSC may change. He suggested that the EPSC should be a first among equals and drive the discussions that take place in Facilities and Technology planning. He also stated that this is the college's moment, as the budget surplus is some 6 million dollars more than it was last year. The college can now implement already identified needs from many different committees.

e. L. Perez reminded the committee that currently the Technology Plan, Off-Site and Facilities Plan committees make independent presentations to EBPAC, and that EBPAC was before against the idea of having all requests first go through another committee. She suggested that different groups could give a presentation of their requests first to the EPSC as a courtesy, but still directly make requests to EBPAC. She also stated that the committee should consider some kind of priority system for which requests should get funding over others. A formal process is necessary, she explained, because money also needs to be linked to those units who are making Program Review requests every five years.

f. R. Martinez informed the committee that the college already increased funds for Mente, the Learning Center and other learning labs. If the college increases its amount of tutors, the college will also need more facilities. She also reminded the committee that ELAC's Joint Hires Process policy still needs Board approval, and that the college has recently updated its state equipment grant process. She further informed the committee that new positions for computer technicians have already been approved along with two new computer software systems. The library also received an additional \$50,000 for books and resources. She further stated that if the EPSC becomes the main advising body to EBPAC, there must be a way for committees to appeal to EBPAC if they feel that the EPSC is not meeting their requests. She suggested that the college should review the current EBPAC membership and ensure that there is a representative from each planning committee to ensure an alignment of educational matters with facilities. In her opinion, direct presentations from informed bodies to EBPAC would be more effective than presentations from uninformed bodies from the EPSC.

g. R. Moyer stated that when departments reevaluate their curriculum, allowing for supplemental instruction by adding an extra laboratory hour to existing courses (as was done for some Biology and Math courses), Academic Affairs finds the funds to assist in this endeavor. He suggested for those who are involved in a recommendation, to write a proposal that is justifiable and based on retention and success rates before sending the proposal to EBPAC. He also suggested for the President to be consulted in an informal context on how he would prefer to receive his information.

h. D. Beaulieu stated that he believes there is already quite a bit of consensus by the college for supplemental instruction to be expanded, particularly in English (although, he stated, the department is reluctant to just add a laboratory hour to existing courses—students should not be sitting in front of a computer doing grammar exercises, they need to be tutored and practicing their reading and writing.) He reminded the committee that Academic Affairs, particularly Richard Moyer, pushed for supplemental instruction for years. Also, the English department has talked about supplemental instruction for years (although they are not clear on how to proceed), along with quite a bit of discussion from various campus committees, namely the Transfer Committee, Chairs Council, and the Senate discussion on adding advisories (suggestions here on how to proceed were made from various departments and resulted in even further discussion in the Student Success sub-group.) He further suggested that since there is widespread agreement that reforming the college's remediation programs is needed, the college just needs to figure out and propose the best way it can be done.

i. S. Goldstein explained that, in principle, the English department was not opposed to adding an extra hour to their curriculum--as long as other activities beyond just sitting in front of a computer could be performed. She further suggested that perhaps all students who are assessing below the English 60s level could have the option to take an additional class or use the writing center as open entry/open exit.

j. K. Daar suggested that EBPAC is not receiving information regarding educational issues from all committees effectively. For example, the Off-Site Committee, which directly addresses EBPAC, is primarily involved in real estate issues rather than educational matters, so the EPSC needs to make sure that off-site educational issues are also being addressed to EBPAC somehow. She also sees the role of the EPSC is to make general, broader-ranging recommendations that address the educational needs of the entire campus as opposed to departmental-specific requests from individual Program Reviews.

- IV. **Off-Site Education:** K. Daar distributed handouts from two campus workshops regarding the process on how South Gate will become a center. L. Perez briefly outlined the process which starts with a needs study establishing the educational/curriculum goals for the center (the needs study will be based on VTEA research and other employment research methodologies.) The South Gate Center cannot merely be a copy of ELAC, but instead must directly reflect the needs of the community it will service. She also reminded the committee that South Gate still needs an educational plan, and that she will create a template for the South Gate educational plan before it goes to EBPAC (and will keep the EPSC informed on the progress.) Faculty will have an opportunity to give input on the plan and educational goals for the center through scheduled, breakout groups. Also, the Department of Finance needs to approve the methodology used for predicting enrollments for the next five

years at South Gate. Allan Petersen and Associates will assist the college in all of these activities.

- V. **Educational Plan:** K. Daar requested committee members to take the initiative and volunteer to analyze and report on the status of various components of the current educational plan, similarly to how she analyzed components of the plan that involved the Curriculum Committee. She believes that her analysis of each step was helpful as it clearly indicated whether or not the action step was implemented, and allowed for a determination of whether the step should be deleted from or repeated onto the next plan. She cited as an example “Implementation Step 1.5b”. After investigation, she determined that the Counseling department actually had a different concern than what was listed in the plan (as a result, the Catalog will list all NDA courses as credit/no credit options and the step will not be listed again on the next plan.) She will assist D. Beaulieu in forming similar analyses for those action items that list the Academic Senate as the “Lead Organization”. L. Perez also stated that an educational plan should include all actions that need to be addressed, even if they are ongoing items that will always need to be attended to. When an operational process is in place, however, the item then can be dropped from the plan.
- VI. **Student Success:** K. Daar reminded the committee that a more formal structure, including a clearer membership and scheduled meeting times, still needs to be established for the Student Success committee. She and David Beaulieu will contact potential participants who expressed interest in forming a committee as well as those who they feel could also contribute to the committee. The Student Success Committee will be a sub-committee of the EPSC and should meet at least once a month.
- a. L. Perez informed the committee that any non-Senate campus committee must first be approved by EBPAC.
 - b. K. Daar responded that after contacting all interested participants, requesting approval from EBPAC for the new committee will be the next step.
- VII. **SLOs:** K. Daar reported on the Academic Senate’s official stance (as was addressed at this year’s Curriculum Institute) on SLOs being listed in course outlines. The Senate recommends that SLOs not be incorporated into the course outline of record (although it does appear that some colleges are doing this anyway.) At the Curriculum Institute, SLOs were described as an umbrella for various course objectives. Course objectives were viewed as stepping stones to reach outcomes (which may be described as life-monitoring experiences—in which grades are only of one aspect of measurement). K. Daar also distributed to the committee two Senate articles related to assessment and SLOs. D. Beaulieu reported that Mark Drummond’s designee for explaining SLOs will give a presentation to the faculty on Opening Day. After her presentation to all faculty, she will then meet with three different breakout groups of about 25 people each from the Social Sciences, English and Math disciplines. A. Samad reported that, so far, only one person (Lurelean Gaines) has volunteered to work on the Student

Assessment Learning Team (SALT). He informed the committee that it was his understanding that he will receive 60% released time for his position as SLO coordinator and that four other faculty members will get 20% released time for being lead individuals for SALT (both vice-presidents in attendance claimed that the latter figure has not yet been agreed to.)

- a. R. Moyer suggested for Department Chairs to create teams for the Opening Day breakouts.
- b. A. Samad stated that he hoped the presenter will be able to redirect any faculty bias regarding SLOs on Opening Day. In the future, faculty will need to attend many more in-depth workshops on SLOs, as much work still needs to take place in learning how to assess outcomes.

Meeting adjourned 4:30 p.m.
Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Daar
EPSC Co-chair