

**MERRITT COLLEGE**  
**Minutes of the \_\_\_\_\_ CEMPC Meeting**  
**Wednesday, November 14, 2012**

*The mission of Merritt College is to enhance the quality of life in the communities we serve by helping students to attain knowledge, master skills, and develop the appreciation, attitudes and values needed to succeed and participate responsibly in a democratic society.*

*To accomplish its mission the College provides open access to excellent instructional programs and comprehensive support services in a culturally rich, caring and supportive learning environment.*

*Our purpose is to provide opportunities for lifelong learning, contribute to the economic growth of our communities while assisting students to attain degrees and certificates, earn credits to transfer and develop the skills necessary to complete their educational goals.*

Present: Anita M. Black, Chris Grampp, Dr. Eric Gravenberg, Tae-Soon Park, Carlos McLean, Dera Williams, Molly Sealund, Janet Zepel

Guest(s): Dr. Patricia Stanley, Dr. Stacy Thompson, Dr. Gina LaMonica, Ann Elliott, Audrey Trotter, Dr. Bill Love

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>FOLLOW UP/ACTION</b>
<b>I. Approval of Wednesday, November 14, 2012's Agenda</b>	Not addressed.	
<b>II. Approval of Wednesday, Sept. 9, 2012's and Oct. 10, 2012's Minutes</b>	Dr. Gravenberg moved to approve both minutes with minor corrections. Seconded by Carlos McLean.	Approved unanimously.

<p><b>III. Review of CEMPC charge via Shared Governance By-Laws</b></p>	<p>Discussion of whether to include the old language crossed out with changes in order to maintain institutional memory. Proposal to include language to widen language in the charge to include curriculum assessment data. Anita M. Black asked what other committees should be involved in reviewing curriculum assessment data, and it was determined that the Academic Senate, the CDC and potentially the Budget Committee should review this data. The question was raised as to how to boil down the data from individual course assessments so that it can be reviewed in a timely manner. Dr. Thompson said that the process needs to begin within the departments. CEMPC could define an annual goal for program outcomes. Dr. Thompson suggested that CEMPC could set individualized meetings with each program to review with them the data regarding their programs. Dr. Audrey Trotter suggested that the charge of the committee should mirror the charge of the PBI Committee. Discussion of how this subcommittee relates to the District committees.</p> <p>In consideration of the composition of the committee, specifically, the issue of the number of faculty members, Tae-Soon Park needs to meet with the Faculty Senate to get feedback on the changes to the number of faculty on CEMPC, whether to have 3, 4 or 6 faculty members.</p>	<p>Janet Zepel will redraft charge for review for the next meeting so that it could be vetted with Academic Senate, CIC, SLOAC, Budget, Facilities, and CDC.</p> <p>Janet Zepel will send redrafted charge and membership draft to Tae Soon for presentation to Academic Senate.</p> <p>Next CEMPC meeting 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm on Wednesday, December 5, 2012 in R23.</p>
<p><b>IV. Integrated Planning &amp; Budgeting Process – Review Flow Chart</b></p>	<p>Dr. Gravenberg presented the timeline for Phase One of the Campus Integrated Planning. Dr. Gravenberg also suggested that Merritt personnel who serve on District Committees have a structure to meet with the President and the Executive Group. The District Committee timeline was covered on Page 2. Phase Two begins in January with budget work at the college and district level culminating in a preliminary budget submission to the District in April. Phase Three covers the revisions and the eventual adoption of the budget by the Board. Dr. Trotter added that in June a report of accomplishments should be added to the timeline.</p>	<p>Committee unanimously concurred with the Campus Integrated Planning document with the addition of the June report deadline.</p>

<p><b>V. College Program Reviews</b></p> <p><b>a. Review Summaries</b></p> <p><b>1. Instructional</b></p> <p><b>2. Student Services</b></p> <p><b>b. Prioritized Needs from Program Reviews</b></p> <p><b>c. Budget Development</b></p>	<p>Discussion regarding the college wide computer refresh that is funded out of Measure A and the time it has taken to move this order forward. Anita M. Black said that the Technology Committee has reviewed the 3 levels of new computers available, and has chosen the middle level of the desktops available as the best value for the computer labs and the goal is making all the PC desktops in labs identical.</p> <p>Due to time constraints the review of the resource requests was tabled until the next meeting. Anita M. Black asked for suggestions as to how the review could proceed in a timely manner.</p>	
<p><b>VI. Accreditation</b></p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	
<p><b>VII. Other</b></p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	
<p><b>Adjournment</b></p>	<p>Meeting adjourned at 4:59.</p>	