

**Minutes of the Education Master Plan Committee Meeting
October 22, 2015
Roberta Tragarz and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

Attendance: Dora Bright, Debra Brooks, Anne Hauscarriague, Anthony Hernandez, Judy Strother, Alex Taber, Rudy Tjptahadi, Aaron Voelcker

Absent: Lynda Armbruster, Leah Freidenrich, Aracely Mora, Roberta Tragarz

Santiago Canyon College
Mission Statement

Santiago Canyon College is an innovative learning community dedicated to intellectual and personal growth. Our purpose is to foster student success and to help students achieve these core outcomes: to learn, act, communicate and think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing an accessible, a transferable, and an engaging education to a diverse community.

| AGENDA ITEM | DISCUSSION | TASKS/FOLLOW-UP |
|---|--|--|
| 1. Approval of Minutes: October 8, 2015 | Corrections – Anthony Hernandez was present and Lynda Armbruster was absent. | Moved by Judy Strothers and seconded by Anthony Hernandez approved with corrections. 6-yes, 0-no, 2 abstentions |
| 2. Collegial Governance Reports | PIE – 2 grants approved to send to College Council; NSF Grant for Biotech and a Juvenile Outreach Grant from the Division of Business & Technical Career Education | |
| 3. EMP Midterm Update | <p>The survey used was presented and Aaron Voelcker walked through the parts and possible responses. The survey was sent twice to both administration and to the Academic Senate governance committees.</p> <p>Recipients were queried about 15 goals and 29 action items.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first set of responses on the 29 action items was – 10 yes, 11 no, 8 undetermined. 2. The second set of responses was – 14 yes, 12 no, 3 undetermined. <p>At first the discussion centered on the rate of response and who had received the survey. When discussion shifted to the comments, the presentation format of the comments made it difficult to follow and the discussion had difficulty focusing. It was therefore determined that the results presentation would be cleaned up and the survey results will be sent to committee members for review with discussion to continue at the next meeting.</p> | <p>Aaron Voelcker will clean up the presentation of the survey results and the comments. He will then send the survey results to committee members for review before the next meeting.</p> <p>All committee members will review the results and be prepared to discuss the following questions at the next meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the survey responses, including comments, and are they providing us with the information necessary to write a response to the accreditation recommendation? 2. If we need to get more information, did this survey function as an adequate tool? If it did, how then do we get more responses or more complete responses? 3. Or, should we re-evaluate and modify the survey and try again? <p>Or, should we try a completely different approach, and if so, what?</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| 4. Accreditation Recommendation #3 Continued | Tabled | |
| 5. APR 2014-2016: panels or “retreat” | <p>Many members gave examples of feedback from faculty who participated in the panel discussions that was both positive and negative. The discussion eventually centered on what is the role of the EMPC. Are we “quality control” or are we a forum for discussion and dispersal of information? Various formats for the next go-around were mentioned and many questions were asked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintaining the same format. 2. Maintaining the same format but adding a panel during flex for those departments and programs that have difficulty with the current scheduling options. 3. Trying a more “retreat” style format either during flex or during the academic semesters. 4. Letting departments and programs that wanted to try a retreat format do so and have those that do not want to do so keep the panel discussion format. 5. Advertising either format to the college community as a whole so that anyone can attend. 6. Should we change the questioning format? Maybe the same questions for everyone? Maybe unstructured questions? 7. Should we change the focus to letting departments and programs pick what they want to discuss? 8. If we tried to have a retreat format during the semester – possibly on Fridays – could attendees and the audience get flex credit for attending? 9. If we tried the retreat format on Fridays would we need to get Academic Senate permission to have meetings outside the approved meeting calendar? 10. Would all committee members need to be present for all meetings if we try a different format that requires longer meetings or Friday meetings. <p>We ran out of time before we ran out of possibilities and we will continue the discussion at our next meeting.</p> | |
| 6. Other | Starting with the next meeting Sylvia Lopez will be a new classified representative to the EMPC | |
| Next meeting | <p>Meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.</p> <p>Thursday, November 12, 2015, 3:00– 5:00 p.m., H-234</p> | Moved by Dora Bright and seconded by Debra Brooks with unanimous approval. |