Santiago Canyon College

Education Master Planning Committee Minutes from Meeting on November 12, 2020

<u>Attendance</u>: Elizabeth Arteaga, Cale Crammer, Erika Gutierrez, Nick Ho, Haydeh Kaveh, Jocelyn Montiel, Elaine Pham, Martin Stringer, Roberta Tragarz, Aaron Voelcker Jessica Gilbert (minutes)

CC: Umaimah Memon

Absent: Matthew Cotter, Melissa Shirah

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, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing the following to our diverse community: courses, certificates, and degrees that are accessible, applicable, and engaging.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	TASKS/FOLLOW UP
1. Welcome		
 2. Program Review Conversation: 3:30 – 3:45 – Phil Crabill and Lacy Hedenberg (Counseling) 	 Phil Crabill and Lacy Hedenberg, Counseling Overview: We are very fortunate to be one of those touchstones on campus that just about every student goes through We make contact with students through the onboarding process of matriculation We form activities to assessment to new student orientations for the early welcome program Our central task goes above and beyond developing education plans for students. It's really focused on helping the students clarify what their goals are based on their values, life experiences, and cultural backgrounds We craft a program, an experience in higher education to lead them to their goal 	

 We have comprehensive career development 	
activities for undecided majors	
 We have a Hawks career series that focuses on 	
career exploration not just for undecided majors	
but nonbiased for STEM majors to dive deeper	
into career exploration	
Every student has an abbreviated one to two semester	
plan and a full comprehensive education plan	
whatever their goal is	
We have faculty who are involved in major legislative	
pieces	
 Guided Pathways, Leadership teams, and all of the clouder present groups 	
the development groups	
Common assessment was AB705 and is now rolled into AB1805	
 AB1805 O Working with critical Math-English faculty as ESL 	
 Working with dual enrollment program 	
Phil focuses on specializations such as STEM support	
services	
 Lacy focuses in Honors programs 	
Specialized counseling for:	
 EOPS/CARE 	
 Cal Works 	
o DSPS	
 CAMP -college assistance for migrant programs 	
 Trio programs 	
 For Veterans 	
For STEM	
 Guardian Scholars 	
 Pathways to teaching 	
 UCI STEM Tech program 	
 iCoordinator program 	
 STEM Academy 	
Support of faculty from other disciplines	
Our successes: Two major successes	
 Transition to delivering online counseling 	
 We are now using Cranium Café' 	

 Live chat drop-in/quick question and answer 	
answerFull 45-minute appointments in and online	
setting	
All changes due to AB705 now AB1805	
 Rethink how we are matriculating students 	
 Still utilize online counseling format 	
Long-term vision?	
 Continue to meet the diverse needs of our learners 	
 Expand our online counseling services further through more promotion 	
Expand our reach into the Orange Unified schools being	
heavily involved in the Guided Pathways model	
Rely more on mobile counseling and high traffic areas	
when we are back on campusUtilize social media	
 To see out counseling center moved into a new student 	
services building or to see the center redesigned and	
updated	
 To be more technology ready 	
Need for more full-time counselors	
 13 full-time counseling faculty now 2 regarding data bugg projects 	
 3 reassigned to huge projects Student to counselor ratio is 1 to 1000 	
 Recommendation is 1 to 370 	
 4 to 5 adjunct counselors whose hours have been 	
significantly cut back	
Question: For some students it might actually now for them to	
talk to a counselor. Have you found that you have more student contact now?	
 Demystify what counseling means 	
Being online has been an incredible shift in expanding our	
reach and providing a way that students are using	
technology to get the information they need	
 Yes, definitely want to assume it has increased our numbers 	
 numbers	

	 We ran numbers in mid-April through the end of May – compared to prior years we are getting a lot of traffic through online Wave of the future in how students are choosing to interact Too early to tell to see what final numbers look like. Student behavior may change We want to promote more students to get more comfortable with it We need to identify students who might be slipping through the cracks We are growing for sure, nice and easy Our goal is to change high school behavior Skills continue to be better Utilize technology as a real tool 	
	 Questions: Is our future with Cranium in jeopardy? State changed their endorsement with the Chancellor's office Still negotiating for how Cranium will be used, uncertain at this time Campus level subscriptions will no longer be subsidized or may only be partially subsidized Cares Act dollars are already accounted for if no longer subsidized District has an agreement with Cranium Café through March Question: Is it an economic question on state level? Yes, economic 	
3. Announcements:	None	
4. Reports from Governance Committees:	 Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE): We developed recommendations for Institution Set- Standards and Stretch Goals These are an Accreditation requirement that we report every two years to the ACCJC. We reported the Institution Set-Standards but did not report Stretch Goals 	

	 We are required to set a minimum threshold of performance Recommendations have gone forward to the Academic Senate for review and approval. Once in place they will be what we report to the ACCJC next March. We also voted on refinements to the resource request form Substantively what questions need to be modified, adjusted or removed because either they are not part of the rubric for which points are associated with the resource request or it's just in some instances providing false hope. 	
5. Approval of Minutes:	The Sept. 24, 2020, Oct. 8, 2020, and Oct. 22, 2020 minutes were reviewed and a motion was made to approve.	Aaron moved that the Sept. 24, 2020 minutes be approved. The motion was seconded by Cale. Aaron moved that the Oct. 8, 2020 minutes be approved. The motion was seconded by Barbara. Aaron moved that the Oct. 22, 2020 minutes be approved. The motion was seconded by Cale. All minutes were approved with no abstentions.
6. Program Review Conversations for Spring- survey creation	 We want send out a survey to department chairs to better understand why not they are not participating Approximately 15 have not signed up We want to know what is stopping them and obtain their opinions It is required for Accreditation 3 major components to Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes Assessment Program Review Integrated planning 	

	 Documented process, have facilitated dialogue institution wide Discuss survey this meeting- discuss results in next meeting Question 1: Have you completed the program review for your department? Y/N If the answer is "no" it's the end of the survey If the answer is "yes" then go to question 2 Do you plan to participate in the program review conversations? Y/N If the answer is "no", it's the end of the survey If the answer is "yes", Is there anything we can do to assist you? What obstacles or challenges do you face? When is a good time to reach back out to you? Send survey out through Survey Monkey with read receipts 	Aaron will send draft survey out to committee to provide feedback with a 48-hour window. The modified version will be sent to the department chairs for review after the December meeting.
7. Educational Master Plan Structure Discussion	 We received feedback from the Math department and from the co-chair of Facilities/Technologies committee. Scott James provided feedback through Barbara. Feedback is that it sounds like a good idea but sounds like a lot of work. It may be something to consider for the future but right now we are not looking at it in a favorable light. From the non-credit side we got a positive response as long as we can cut out any part that may be repetitive and reduce some of the work by having just one comprehensive plan then they are all for it. The first time it will be a lot of work but then will get easier over time. Rick Adams on Facilities Committee said it sounds like a great idea but would it work? They are heavily law and 	

8. Other	 Start a conversation with the key players to see if it is feasible To dig deeper, take this to the PIE Committee so that we can ask them these questions at the December meeting The work would still be done in the committees. Can the key actors work together? More work would be done in collaboration and communication. Requires less time to approve so many individual plans None 	Aaron will request this to be added to the PIE agenda for further discussion.
	 regulations driven. He did say if we work together it could work. Rick suggested that a member from Facilities and from the Technology Committee should be on EMPC. Then they will have a voice when we do plan. Make composition of committees more similar. Next plan needs to be in place by spring 2022 Writing component would need to be in place by fall 2021 	

Meeting adjourned: 4:31 p.m.