Minutes-Approved
Senate Business Meeting
September 3, 2013
1:30 pm-3:00 pm E-306

Present:

Senators
Aguilera, Leonor
Carrion, Rudy
Cummins, Shawn
Deeley, Steve
De-la-Cusack, Lisa
Elchlepp, Elizabeth
Freidenrich, Leah
Hovanitz, Eric
Matthews, Evangeline
Mettler, Mary

Non-Voting Members
Nance, Craig
Salcido, Andrew
Sproat, Barbara
Taylor, Michael

Officers
Evett, Corinna (President)
DeCarbo, Michael (Vice President)
Wagner, Joyce (Sec/Treasurer)
Rutan, Craig (Curriculum Chair)

Non-Voting Members
ASG: Blake, Matt

Guests:
James, Scott
Quimzon, Eden
Smith, John
Voelcker, Aaron

Absent:
Deaver, Doug
Frost, Alicia
Shekarabi, Nooshan
Shields, Jolene
Shoro, Natasha

I. Order of the Agenda (no changes)

II. Approval of Minutes
   A. The minutes of the August 21, 2013 Senate Retreat were approved (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Hovanitz).

III. Public Comments
   A. Prof. Smith:
      1. Assembly Bill 955 was taken off suspension. If passed, it would authorize specified community colleges to establish and maintain extension programs offering credit courses during summer and intersession. Students pay the full cost of an extension course.
      2. Please visit FACCC.org to keep current with upcoming legislation.

IV. AS Executive Board Reports
   A. President (Prof. Evett):
      1. Appreciation and Welcome:
         a. Thank you to previous senators for service: Danny Martino, Randy Scott, Jim Isbell, Jim Granitto, Melinda Womack, and Emma Breeden.
         b. Welcome to returning senators.
         c. Welcome to new (and repeat) senators: Mike Taylor, Alicia Frost, Natasha Shoro, and Leah Freidenrich.
d. The new ASG senate representative is ASG Vice President of Senate, Matt Blake.

2. Hiring
a. There were some changes with the Water Utilities faculty position that allowed us to go for a few faculty positions.
   i. Faculty were available and willing to work as early as June this summer. The fact that we have new faculty beginning the week of flex and mid semester is not due to faculty lack of participation. Those who served on the Counselor and Sociology faculty hiring committees should be commended for their efforts and dedication this summer.
   ii. Welcome to Vanessa Jones, our new Mathematics Instructor, and Tiffany Gause, our new Sociologist. Counseling is hoping to have a new hire within a few weeks.

b. Distance Education Coordinator:
   i. Originally, with the dollars that SCC had been promised from the Chancellor and in accordance with last semester’s planning process, SCC was going to go for a classified Distance Ed. Coordinator position.
   ii. SCC did not receive that money but now has the opportunity, with help from the Career Tech Division, to hire a faculty Distance Ed. Coordinator position.
   iii. Prof. Evett, as Academic Senate President, agreed with the change back to a faculty position because of the original discussions in Senate, the fact that the need was validated in last semester’s planning process, and the additional expertise a faculty member would bring in curricular and instruction matters.
   iv. VP Mora and Prof. Evett will be working together to create a job description and flyer. If you have any suggestions, please send them to Prof. Evett.

3. Minutes Mistake
a. Prof. Evett made the following statement “I misspoke during my report to SCC’s Academic Senate at our 7 May 2013 meeting, which culminated in an unintentional misrepresentation of actions taken by the board. In my report, I mentioned the following: ‘In response to a question raised at the board meeting, a lawyer, Mary Dowell, stated that the student trustee is not bound by this [ethics] code.’ Upon reviewing the transcripts from the 6 May 2013 board meeting, it is clear that Ms. Dowell was speaking of the ASG Student President and not the RSCCD Student Trustee. As a result, I, in fact, misheard what Ms. Dowell said and, therefore, inaccurately reported what occurred at the board meeting. Thus, I apologize for my unintentional error, and I will do better to accurately report happenings at the board to you”. The following is a precise account of what transpired at the May 6th board meeting:
   • **Claudia Alvarez**: “What about this “hybrid,” if you will, we have a student body, right, but we have a student trustee as well and he serves as a member of this board, so when this board, including that trustee member as a student, makes a decision, would that trustee member, the student one, still be subject to these rules?
   • **Mary Dowell (MD)**: That’s an interesting question. Is the student trustee bound by the code of ethics of the board? I believe so. The student is there to represent the interest of the students as the trustees are to represent the entire community...but there is probably a reason why the code, in creating the position of the non-voting student board member didn’t say “the ASG student president shall also be a non-voting member of the board.” The student trustee is a trustee of the district and is in a different role than the role of the elected president of the Assoc. Student Government.
   • **John Hanna**: Does that apply also - the Brown Act – not just to do with the non-voting student trustee but any non-voting member of a permanent committee which could be a student trustee - does the Brown Act apply to that person also?
Mary Dowell: The Brown Act will apply to any member of any committee that was created by the board. So, if the board has created an advisory committee, to report back to it even though that committee contains people other than board members, the Brown Act will also apply. The Brown Act also applies to the ASG and the Academic Senate. Those have been specifically determined by the Attorney General.

4. Faculty Forum Follow-Up
   a. Prof. Evett shared with President Vazquez that many faculty feel as though our good nature and willingness to do what needed to be done during the budget crisis is being taken advantage of. Faculty have been very flexible when it comes to planning, budgeting, and scheduling. However, the faculty have concerns when they see what was considered to be a special practice, unique to the budget crisis, becoming common practice—and a poor practice at that. Intersession, scheduling management, and enrolling above class capacities are some specific areas of concern.
   b. President Vazquez appeared to truly hear the message and apologized on behalf of the administration for the way that they approached the intersession topic. He also added that the message of inviting collaboration regarding the intersession topic could have been conveyed better. He explained that at his next Managers’ Meeting, he will have a dedicated discussion regarding collaboration and ways to elicit input from faculty when it comes to planning and scheduling.
   c. President Vazquez also provided some insight as to the position our deans are placed, which gave some context as to why some of them may move ahead more quickly than others: They are a group of those who do, and when a course of action is presented, they begin planning as if it is a done deal so that they are not caught off guard if the plan is enacted. Yet in their exuberance to put their ducks in a row, they sometimes forget that discussions need to be had and that decisions haven’t been made. It important for faculty to understand how managers work so as to improve collaboration and the lines of communication.
   d. Prof. Evett also mentioned to President Vazquez that much of faculty’s frustration with planning and participatory governance could be alleviated if the processes collaboratively agreed upon in the PIE and EM committees are practiced in reality and not just in theory. Furthermore, faculty would also appreciate if administration could deal with issues in a method that encourages collaboration instead of just informing faculty about already reached decisions.
   e. It appeared that faculty concerns were heard and that our administration will make a concerted effort to help alleviate our concerns. However, if after a reasonable amount of time, faculty do not see things moving in a more collaborative direction, the senate will move toward taking further action.
   f. It appears, at this point, that intersession will not be offered in January 2014 and that the district will begin discussions for instituting an intersession for January 2015. Other avenues to capture growth dollars for this academic year will be explored.

5. FARSCCD Report at Faculty Forum
   a. At the Faculty Forum, FARSCCD President Resnick shared Prof. Stew Myers’ difficulties from last semester.
   b. Prof. Evett congratulated FARSCCD on their advocacy and the ultimate positive results their advocacy achieved on behalf of Prof. Myers and agreed that both SCC’s administration and the district’s Human Resources department could have handled Prof. Myers’ situation much better.
   c. However, Prof. Evett felt it is extremely important that faculty be given complete and accurate information to enable them to make informed decisions and take informed action when needed. There were a few subtle but significant details related to Professor Myers’ situation that might not have been clearly understood by those who attended the Faculty Forum.
i. SCC administration did not seek information regarding Professor Myers’ eligibility to teach his classes. An HR employee informed Dean Doughty that Professor Myers was ineligible to teach his courses.

ii. In light of the initial information that was available, at one point, all parties, including HR, SCC Administration, and faculty leadership (SCC Academic Senate President, SAC’s Academic Senate President, and FARSCCD President), questioned Prof. Myers’ eligibility.

iii. For some time, no one party was willing to take responsibility for the situation, so Prof. Myers and Prof. Slager were directed to consult with a variety of people a number of times.

iv. Ultimately, with Prof. Myers’ and Prof. Slager’s diligence and fortitude, combined with FARSCCD’s advocacy and HR’s cooperation, Prof. Myers was deemed eligible to teach his classes.

6. Guest Speaker Note Cards
   a. Since faculty typically hear many updates of happenings from the administration in our participatory governance committees and other meetings, Prof. Evett proposed a different process for senate visits from our SCC President and Vice Presidents this semester. Senators will write questions on note cards that they would like the guests to answer. The guests will be sent the questions before our meeting and will have the freedom to answer those questions that they choose.

B. Secretary/Treasurer (Prof. Wagner):
   1. There is money in the senate conference account.
   2. A revised program review template will be brought to the September 17 Senate meeting.

C. CIC Chair (Prof. Rutan):
   1. At the August 26 CIC meeting, members were trained about the current approval process for stand-alone courses. This process will change in January 2015. New and revised stand-alone courses must then be approved by the Chancellor’s Office. Stand alone courses are those courses that are not directly attached to an approved certificate or degree.
   2. At the September 9 CIC meeting, Scott James will be leading a training about the distance education addendum. In the past, many of these addendums were incomplete, which could be a red flag for the ACCJC.
   3. There will be discussion about prerequisites at the September 9 CIC meeting.

V. ASG Report (Matt Blake)
   A. Please let students know that several ASG positions are still vacant. The ASG senate meets Wednesdays at 3:00 and the General Council meets Thursdays at 3:30. Applications are available in front of A-205. Student applicants will then be interviewed.

VI. Action
   A. Resolution F2013.1: Adoption of Revised SLO Mapping for Degrees and Certificates--First Reading (Prof. Rutan):
      1. SCC currently has a document that maps courses to program award outcomes. However, since assessment data is generated for course outcomes, not courses, and not all outcomes in a course will necessarily relate to a program award outcome, the revised document will map course outcomes to program award outcomes.
      2. Are program outcomes the same as program award outcomes? Not necessarily. A single program could offer multiple awards (degrees, certificates) with various outcomes. Program award outcomes are listed in CurricUNET under the program link.
      3. The revised mapping has been approved by SLOARC and CIC and will be up for a second reading at the September 17 senate meeting.
      4. Moved by Prof. Rutan and seconded by Prof. Nance.
B. Resolution F2013.2: Joint RSCCD Senates Resolution: Adoption of Policy for Temporary Suspension of Courses--First Reading (Prof. Rutan):
1. This policy has been in the works for a while. Thanks to Prof. Rutan and CIC for working in collaboration with SAC.
2. The resolution asks for both senates to jointly adopt a set of procedures for officially suspending courses that are temporarily not going to be offered.
3. There has been some dissention from the administration at SAC.
4. The policy has been revised and no longer requires noting suspensions in the catalogs. A master list of all suspended courses will be compiled by the curriculum offices, and departments are supposed to post their suspended courses on their websites.
5. One motivation for this policy is to prevent a program from being cut by just not offering its courses. Programs should only be cut using the official program discontinuance policy.
6. If the resolution is approved by both senates and the college councils, it should be active by January of 2014
7. Moved by Prof Mettler and seconded by Prof. Hovanitz.

C. Resolution F2013.3: Acceptance of Educational Master Plan Committee Recommended 11 April 2013
Santiago Canyon College Mission Statement--First Reading (Dean Voelcker):
1. The ACCJC requires that the college mission statement be reviewed on a regular cycle.
2. The EMPC was charged with the task and distributed a survey last year. Most respondents reported satisfaction with the mission statement. Some grammatical changes were suggested.
3. How often does it need to be reviewed? The ACCJC doesn’t specifically say, but the cycle of review should match our planning cycle; either 3 or 6 years.
4. A motion was made to waive the first reading since the changes were only grammatical. The motion passed with one nay (moved by Prof. Nance and seconded by Prof. Deeley).
5. The motion to approve resolution F2013.3 was passed without dissent (moved by Prof. Nance and seconded by Prof. Deeley).

VII. Discussion Items
A. Accreditation Committee Restructure (Prof. Rutan):
1. The collegial governance handbook lists an accreditation committee. However, that committee does not meet regularly and has not taken charge of any of the accreditation reports.
2. The current accreditation steering committee has taken charge of the upcoming accreditation report. It is a fairly large committee that does meet regularly.
3. VP Mora has proposed replacing the accreditation committee with a committee that has the same structure of the steering committee that would meet every 6 years.
   a. There seems to be a need for such a committee to meet more regularly to discuss the results of previous visits and to continually prepare for the next report.
   b. One suggestion was to maintain at least the 4 co-chair structure and have them meet once or twice a semester.
   c. Does ACCJC care how we structure an accreditation committee? The commission requires institutional participation, but does not specify how a college chooses to get that participation.
   d. Some colleges give responsibility to the other participatory governance committees to regularly collect evidence and have discussions at their normally scheduled meetings about those accreditation standards that are related to each particular committee.
4. What harm is there to our current method?
   a. The process demands a large time commitment and often the same group of people does (should that be do?) the work each time.
   b. If all the evidence is collected just before the report is due, some evidence may be overlooked.
   c. We want to make sure that we don’t miss responding to any of the ACCJC recommendations.
   d. We are no longer a small college and need to develop structures and policies.
5. Prof. Evett will present a summary of this discussion at the next College Council meeting.
VIII. Reports Discussion

A. Student Success Committee (Prof. Mettler):
   1. The Chancellor mentioned the early alert system in his August e-blast. He expressed concern at the limited usage by faculty.
   2. At their next meeting, the committee will be taking a critical look at the system to determine how it could be improved.
   3. A summary of what is being done at SCC to reach students will be presented to the Chancellor.
   4. Some faculty use alternate methods to alert the students that are at risk of failing.

B. Technology Committee (Scott James):
   1. Work is being done on the distance education policy and the development of a comprehensive distance education handbook for faculty.

C. Website Committee (Prof. DeCarbo):
   1. The website committee meets the 1st Thursdays at 1:00 in U-101.
   2. The website redesign group meets the 1st and 3rd Wednesdays from 1:00-2:00. The location alternates between the district office and SCC. Contact Scott James if you are interested.

D. Summary Reports: Last year, summary reports were requested from committees but not officially required. A resolution to institutionalize these reports will be brought forward at a future senate meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:50 pm.
Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Wagner
SCC-AS Secretary/Treasurer
Resolution F2013.1

Adoption of Revised SLO Mapping for Degrees and Certificates

Moved:
Seconded:

 Whereas, Santiago Canyon College has created Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for all of its courses, degrees, and certificates, and all of these outcomes must be assessed regularly; and

 Whereas, All course level SLOs are already assessed regularly, and those assessments can be used in the assessment of program level outcomes; and

 Whereas, The previous course to program mapping document incorrectly mapped individual courses to the program outcome instead of the course SLOs;

 Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College adopt the “Spring 2013 Program Mapping Outcome to Outcome” mapping document; and

 Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College encourage all departments to complete this new document and submit it to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment by the end of the Fall 2013 semester.

 Date Presented: 3 September 2013
 Date Approved:

 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. (Approved 4/12/2011)
1. Award Program Student Learning Outcomes

A.

B.

C.

D.

E.

F.

G.

2. Mapping for Core/Required Courses of an Award Program

0  **No Contribution:** The curriculum associated with the course Student Learning Outcome (SLO) does not contribute in any way to the students’ ability to exhibit the knowledge/skills associated with the Award Program Student Learning Outcome (APSLO).

1  **Minor Contribution:** The contribution of the curriculum associated with the course SLO to the students’ ability to exhibit the knowledge/skills associated with the APSLO is not explicit but can be inferred.

2  **Moderate Contribution:** The contribution of the curriculum associated with the course SLO to the students’ ability to exhibit the knowledge/skills associated with the APSLO is clear. Data derived from the assessment of the course SLO can be used to measure the achievement of the APSLO.

3  **Major Contribution:** The contribution of the curriculum associated with the course SLO to the students’ ability to exhibit the knowledge/skills associated with the APSLO is explicit and substantial. Data derived from the assessment of the course SLO will be used to measure the achievement of the APSLO.
Utilizing the mapping criteria as your guide to linking course outcomes with program outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core/Required Course</th>
<th>Course SLO</th>
<th>Award Program Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution F2013.2

Joint RSCCD Senates Resolution: Adoption of Policy for Temporary Suspension of Courses

Moved:
Seconded:

Whereas, Recent budget challenges have made it difficult for Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College to schedule all of the courses listed in their college catalogs; and

Whereas, The students of the Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD) have a reasonable expectation that all courses listed in the college catalogs will be offered during a two-year period and should be informed if the courses they need will not be available during that time; and

Whereas, The faculty at Santa Ana and Santiago Canyon Colleges realize that there will be times when some courses cannot be offered for various reasons; there is concern that vital courses may be deleted simply because they have not been scheduled for several years; and

Whereas, There should be guidelines to ensure participation, predictability, parity and consistency in the contraction of course offerings;

Resolved, That the Academic Senates of Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College adopt the Fall 2013 Policy for Temporary Suspension of Courses as recommended by the Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College Curriculum and Instruction Councils; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senates of Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College forward the Fall 2013 Policy for Temporary Suspension of Courses to the College Councils at Santa Ana and Santiago Canyon Colleges for adoption.

Date Presented: 3 September 2013
Date Approved:

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. (Approved 4/12/2011)
Fall 2013 Policy for Temporary Suspension of Courses

The colleges of the Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD) strive to offer a complete schedule of courses that is reflective of all of the items listed in each college’s catalog. Unfortunately, there may be circumstances that do not permit the offering of courses for an extended period of time. In the spirit of participatory governance and recognizing that curriculum is #1 on the “10+1” for which the RSCCD Board of Trustees relies primarily on the advice of the academic senate (BP 2410), it is necessary for the administration to collegially consult with faculty prior to making a decision to suspend the offering of a course.

1. If the administration would like to propose the temporary suspension of a course or courses, the Vice President of Academic Affairs will notify the Senate President and call a meeting with the appropriate dean, and the chairs of any department affected to discuss the proposal and ramifications of suspending the course(s).

2. Either an administrator (Division Dean or Vice President of Academic Affairs) or a discipline faculty (Department Chair or Coordinator) must make a formal request of the college’s Curriculum and Instruction Council to temporarily suspend a course or group of courses in a specific discipline. The following items must be included in the request:
   a. A listing of the course(s) being suspended (Discipline, Course Number, and Title)
   b. A list of degrees and certificates to which each course is attached
   c. A rationale for why each course is being suspended
   d. The projected date when the Curriculum and Instruction Council will review the suspension in order to return the course(s) to active status.
   e. A confirmation that all other required courses for the degrees and certificates listed in 2b will be scheduled while the proposed course(s) is suspended.

3. The Curriculum and Instruction Council will review the request to guarantee that students will be able to complete their chosen program of study without the suspended course(s). If an approved program of study cannot be completed without the proposed course(s), the request for suspension will be denied.

4. If any state approved degree or certificate would drop below 18 units without the proposed course(s) for temporary suspension, then the request will be denied.

5. Once the request is approved, the course(s) will be suspended for up to two years; however, any suspended course may be scheduled at any time during the suspension thus removing it from suspension. A two-year suspension may be extended for one year, for a maximum suspension of three years. After three years, the Curriculum and Instruction Council will decide if the course(s) will be reinstated or permanently removed from the college catalog.

6. Suspension is not allowed for an entire program of study. If an entire program is being considered for suspension, please refer to the Program Discontinuance Policy listed in AR6134.

7. At the beginning of each semester, the Curriculum Office will compile a list of all suspended courses. This list will be distributed to all faculty at the college. Counseling will have this information available so as to inform students and each department will ensure that the courses not available in that department are posted on the department website.
Resolution F2013.3

Acceptance of Educational Master Plan Committee Recommended 11 April 2013 Santiago Canyon College Mission Statement

Moved: Craig Nance
Seconded: Steve Deeley

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) has embedded within its eligibility requirements and accreditation standards that an institution has a statement of mission the defines the institution’s broad educational purpose, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning; and

Whereas, The ACCJC also has embedded within its accreditation standards that an institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary; and

Whereas, The Educational Master Plan Committee (EMPC) was charged with reviewing the Santiago Canyon College mission statement and has performed its due diligence through collecting campus opinion and soliciting recommendations for improvements to the mission statement; and

Whereas, The EMPC has developed a revised mission statement based on recommended improvements gleaned from survey results;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College accept the EMPC recommended 11 April 2013 Santiago Canyon College Mission Statement.

Date Presented: 3 September 2013
Date Approved:

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. (Approved 4/12/2011)
On March 18th, 2013, the Educational Master Planning Committee distributed to all campus constituencies a survey designed to review the Santiago Canyon College (SCC) mission statement. The survey asked respondents the degree to which they agreed with the statement that Santiago Canyon College has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purpose, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. The survey also asked respondents the degree to which they agreed with each of the three statements that collectively compose the Santiago Canyon College mission statement. Survey respondents were also afforded the opportunity to recommend changes to each component of the mission statement.

On April 11th, 2013, the EMPC met at its regular meeting to discuss the results of the mission review survey. The results of the survey show that 90% or more of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with each of the three statements made within the SCC mission statement. Further, upon review of recommended changes offered by survey respondents, the EMPC has drafted a revised SCC mission statement to make the mission statement clearer and grammatically correct.

The following is the current SCC 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. (Approved 4/12/2011)

The revised SCC mission statement recommended by the EMPC is as follows:

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 accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Created 4/11/2013)

It is recommended by the Educational Master Planning Committee that Santiago Canyon College, through the appropriate collegial governance approval process, adopt the revised SCC mission statement created on 11 April 2013.

Approved by EMPC on 11 April 2013