

**Minutes of the Education Master Plan Committee Meeting
February 13, 2014
Roberta Tragarz and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

Attendance: Debbie Brooks, Lynda Armbruster, Alex Taber, Marilyn Flores, Carolyn Motokone, Anne Hauscarriague, Leah Freidenrich, Rudy Tijptahadi, Melinda Womack, Rebecca Mikhail (student representative)

Absent: Rick Adams, Dora Contreras-Bright, Aracely Mora

Guest: Phil Crabill

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. Welcome		
2. Approval of the minutes of December 12, 2013		Debbie Brooks moved to approve the minutes; Rick Adams seconded the motion; the minutes were unanimously approved.
3. Report from Joint Chairs meeting	<p>Roberta and Aaron presented the Program Review template to the Joint Chairs and used Alex Taber's as a model.</p> <p><u>Aaron Voelcker:</u> We will send a survey after receiving the Program Reviews, which are due on March 17, 2014</p> <p><u>Debbie Brooks:</u> I don't believe that a written survey will elicit the response that you need. What I would suggest is that you go to a Joint Chairs meeting and facilitate a discussion about how they found the process after completing the Program Reviews by asking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. What was their biggest challenge? B. How to improve? <p><u>Marilyn Flores:</u> If the Committee will provide me with 2-3 well thought-out questions to stimulate conversation, I will present them at the Joint Chairs meeting.</p> <p><u>Aaron Voelcker:</u> There are some issues with the template and the data:</p>	

- A. There is concern about the data
- B. There is confusion about the data
 - 1) All LHE
 - 2) Full-time
 - 3) Overload
- C. Continuing Education: the non-credit templates were not sent out in November. There was very limited data and what data was available was not informative. Jose Vargas and the non-credit Deans were contacted and asked what kind of data they would like to review. A meeting was scheduled for 3/10/14, in E-208, from 3 – 4:30 p.m. All EMPC members are invited. We will be discussing:
 - A. What do you think of the template?
 - B. Do you see any issues?
 - C. What type of data do you need?

Marilyn Flores: There is a blank template and Alex’s example on the EMP website. Alex’s example sets the gold standard. It is very detailed and of high quality. Do we have another example to post that won’t be as intimidating? I would suggest using a colored font to show “borrowed” material.

Debbie Brooks: Drafts could be marked when posted online. When Departments make revisions, there is concern about access to former templates.

Roberta Tragarz: I have all of the past templates.

Leah Friedenrich: Is the deadline of 3/17/14 a soft deadline? Is Spring break the actual hard deadline?

Aaron Voelcker: The deadline is for compiling data for a report of the information to use for the next cycle.

Debbie Brooks: As a result of intersession being added to the 2013-2014 Academic Calendar, moving the deadline to before Spring Break will panic some of the departments.

Rick Adams: If the Committee is appraised of those departments we can offer additional support.

Debbie Brooks: We can request that the Academic Deans notify the Committee of faculty who are having difficulties and the Committee can reach out to them.

4. DPP Discussion

Aaron Voelcker: In the last meeting for 2013, we asked the EMP Committee members these questions about Department Planning Portfolio:

A. What have you found useful?

B. Should the DPP be built out further to be useful?

We asked you to have conversations and bring feedback to the next meeting so we could develop a set of recommendations to bring to *Taskstream*.

Marilyn Flores: I would suggest that we look at what was produced in the past.

Alex Taber: Rosi Enriquez may have the forms from 10 years ago when she was Academic Senate President.

Debbie Brooks: What is more important SLOs or DPP? People don't understand how they are integrated or how the DPP goals are going to be achieved.

Roberta Tragarz: They are both important.

Aaron Voelcker: We conducted a campus-wide survey addressing Accreditation. One thing we learned was the need to communicate the purpose of our processes and how they are used. We cannot communicate enough. Why do we do this—for planning and improvement.

Melinda Womack: Focusing on the DPPs, when funding is scarce the perception is that you fight for what you have requested in your DPP.

Aaron Volcker: The intent of the document was for good but when there are fiscal issues and no contingency funds, it is seen as a negative. When there two types of needs, one need that has been planned for in the DPP and one need that could not have been anticipated, and only one can be funded, which ones gets the funding?

Debbie Brooks: Some faculty have had their DPP requests go unfunded for eight years because emergency needs took precedence.

Rick Adams: The planning process is disconnected from efficacy. Reframe the DPP to include efficacy because there is no connection between making plans that will come to pass. The conversation we should have is the need to connect the process to efficacy.

Marilyn Flores: The purpose is not clear, the goal, transparency, dialogue, planning process leading to consensus of priorities. Emergency needs shouldn't

Alex will check with **Rosie** to see if she has the DDP forms from the past.

	<p>be part of the DPP. We need a contingency fund for emergencies. There is no other place to put necessities and that is the predicament.</p> <p>DPP -----PIE ----funding</p> <p><u>Aaron Voelcker</u>: Guidelines will help to clarify what to include in the DPP; if not in the DPP, where does the need go? Planned needs shouldn't compete with safety or instructional necessity.</p> <p><u>Debbie Brooks</u>: The Committee needs to reconcile how it should work and how it works in practice.</p> <p><u>Rick Adams</u>: What we are saying is that we need a huge re-set. Do we have a deadline because of Accreditation?</p> <p><u>Aaron Voelcker</u>: This affects how processes and plans are funneled into the planning pieces and into the yearly reports.</p> <p><u>Debbie Brooks</u>: Let's start with what we need for Taskstream and that leads to the DPP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. What do you need to function? B. What do you need to grow? <p>We could change the DPP to feed into Taskstream.</p>	
5. Other	<u>Roberta Tragarz</u> : Alex Taber's Program Review may be sent for review at next meeting.	
Next meeting	February 27, 2014, 3:00 p.m.	Rick Adams moved that the meeting be adjourned; Debbie Brooks seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.