

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

**Attendance:** Debbie Brooks, Alex Taber, Carolyn Motokane, Anne Hauscarriague, Rudy Tjiptahadi, Rebecca Mikhail (student representative); Phil Crabill, Eden Quimzon, Linda Armbruster  
Theresa Buck, Dora Contreras-Bright

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 of February 13, 2014  Approval of Minutes of February 27, 2014		<b>Anne Hausecarriague</b> moved to approve the minutes; <b>Rebecca Mikhail</b> seconded the motion; the minutes of February 13, 2014 were unanimously approved.  Approval of Minutes of February 26, 2014 tabled until next meeting
2. Proposal to extend APR deadline to March 24, 2014	Aaron Voelcker brought forward a proposal on behalf of the division deans to extend the APR deadline one extra week, to March 24, 2014.  <u>Rudy Tjiptahadi</u> : Is it too late to extend the deadline since there are a few who have already completed and will not benefit from the extra time?  <u>Rick Adams</u> : The extension won't fix those that will be late anyway, but will help those who could use the extension. -formatting may be an issue for some. The margins of the template are narrow. Technology may be a contributing factor.	<b>Rick Adams</b> moved to extend the deadline of the APR; <b>Linda Armbruster</b> seconded the motion; the Committee approved the extension of the APR deadline to March 24 <sup>th</sup> unanimously.
3. Economics APR Discussion Preparation	Part II, Question 1 – Anne Hauscarriague Part III, Questions 3 & 1 – Carolyn Motokane Part III, Questions 2 & 5 – Phil Crabill Part III, Question 6 – Rudy Tjiptahadi	.
4. Economics APR Discussion with Alex Taber	<b>Part II, Question 1</b> – Anne Hauscarriague  What kind of incentive/resources encourage students to put in 2 for 1 hours of studying?  <u>Alex Taber</u> : This is difficult and I have not been successful. The publisher has a	

resource: myEconLab that comes with the book. Some students are enthusiastic to use that. I have them use it for extra credit. Students are given sample exercises. I emphasize six hours of studying for the three hours spent in class. I ask students to make sure they are prepared and to do the reading prior to class. I also make a point to learn students' names so that they know they might get called on.

### **Part III, Questions 3 & 1 – Carolyn Motokane**

With SAC keeping the Econ 120 and 121 numbering system, will they also change the prerequisite to Math 080?

“The prerequisite was removed when the California State University relaxed this requirement and this change went into effect just prior to the start of the fall 2012 semester. **The data do suggest that having the Math 60 prerequisite in place from fall 2010 to spring 2012 had a positive impact on student success.** As a result (and also for C-ID compatibility reasons) the program will reinstate the Math 80 prerequisite beginning in fall 2014. With the reinstatement of the Math 80 prerequisite beginning in fall 2014, the program will be monitoring these data to see if success rates rebound to their pre-2012 levels.” Does that mean only having Math 60 as a prereq was good or bad? I thought there was a higher success rate with Math 80 as a prereq. Maybe it's a typo?

Alex Taber: Yes, this was a typo. We would be exceeding the requirement by having Math 80 as a prerequisite. We were able to validate Math 80 as a prerequisite, but not Math 60. SAC is trying for Math 60.

Carolyn Motokane: Student might want to shop if SAC has Math 60 validated

Aaron Voelcker: Explained why 60 was not validated and why 80 was.

Alex Taber: We will have to wait until fall 2014 to see what effect the prerequisite of Math 80 has on enrollment.

### **Part III, Questions 2 & 5 – Phil Crabill**

Part III of the Economics APR prominently features removal of the Math 080 prerequisite as a detrimental decision, linking this action with decreased student success in Economics courses and lower retention during the 2012-2013 academic year. In the 2011 APR for Economics, it was suggested that the addition of a Math 080 prerequisite requirement "...decimated Santa Ana College's Economics course offerings during the 2010-2011 academic year" (p.11).

Two-part question: a) Do you foresee any potential negative outcomes when the

Math 080 prerequisite is instituted at SCC in fall 2014? B) Did the department notice an increase in student success and retention rates between the 2009-10 (with no Math 080 prereq) and 2010-11 academic year (after the prereq was instituted) at SCC? If so, it may be beneficial to include statistics from the 2009-10 year in the current report's Student Success Rate and Retention Rate tables.

You wrote that re-instating the Math 080 requirement may increase the success rate, but will it limit the number of students that enroll in Econ courses? Based on enrollments in past semesters when Math 080 was a prerequisite, will you have to reduce sections to accommodate fewer students? We probably should check the correlation between Math 080 prereq. and success in Econ 120, 121.

Alex Taber: From before when Math 080 was introduced there was a reduction of enrollment by 5%. At SAC almost 50% of sections were cancelled, but I don't expect this enrollment behavior. When Math 080 was removed as a prerequisite, the retention rate dropped from somewhere in the low 80s to 74%. I'll go back to 2009 to see the impact on success when Math 080 was introduced as a prerequisite.

### **Part III, Question 6 – Rudy Tjiptahadi**

You mention that very few students pursue degrees in Economics. Do you think the fact that we offer two Economics courses limit the number of students pursuing degrees? Is there any plan or ambition to expand course offerings to more advanced Economics Courses?

Alex Taber: One possibility would be Econ for non-majors which is a micro and macro econ combination course that is not as in-depth. Micro and Macro are typically the ones that are desired by the CSUs and UCs. It may be of no benefit to students in terms of transfer to have more diverse offerings in Economics. I would love to teach intermediate micro and macro Economics courses, but universities would likely force students to retake those courses.

### **What did you think about the process?**

This was a significant improvement over last time.

Part I – Data made it easy and saved time.

Part III – I was unclear of the expectation and it felt a bit open-ended.

Part IV and V – SLO sections were great

Rest – Other sections had little change

<p>5. Report from PIE Committee</p>	<p>Aaron Voelcker delivered an update from the Planning &amp; Institutional Effectiveness Committee.</p> <p><u>Aaron Voelcker</u>: The PIE Committee finalized its prioritization rubric. The Committee will be receiving prioritized lists from VPs (Joint Chairs' List funnels through VP of Academic Affairs) which will be run through the rubric to create one list of priorities for the college. The Committee voted on a process flowchart that shows the process – this is a transitional year so some parts of the official process will not be incorporated until next year (2014-2015) when the model will be fully implemented. The Committee also approved the resource request form that is based on the approved rubric, so requestors will know what to expect from the rubric and what evidence will be expected from them as they put their request forward. The Committee expects less confusion on the next go-around.</p> <p>PIE will be meeting on Wednesday, March 19<sup>th</sup> to scale back the full rubric for the 2014-2015 planning process to suit what is reasonable for this year's process.</p> <p><u>Rick Adams</u>: Questions from College Council</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How is safety going to affect priority? Will it exhaust resources before we get to other items on the list?</li> <li>2. Will this derail our intent to have planning drive budget?</li> </ol>	
<p>6. EMP Midterm Update Template</p>	<p>Aaron Voelcker presented a draft template to collect information regarding progress made on EMP action plans and EMP Goal accomplishment now that we are approaching the half way mark of the 4-year EMP Cycle.</p> <p>Discussion followed:</p> <p><u>Rudy Tjiptahadi</u>: Relative to the goals of action items—that may encourage a long list, as in Student Success, for example.</p> <p><u>Aaron Voelcker</u>: Are you suggesting setting limits or better defining the areas?</p> <p><u>Rudy Tjiptahadi</u>: Yes, could it be the top four goals?</p> <p><u>Aaron Voelcker</u>: I would rather have everything and then discard.</p> <p><u>Debbie Brooks</u>: For the column for Responsible Parties, I would suggest splitting that into two columns, the overseer and the person who does the work.</p> <p><u>Aaron Voelcker</u>: The overseer should do the reporting.</p>	

From the Vice President down:  
Vice President – Deans – Chairs – Faculty  
The responsible party aggregates the data.

Debbie Brooks: The buck stops here method.

Rick Adams: The Dean would ask the Chairs. If the responsible party delegates, do you want who is doing the work or who is ultimately responsible?

Example: Action Item 2B – If the Deans are responsible for reporting; would the Dean ask Chairs for curriculum information, or does the Dean interview Department Chairs and then compile the information?

There is no mechanism for reporting how the work was accomplished.

Debbie Brooks: Is the intent to track the process and results or just results?

Aaron Voelcker: It is a measurement of where we are half way through the process. So, just results.

Rick Adams: Is the Dean the centralized repository of the results?

Aaron Voelcker: We need to be mindful of the impact on how work trickles out. Back to Rudy's original point about the goals of the action items, I would say that we should limit the information.

Rick Adams: You signal what you want by asking for details, if you ask for more robust details you get one type of information or do you just want a snap shot? Scaling is great – it is accomplishing what you want.

Aaron Voelcker: We will generate a report back to the institution as a result of the work of the EMP.

Debbie Brooks: Aaron will decide the purpose of the document.

Aaron Voelcker: I need your help with the development of the next EMP, how lofty should we make the goals? What are we able to accomplish and in what time frame? What activities are going on?

Rudy Tjiptahadi: More like a to-do list?

Aaron Voelcker: In terms of accreditation for the Mid-Term Report. I will

Next meeting: We will re-visit the suggestions for revisions to this template. **Aaron Voelcker** will send a revision to the EMP Committee members.

	need to figure out the level of detail.	
7. APR Feedback question to Joint Chairs		
8. Spring Semester Meetings	March 27 April 24 May 8 May 22	
<b>Next meeting</b>	March 27, 2013, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., E-308	<b>Debbie Brooks</b> moved that the meeting be adjourned; <b>Rudy Tjiptahadi</b> seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.