

**Minutes of the Education Master Plan Committee Meeting
April 24, 2014
Roberta Tragarz and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

Attendance: Alex Taber, Rudy Tjiptahadi, Rebecca Mikhail (student representative); Phil Crabill, Eden Quimzon, Linda Armbruster, Dora Contreras-Bright, Melinda Womack, Leah Freidenrich, Carolyn Motokane Marilyn Flores, Anne Hauscarriague, Rick Adams

Guest: Craig Rutan

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 March 27, 2014	Tabled to next meeting.	
2. Physics/Engineering APR Discussion/ Preparation	Questions were reviewed and discussed. Faculty were assigned questions to present to Craig Rutan.	
3. Physics/Engineering APR Discussion with Craig Rutan	<p>Commendations from the Committee members for Physics were read.</p> <p>Part IV, Course Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, Question #1: <i>Regarding course student learning outcomes assessment, you write “Most of our assessment has been centered on determining which students will be successful in subsequent physics courses and in earning a STEM degree. This has caused us to use difficult questions and a higher standard of success than is required to pass the course. This is the reason that our success rates have been lower than our passing rates. The program faculty have been discussing how we might change this current practice to have our outcomes assessment results be more representative of our course achievement data, even though these are two separate measures of students success.” At least one other department has been grappling with similar issues. How do you see the physics program attempting to reconcile these different success rates?/Alex Taber</i></p> <p>Craig’s response: Modified grade scale; major universities curve tests: 60 % pass 75% B 85% A Physics courses are sequential, students must have the skills to be successful at</p>	

the next level. We need to bring students up to the level we want to assess; Supplemental Instruction and the STAR Center have elevated the success level in Physics.

Part VI: **Curriculum and Program Management**, Question #1: *With the replacement of the AS in Physics with the AS-T, are you concerned that the number of those applying for degrees will go down due to students who are applying to universities other than the CSUs?/ Carolyn Motokane*

Craig's response: The numbers of physics degrees awarded has never been high and physics majors will not usually complete general education requirements. But guaranteed admission makes the Associate of Science Transfer Degree appealing.

Question on Part VI and VII, Question #1: *With concern about low enrollments and/or a desire to increase enrollments coupled with difficulty finding lecture room space, have you considered offering a hybrid or online version of some of your classes to boost enrollments and alleviate some of the space challenges?/Linda Armbruster*

Craig's response: Hybrid/online courses in Physics have not been successful.

Commendations from the Committee members for **Engineering** were read.

Part III, Question #1: **Student Achievement Data Analysis**/*What is the status on the articulation of these courses? Realistically, when do you expect to offer these classes? Will you be postponing offering the Engineering courses until articulation is confirmed with all local universities? When can we expect these classes to be offered?/Phil Crabill*

Craig's response: Cal Poly Pomona, CSU Long Beach, CSU Fullerton, San Diego State University and UCI have approved one of the new physics courses. We are starting from scratch and we will not offer these courses until they are articulated, which will cause enrollment drop. A year from now, Fall 2015, the courses will appear in the SCC Catalog.

Part VI, Question #1: **Curriculum and Program Management**/*Do you have any sense of how the introduction of the engineering courses might impact (positively or negatively) enrollments in physics courses or the number of physics degrees awarded? Would students perceive engineering courses as substitutes or complements for physics courses?/Anne Hauscarriague*

	<p>Craig’s response: Engineering courses have physics courses as pre-requisites so that shouldn’t be an issue. In fall 2013, the Physics program began expanding but there is no dedicated classroom for physics. We will also need a dedicated classroom for engineering courses.</p> <p>General, Question #4: <i>What are you anticipating in terms of requested revisions to the course outlines (especially since they were based upon previously articulated courses)?/Leah Freidenrich</i></p> <p>Craig’s response: CSU Long Beach has approved articulation of the circuit course, after seven months. The transition from semester to quarter may affect articulation.</p> <p>Part VII, Faculty, Question #4: Is there any committee Craig Rutan is not a member of?/Anne Hauscarriague</p> <p>Craig’s response: I was never a member of the SLOARC but I attended the meetings.</p> <hr/> <p>Craig’s reflection on the process of program review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We did not have to re-invent the wheel which is good • Looking forward to electronically stored information • Not difficult or complex • Frustrated with unequal working factors within the sciences • 4th time completed the APR • All Department Chairs are not familiar with or understand the numbers that are populated • Program Review documents should be public 	
<p>4. Report from PIE Committee</p>	<p>Aaron reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five (5) units (Academic Affairs, Student Services, OEC, Administrative Services and Joint Chairs) submitted a list of 60 requests, which begins the prioritizing process. • The rubric was finalized but adjustments will continue • PIE meets on the 7th of May to discuss and approve a final list • This list will be forwarded to the Budget Committee • The Budget Committee will send the list back to PIE with funding recommendations • The final list will be sent to College Council 	

<p>5. EMP Midterm Update Template</p>	<p>The Committee approved the template.</p> <p>It was recommended that distribution be delayed until Fall 14 in order to include complete two years of information from implementation. Aaron stated that this suggestion would not affect accreditation.</p>	<p>A motion to approve the EMP Midterm Update Template passed without dissent (moved by Marilyn Flores and seconded by Rick Adams).</p>
<p>6. Publishing APR Online Discussion</p>	<p>Rick Adams: This comes up in College Council.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: Rudy Tjiptahadi, Aracely and I met with Drasco to develop our site for the visiting team. SAC is making everything public. After the team leaves, this site will become part of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment website. Should we make this site password protected?</p> <p>Marilyn Flores: Is it possible that we can have two weeks after a program is reviewed by the EMPC to updated prior to making it public—a 2 week window?</p> <p>Roberta Tragarz: It would be like giving students a chance to re-write their papers.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: We could make components available to the public. People accessing the information would know when the EMPC hasn't yet discussed the program review with the program's representative.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: The Accrediting Commission has decided to change the Accreditation cycle from a 6 year cycle to a 7 year cycle. The bad news is that our alignment planning needs to be adjusted; the good news is that it gives us an extra year.</p> <p>Marilyn Flores: Do we need this to be online for this accreditation? Could we have a month to review and when it is posted make is available to employees and the site team, not the public? Can we make it password protected?</p> <p>Rudy Tjiptahadi: What if the information was available to just the site team on the site but restrict it to the site team and the EMP members?</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: We developed a recommendation and checked with listserv; most institutions do make their EMP public for transparency and share as public documents. Program review is our mechanism for evaluation. Now, we can decide not to share the information but the visiting team may ask when we will be sharing the information.</p>	

	Let's continue this discussion at the next meeting and forward our decision to the Academic Senate first thing in the fall regarding whether or not we want the site team to have full material available for accreditation.	
7. Spring semester meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. May 8: Reading with Mary McMullin B. May 22: Astronomy with Danielle Martino 	
Next meeting	<p>Meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.</p> <p>Wednesday, May 8, 2014 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., E-308</p>	