

**Minutes of the Education Master Plan Committee Meeting  
May 8, 2014  
Roberta Tragarz and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

**Attendance:** Alex Taber, Rudy Tjiptahadi, Rebecca Mikhail (student representative); Phil Crabill, Dora Contreras-Bright, Melinda Womack, Carolyn Motokane, Marilyn Flores, Anne Hauscarriague, Rick Adams, Debbie Brooks

**Guest:** Mary McMullin

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  Approval of Minutes for April 24, 2014	Tabled	Minutes will be emailed to Committee members. Corrections and/or approval will be emailed.
2. APR Discussion/Preparation for Reading	<p>Questions were reviewed and discussed. Faculty were assigned questions to present to Mary McMullin.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Rick Adams: Does Reading have enough mutual exclusivity not to have planning agenda items?</p> <p>Marilyn Flores: They have asked for growth, both in courses and faculty.</p> <p>Debbie Brooks: How long has it been since we have had full-time faculty teaching Reading? That makes a difference in the Program; it is a focus issue.</p> <p>Three (3) questions were chosen and one (1) additional question was added.</p>	
3. Reading APR Discussion with Mary McMullin	<p>Part II: <b>Program Goals and Objectives</b>; Question #1 asked by Rudy Tjiptahadi: (3) <i>One of your department goals is to build enrollment in reading courses. While there was growth from 2009-10 through 2011-12, there was a large drop in enrollment and sections offered in 2012-13. Can you tell me what challenges the department is facing in growing the enrollment?</i></p> <p>Mary McMullin: Reduced offerings were a great part of the problem. Few</p>	.

students are entering California community colleges without basic skills needs. 75% of our students are at college level. Students can fulfill reading requirements in many ways-- a reading course is not required. Reading 102 was developed to help students read college level textbooks.

**Part III: Student Achievement Data Analysis:** Question #1 asked by Anne Hauscarriague: (2) *Just to point out that the APR erroneously noted that the success rate is "slightly less than the institution-set standard . . ." Reading success rate is 77% in 2012-13, well above the 63% standard.*

Mary McMullin: 63% college level SLOs relates to the 63% SLOs, not to classroom success rates, but I will clean that up.

Aaron Voelcker: The 63% for Fall 2009 is a 5 year average for all courses.

**Part III: Student Achievement Data Analysis:** Question #3 asked by Debbie Brooks (7) While the dominant ethnicity is Latino, based on over 20 years of classroom experience, poor reading skills have not been ethnic specific. What are the challenges and/or strategies for increasing the number of white students enrolling in Reading courses?

Mary McMullin: Counseling places students in Reading courses by scores and multiple measures.

Rudy Tjiptahadi: Why is Latino enrollment so high in Reading 102?

Mary McMullin: English placement test results automatically place a student in Reading.

Carolyn Motokane: Student placed in English 061 are encouraged to enroll in Reading 102. English 101 and Critical Reading 150 complement one another—they are similar courses from a different perspective.

Debbie Brooks: Reading comprehension is an issue in Geology.

Mary McMullin: Reading pre-requisites were removed. Reading 102 helps with strategies for different types of textbooks, i.e. science, math, etc.

Rick Adams: Do you feel comfortable with the assessments?

Mary McMullin: The short passages in the placement test do not offer a good assessment. The Counseling Department does a good job placing students and

looking out for those who would benefit from a reading course.

Carolyn Motokane: The problem is that there is no pay-off for taking a reading course – it doesn't satisfy general education requirements, major preparation, or elective credit.

Rick Adams: The English Department is starting to see some reading deficiencies.

Carolyn Motokane: Reading 150 is not accepted as transfer credit for UC.

Mary McMullin: The intentional focus of Reading 150 is for CSU transfer. Reading 150 typically has 3-4 full sections. We are not using literature or fiction, we are using argument.

**Part IV, Course Student Learning Outcomes Assessment:** Question #4 asked by Alex Taber (2) *You mention that SLO assessment data reveals that students in N96 and 097, "have difficulty in applying basic reading skills (e.g. identifying main idea and supporting details) as well as more advanced skills (determining purpose and tone, inferences, drawing conclusion, etc.)." What changes has the department considered implementing to address this?*

Mary McMullin: We have considered:

- Taking a look at the strategies used
- Re-thinking classroom focus
- New faculty with new ideas
- Students lacking basic skills need more than one semester
- Faculty strategizes and every semester we try different suggestions

Rudy Tjiptahadi: Do you share SLO results with new adjunct faculty?

Mary McMullin: Yes, I share the SLO results with new adjunct faculty.

Extra questions from Rick Adams: *I noticed that Reading doesn't have any action plans. What is the reason?*

Mary McMullin: Planning has been part of every semester's work since 2008. Every semester we adjust, re-evaluate, and change the curriculum. It isn't something extra, it is part of what we do continually.

In an effort to see where reading can cross pollinate, I have spoken with Jennifer

	<p>Coto and Maureen Roe/BSI, and we are going to create a chart of which reading course corresponds with reading courses.</p> <p>Rick Adams: Do you need to add new classes?</p> <p>Mary McMullin: Yes, we would like to add more sections of 102 and 150 but it has not been a priority for the Division.</p> <p>PROCESS FEEDBACK:</p> <p>Roberta Tragarz: How was this process for you?</p> <p>Mary McMullin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It wasn't difficult</li> <li>• It was nice to step back and reflect and think about the Program.</li> <li>• Major revisions happened several years ago.</li> <li>• We are reaping benefits of work done in the past.</li> <li>• We offer a comprehensive program for this environment.</li> </ul> <p>Rudy Tjiptahadi: Was the pre-populated data useful?</p> <p>Mary McMullin: No, it is just my way of doing things. I went back and pulled data from the Research Department.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: Would it be useful to have data for each of the courses?</p> <p>Mary McMullin: When it is lumped together, it isn't useful because I have basic through college level courses.</p>	
<p>4. Slices of PIE</p>	<p>Aaron Voelcker reported on the last PIE meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee reviewed the results of the rubric, the 63 resource request, which was morphed into a single list.</li> <li>• This list was discussed and forwarded to the Budget Committee.</li> <li>• The rubric will be fine tuned for next year.</li> <li>• The Budget Committee will return the list to PIE before the next PIE meeting. Some items will be removed because they are already funded or alternative funding was found.</li> <li>• The Budget Committee reviewed list will be discussed and sent to College Council.</li> <li>• The request form was finalized for next year.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next year's process should go smoother as we won't be planning and implementing at the same time.</li> </ul>	
<p>5. EMPC Restructuring: How do we tackle the mountain of APRs?</p>	<p>Roberta Tragarz: We have a lot of program reviews for next year.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: These are the numbers: 48 documents for instruction/ 7 meetings/2 program reviews per meeting; 7 meetings per semester.</p> <p>Roberta Tragarz: There will be no program reviews done at the first meeting.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: We will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide feedback</li> <li>• Carry results to College Council</li> <li>• Communicate results for planning to the college as a whole</li> </ul> <p>Roberta Tragarz: The Plan is: Divide into sub-committees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 meeting of the entire group</li> <li>- 1 meeting with the sub group conducting the interview and reporting back to the entire Committee</li> </ul> <p>Debbie Brooks: I would suggest a variation of the interview process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 15 minutes for good programs; ½ hour for struggling programs</li> <li>- One Division per year</li> <li>- Discussion is valuable</li> </ul> <p>Alex Taber: I would suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coordinate questions prior to the meeting</li> <li>- Four Departments at one time; 22 minutes; round table</li> </ul> <p>Debbie Brooks: The sub-committees do the reading but everyone comes together for the discussion.</p> <p>Alex Taber: Divide the sections; each person wouldn't have to read all four program reviews; each person would read their section.</p> <p>Anne Hauscarriague: I would suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Choose the questions before the meeting</li> <li>- Not read the commendations</li> </ul> <p>Marilyn Flores: I would suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interdisciplinary discussion</li> <li>- Assign areas by choice; what Committee member enjoys the most</li> </ul>	<p>and seconded by <b>Rick Adams</b>).</p>

	<p>-</p> <p>Melinda Womack: I would suggest mixing Divisions.</p> <p>Debbie Brooks: I would suggest giving everyone a 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> choice and provide a sign-up sheet for Department Chairs.</p> <p>Roberta Tragarz: Let's mull this over and vote on the restructure at the next meeting and we will work on logistics over the summer.</p> <p>Debbie Brooks: Send emails with more suggestions.</p>	
6. Seven-year Accreditation Cycle	<p>Aaron Voelcker spoke about the ACCJC's plan to change the accreditation cycle from a 6 year cycle to a 7 year cycle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is not an official decision; it is in a feedback cycle.</li> <li>- SCC's planning processes are based on a 6 year cycle</li> </ul> <p>Debbie Brooks: Could we create a 3 year cycle with a revision system at the end of every three years?</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker shared concern with outcome assessment: Who will we handle this change and we need to make a recommendation to the Senate by Fall 2014.</p> <p>Marilyn Flores: Our prioritizing needs to continue but may not be as comprehensive. We could have a hybrid year where we rest and rejuvenate.</p>	
7. Last Spring 14 semester meeting	<p>May 22: Astronomy with Danielle Martino</p>	
<b>Next meeting</b>	<p>Meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.</p> <p>Wednesday, May 22, 2014 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., E-308</p>	