

Minutes of the Education Master Plan Committee Meeting
September 11, 2014
Roberta Tragarz and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs

Attendance: Alex Taber, Dora Contreras-Bright, Melinda Womack, Marilyn Flores, Anne Hauscarriague, Jim Isbell (alternate); Judy Strother; Leah Friedenrich, Theresa Buck

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. Introductions	Introductions were made for the new EMPC members.	
2. Orientation	<p>After programs are reviewed it is important for Committee members to discuss the outcome with area representatives. Currently, there are 47 program reviews to complete. The <i>Education Master Plan</i> is on a 4 year cycle, with a two-year program review cycle.</p> <p>Melinda is our representative to College Council and is crucial in carrying our decisions forward.</p>	

3. APR Discussion
Process Proposal
Discussion

Reviewing the proposed process format change:

At the last meeting for 2013-2014, there was a discussion about the implementation of a panel of four programs at each EMPC meeting:

- A. Each of the four panelist would share highlights of their programs
In five minutes; and,
- B. there would be 40 minutes for questions.

The process would include:

- A. members would read the Program Reviews
- B. members would compose questions
- C. members would send their questions to Roberta (or be submitted electronically to a web page?)
- D. Roberta and Aaron would review the questions.
- E. The questions would be divided online

Possible divisions of work:

- A. One member would be an expert on one part of the program review
- B. Two members would read two of the program reviews, and two members would read the other two program reviews
- C. There would be some sections that all members would read.

Discussion:

Leah: Prefers B, where members would read the entire program review because not reading the entire Program Review may result in members posing questions that could be answered in an area not read.

Aaron: Parts 1 to 3 of the program review contain data and parts 4 and 5 are the student learning outcomes. Members may submit questions on any of those parts.

Marilyn requested that the first line of the proposal be changed from: "In the past, the EMPC has invited department chairs, individually . . ." to ". . .department chairs, or their designee . . ."

Alex: A counter argument would be that separating out SLOs may spark dialogue in one area among the four department chairs.

Melinda: Historically, was the focus not distributed evenly on each section?

Roberta: There was no pattern.

Marilyn: The department chairs may learn from one another by hearing what others are doing or learning from their colleague's program reviews.

Roberta: At the year end, we will evaluate the process.

Proposal: People will keep their area for a semester; would there be any consideration for rotating that assignment? Is the work load equitable?

Melinda: Rotate each semester, not within the semester.

Aaron: We could structure the groups, such as doing all of the Basic Skills (English, Math, and Reading) in one session and all Career Technical Education (CTE) programs in one session. The reality is that it may depend on when each department chair is available to meet with the EMPC.

Melinda: What is the size of the panels?

Roberta: They are panels of four, and then three.

Aaron: The commendations will be in written form and not read in Committee, as we have been doing in the past.

Leah: If the current *Education Master Plan* is for 2012-2016, when do we begin writing the document for the next four years?

Aaron will send the template to Melinda.

	<p>Judy: This is a great deal of work for one committee, why aren't there two committees?</p> <p>Aaron: A recommendation for the EMPC from the last accreditation needs to be addressed in one year: Is it the responsibility of this Committee to take charge of Departmental Planning and Program Review and the EMP?</p> <p>Motion: Implement the plan for a semester, review, and, if needed, refine.</p> <p>Aaron will make a chart. Melinda will move the approved change forward to College Council.</p> <p>Alex: Developing a new <i>Education Master Plan</i> may result in changes in the EMPC responsibilities.</p> <p>Melinda: When will we know our assignments?</p> <p>Aaron: Review the programs that are in the cycle and we will discuss the assignments next meeting.</p>	<p>The motion was approved without dissent (moved by Melinda Womack and seconded by Anne Hauscarriague.)</p>
<p>4. Approval of Minutes</p>	<p>March 27, 2014</p>	<p>The minutes were approved without dissent (moved by Dora Contreras-Bright and seconded by Leah</p>

	<p>April 24, 2014</p> <p>May 8, 2014</p>	<p>Freidenrich.)</p> <p>The minutes were approved without dissent (moved by Melinda Womack and seconded by Alex Taber.)</p> <p>The minutes were approved without dissent (moved by Melinda Womack and seconded by Dora Contreras-Bright.)</p>
5. Fall Semester meetings	<p>September 25</p> <p>October 9</p> <p>October 23</p> <p>November 13</p> <p>December 11</p>	.
Next meeting	<p>Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.</p> <p>Wednesday, September 25, 2014 3:00 – 4:30 p.m., E-308</p>	