**Mission Statement**

*With a "students first" philosophy, Moorpark College empowers its diverse community of learners to complete their goals for academic transfer, basic skills, and career technical education. Moorpark College integrates instruction and student services, collaborates with industry and educational partners, and promotes a global perspective.*

**EdCAP Committee Charter**

*The Education Committee on Accreditation and Planning makes recommendations on college-wide planning and accreditation issues related to educational programs and services.*

*The planning component under the purview of EdCAP includes:*

* *Program Plans: Evaluate the program planning process and recommend modifications as needed*
* *Educational Master Plan: Define the format of the Educational Master Plan, establishing and monitoring the timeline, and recommend approval of the final document*

*The accreditation component under the purview of EdCAP includes:*

* *Monitoring and reviewing the preparation of the Self-Evaluation reports required by ACCJC*
* *Monitoring/evaluating/documenting progress on self-evaluation plans developed by the college as well as recommendations from the ACCJC*

***Goals for 2018-19:***

1. *Clarify EdCAP charter (add measurable objectives)*
2. *Midterm Accreditation Report – review and recommend to Academic Senate (presented by workgroups outside the committee; QFE Project 1 by Institutional Effectiveness, QFE Project 2 by a workgroup)*
3. *Make recommendations for integrated planning models (QFE action item #2 reviewed by EdCAP)*
4. *Integrated Planning – address IEPI planning suggestions (or address integrated planning issues as outlined in the QFE and recommendations)*
	1. *Look for opportunities to strengthen the connection between planning & resources*
5. *Review, discuss, and modify Program Planning platform and interface*
6. *Assessment of modifications to the Program Planning process (including three-year review cycle with ‘off years’)*
7. *Program Plan report out and results from Vice Presidents and Academic Senate President*
8. *Cross-disciplinary program plan discussions: generate process or foster environment for implementation in 2019-2020*
9. *Review Educational Master Plan drafts and make final recommendations to Academic Senate*

**Membership / Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Position** | **Name** | **Present** |  | **Position** | **Name** | **Present** |  | **Position** | **Name** | **Present** |
| Co-Chairs | Jennifer Kalfsbeek-Goetz | x | Associated Students Rep |  |  | Media Arts & Comm Studies | Rolland Petrello | x |
| Nathan Bowen | x | ACCESS | Silva Arzunyan | x | Physics/Ast/Engn | Erik Reese | X |
| VP Academic Affairs\* | Julius Sokenu | x | Animal Sci/EATM | Cynthia Stringfield | x | Social Sciences | Lee Ballestero | x |
| VP Business Services\* | Silvia Barajas |  | Athletics | Remy McCarthy | x | World Languages/Library | Jerry Mansfield | x |
| VP of Student Support\* | Amanuel Gebru | x | Behavioral Sci | Chad Basile / Dani Vieira | CB | Health Center | Sharon Manakas | x |
| Academic Senate Pres. | Nenagh Brown | x | Business | Reet Sumal |  | Student Activities | Kristen Robinson | x |
| Dean | Oleg Bespalov | x | Chemistry/Earth Sci | Roger Putnam / Rob Keil | RP / RK | Student Success | Jesus Vega |  |
| Dean | Howard Davis | x | Child Dev | Cindy Sheaks-Mcgown |  |  |  |  |
| Dean | Carol Higashida |  | Counseling | Jodi Dickey | X |  |  |  |
| Dean | Traci Allen | x | English/ESL | Sydney Sims |  | **Guests** |  |  |
| Dean | Lisa Putnam |  | Fine/Perf Arts | John Loprieno |  |  |
| Dean | Mary Rees | x | Health Sciences | Christina Lee | x |
| Dean | Sam Lingrosso | x | Life Science | Andrew Kinkella |  |
| M&O Representative | John Sinutko |  | Mathematics | Phil Abramoff |  |

\* Ex-offcio, non-voting member

|  |
| --- |
| **Today’s Handouts** |
| Educational Master Plan\_draft 2019-04-19Appendix A-How Goals Were Set\_draft 2019-04-19Appendix B-Environmental scan\_draft 2019-04-02Mission\_Vision\_Values\_04.19.2019Vision for Success\_from EMPProgram Evaluations 2018-2019 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **DISCUSSION NOTES** | **ACTION** |
| **CALL TO ORDER AND READING OF MINUTES** |  |  |
| Call to order; Public commentsApproval of minutes: February 26, March 19  | Public comments: we do not have a faculty co-chair for EdCAP next year. Focus for the next two years is the mid-term report. It’s going to be highly productive and essential work. | 2/26/19 minutes approved, Sam, Rob, Sharon abstained; 3/19/19 minutes approved, Sam, Cynthia, Sharon, Lee abstained |
| **NEW BUSINESS** |  |  |
| 1. Program Plan report & Cross-Disciplinary PP follow up
2. Information Items:
	1. Vision for Success Metrics
	2. ACCJC Institution-Set Standards
	3. Strategic Annual Workplans (2018-19, 2019-20)
3. Goals and Accomplishments
4. Planning retreat debrief
 | 1. 23 programs were reviewed with the ‘Executive’ team of VPs, IE Dean, and AS President. 23 were rated as ‘strengthen the program’. There are nuances: some desperately need resources, others that are doing really well that need resources to realize a fuller potential, and there are others that are doing fine and could certainly use resources.Lessons learned:
* Continue to disaggregate data for achievement gaps
* Help programs connect strategic directions to resource allocations
* PP training sessions during FLEX
* Continue 3-year cycle for next year
* Keep the 45m meeting allotment
* Keep current PP template
* Need to review timeline within an integrated planning approach
* Need to establish review process for programs that don’t have leadership planning meetingHow many of these programs are automatically part of next year? Response: approx. 7. (about 1/3). The program is asked whether they’d like to meet. Does this create a snowball effect? Could we get a list of who is going to be up for next semester before the semester ends? Julius: yes. Oleg can distribute.
1. a) Vision for Success Metrics – at most recent ASC meeting this document was approved, but we present it here as an information item especially to highlight that the equity metrics don’t include enough populations that belong in this category. This may be updated.b) ACCJC Institution-Set Standards – we made a decision to set them for three years and not change them, and we’re in year three. Next year is going to be a big year because these metrics are very different from the Vision for Success Metrics. The only complication is that we didn’t get the fiscal information until the day before we had to vote on them. ASC actually balked at doing this because the info came out too late. It came back in the next meeting, in which it passed. Senate has a charge over the annual report. c) Strategic Annual WorkplansOleg will be in touch with about the current workplan It used to be that, if we weren’t working on the strategic plan, we’d do a workplan. We’d find whatever wasn’t accomplished, and go about checking those boxes based on holes. The other approach is to do it by goals. Where do we want to spend our energies for the year? We can go either way.
2. We are getting closer to integrated planning through the use of the EMP. A Decision Making Handbook. The idea of putting Fiscal and EdCAP together, which was rejected. Yet, we now do have an EMP. So perhaps the issue is to include a question about how Fiscal aligns with EMP, and consequently EDCAP
3. Speaker was difficult to understand. Q&A helped.A number of people felt good about this particular process this year, and that it was focused. The general temperature of our college is different this year, and there was a good vibe. This is good to hear, as this was not the tone in January. Will that feedback be used? We know that the feedback for the Mission/Vision/Values was used. The process from January until now has really changed. If enough people say the same things about participatory governance, it makes a difference. A good example of this is getting curriculum to be an important part of the EMP. Some suggestion about having a student panel instead of a speaker. Several comments about improving the layout for lunch. There was a lack of movement. Trivia games, or something that celebrates our history.

 | 1. Oleg will distribute list of ‘next up programs’
2. May 8, May 22nd (two meetings to work on the workplan, subsequently shared with department chairs and program leads
 |
| **PREVIOUS BUSINESS** |  |  |
| 1. Mission / Vision / Values Statement
2. Educational Master Plan
3. QFE 2 workgroup for step 1, report back (workplan)
 | 1. One item of feedback that had resonance but was omitted was the word citizenship, as it could have adverse effects for DACA students. This ‘feels’ like a college-wide document as there was substantive revision from the original draft, with feedback coming from a variety of participants across campus.
2. There were four substantive comments brought up at the planning retreat. There were efforts made to address those comments in the EMP“Improve and expand CTE” in Goal #1, B. We want to make sure that ‘improve’ has a metric associated with it. It’s a good concept, and Mary R. can give ideas on metrics that can tie in on this.Concern: as the population is in flux, if we give targets that are numerical as opposed to percentages. We are setting ourselves up for failure if our numbers are shifting due to population changes that are beyond our control. Response: this is basically how the metrics were set up by the Chancellors Office, so this version is set. 2nd response: can we co-list the percentages? What can we do feel confident about the living nature of the document? It can be recalibrated from year to year. If there is a need to change the data points, then we can supply need and evidence to support that need. What we’re asking is that we start with a clear data set, with recognition that many data points or goals may need to be changed over time. Consistent with what? We’re aligning this document with Chancellors Office data points. Note that it’s unfortunate that we are locked in to data presented this way by the Chancellors Office, as it may be problematic.
3. We’re going to set three Monday late-afternoon meetings and invite non-instructional, in a setting similar to the CCCR. There was nothing that our research group was going to be able to do in order to adjust the Program Planning process. So this is going to be expected to be moved forward for the next cycle.
 | 1. Approved (Rolland moved, Howard seconded)
2. Approved (Oleg moved, Rob seconded), with Rolland and Sydney abstaining
3. Thanksgiving is the tentative goal for action items.
 |
| **ANNOUNCEMENTS** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **NEXT MEETINGS (Items)** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Adjournment** |  |  |