**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 / DV | Health Center | Sharon Manakas |  |
| Academic Senate Pres. | Nenagh Brown | X | Business | Reet Sumal | X | 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 | X | Counseling | Trulie Thompson / Jodi Dickey | JD |  |  |  |
| Dean | Traci Allen | X | English/ESL | Sydney Sims | X | **Guests** |  |  |
| Dean | Lisa Putnam | X | Fine/Perf Arts | John Loprieno | X |  | | |
| Dean | Mary Rees | X | Health Sciences | Christina Lee |  |
| Dean | Sam Lingrosso |  | Life Science | Andrew Kinkella |  |
| M&O Representative | John Sinutko |  | Mathematics | Phil Abramoff | X |

\* Ex-offcio, non-voting member

|  |
| --- |
| **Today’s Handouts** |
| 2018\_01\_22\_EdCAP\_Minutes (DRAFT)  Local\_Goal\_Reporting\_Form\_Template (1)  Local\_Goal\_Setting\_FAQs  Local\_Goal-Setting\_Guidance\_Memo\_11.5.18 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **DISCUSSION NOTES** | **ACTION** |
| **CALL TO ORDER AND READING OF MINUTES** |  |  |
| Call to order; Public comments  Approval of minutes: January 22nd | Phil: Congratulations to tenured faculty  Minutes approved with Jodi abstaining, Julius, Cynthia, Silva | Minutes approved |
| **NEW BUSINESS** |  |  |
| 1. Vision of Success goals 2. Cross Program Planning: what would this look like? | 1. The vision of success is similar to previous initiatives, the scorecard and institution set standards. The stat    1. State would like us to determine our own numbers for five goals:    2. May 31st is the deadline, and fortunately these goals need to be incorporated into the Ed Master Plan (EMP), which we happen to be working on right now (other institutions are scrambling to weave them into their EMPs).    3. One of the key words that came out of discussion about this is ‘aspirational’. What would we want to aim to achieve rather than what would be afraid to get dinged for if we didn’t meet them.    4. It is important that these are grounded in data and metrics. Whatever we set needs to be contextualized.    5. ACCJC institution set-standards should be in lock step, though we’re due to refresh those anyway.    6. Perhaps too micro for now, but how do the discussions about certificates going on in curriculum tie into this? Are certificates required to be tied to top codes, or part an amount of units (e.g. 12).    7. Fiscal is funding formula (9 units of CTE for funding, 16 for certificates). There are more metrics involved. The compromise was that any student teaching 9 units of CTE. There is confusion about    8. One of the reasons we can’t see data, the Chancellors Office is trying to clear up their own data.    9. We have been cutting all kinds of courses due to low enrollment; how can we be generating certificates and degrees if we are losing students? Response: how to we help students currently enrolled to persist and complete, identify their goal ahead of time, and as an institution we need to look at our schedule. How do we attract students with a lot of options to go elsewhere? We realize that this is a contention that we’ll have to deal with. As we project, we need to bear this lower enrollment in mind.    10. Demographic data is not shifting in terms of great number growth. Are we thinking of talking in terms of percentages instead of raw numbers? If 30% of our students are completing, and we can increase our numbers of completers to 38% of enrolled students. Response: we have to work with these raw numbers and percentage. In the past there has been a cohort.    11. When you hear the chancellor talk, he’s very much on a mission, and isn’t looking for refinements, but instead big dramatic goals. He is not playing to a community college audience at all but to legislators and employers.    12. Middle skills jobs are a huge focus for community colleges.    13. It’s hard for us to set metrics and goals until we have contextual data.    14. Incremental growth is clearly not acceptable. If we choose the path of least resistance, it’s not going to work well. We know that aspirational goals quickly transition to become expectations. Response: If we can adequately document this, and show good-faith effort, we believe we’ll be all right.    15. We need to have the institution-set standard data so we can make informed decisions for these goals    16. Statewide they want 20%, but if we’re near the top on some of these metrics, then perhaps it’s unrealistic to say 20%, though that might be a reasonable goal for the entire system.    17. Do we need different goals for each group in Equity goals? Response: yes. 2. What/where/how should these conversations take place?    1. Comment reaction: it’d be great to do this in Guided Pathways    2. Maybe it should be here in EdCAP (with slides and bullet points). Since we have mostly department chairs here, perhaps if we each gave a presentation in EdCAP, this general, succinct format could be beneficial. Could it be a one-day meeting? Or perhaps two or three programs presented briefly in EdCAP over the course of the yearly meeting schedule?    3. Concern: we might miss things for services in the ‘program window display’ option.    4. We did talk about doing this within departments; thoughts? Response: We think this is happening; it’s the interdivision ones that aren’t happening.    5. We could use general ed level outcomes as a vehicle.    6. Flex day activity along with training for data-based PP writing?    7. Goal was to have a qualitative discussion after training has occurred.    8. How do we get programs together that have overlapping outcomes to work on projects together?    9. Much less about sharing information, but focus energy. We want to create synergy. We do PP conversations.    10. Deep dive: here are programs that are struggling; we’ve all been “siloed” for so long, we don’t know    11. Where does this fit in with our QFE and whole discussion of our planning committees? This is about a ¼ of the way there. It’s QFE #2.    12. Need for meeting so that I consider things that I would normally not think of…    13. Julius & Nenagh can’t necessarily serve as matchmakers for programs | A. Oleg will bring some of this data 3/19/19 as we discuss the Ed Master Plan. |
| **PREVIOUS BUSINESS** |  |  |
| 1. Program Plan (PP) process discussion, input side (software) 2. Educational Master Plan Draft 1 – follow up |  |  |
| **ANNOUNCEMENTS** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **NEXT MEETINGS (Items)** |  |  |
| 1. Ed Master Plan Draft 2 presentation 2. QFE 2 workgroup for step 1, report back (workplan) |  |  |
| **Adjournment** |  |  |