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)*
   a. *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
Co-Chairs	Jennifer Kalfsbeek-Goetz	x
	Nathan Bowen	x
VP Academic Affairs*	Julius Sokenu	x
VP Business Services*	Silvia Barajas	
VP of Student Support*	Amanuel Gebru	x
Academic Senate Pres.	Nenagh Brown	x
Dean	Oleg Bespalov	x
Dean	Howard Davis	x
Dean	Carol Higashida	
Dean	Traci Allen	x
Dean	Lisa Putnam	
Dean	Mary Rees	x
Dean	Sam Lingrosso	x
M&O Representative	John Sinutko	

Position	Name	Present
Associated Students Rep		
ACCESS	Silva Arzunyan	x
Animal Sci/EATM	Cynthia Stringfield	x
Athletics	Remy McCarthy	x
Behavioral Sci	Chad Basile / Dani Vieira	CB
Business	Reet Sumal	
Chemistry/Earth Sci	Roger Putnam / Rob Keil	RP / RK
Child Dev	Cindy Sheaks-Mcgown	
Counseling	Jodi Dickey	X
English/ESL	Sydney Sims	
Fine/Perf Arts	John Loprieno	
Health Sciences	Christina Lee	x
Life Science	Andrew Kinkella	
Mathematics	Phil Abramoff	

Position	Name	Present
Media Arts & Comm Studies	Rolland Petrello	x
Physics/Ast/Engn	Erik Reese	X
Social Sciences	Lee Ballestero	x
World Languages/Library	Jerry Mansfield	x
Health Center	Sharon Manakas	x
Student Activities	Kristen Robinson	x
Student Success	Jesus Vega	
Guests		

* Ex-offcio, non-voting member

Today's Handouts
Educational Master Plan_draft 2019-04-19
Appendix A-How Goals Were Set_draft 2019-04-19
Appendix B-Environmental scan_draft 2019-04-02
Mission_Vision_Values_04.19.2019
Vision for Success_from EMP
Program Evaluations 2018-2019

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION NOTES	ACTION
CALL TO ORDER AND READING OF MINUTES		
Call to order; Public comments Approval 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		
A. Program Plan report & Cross-Disciplinary PP follow up	A. 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 meeting How many of these programs are automatically part of	A. Oleg will distribute list of 'next up programs'

	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.	
B. Information Items: a. Vision for Success Metrics	B. 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. May 8, May 22nd (two meetings to work on the workplan, subsequently shared with department chairs and program leads
b. ACCJC Institution-Set Standards	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 Workplans (2018-19, 2019-20)	c) Strategic Annual Workplans Oleg 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.	
C. Goals and Accomplishments	C. We are getting closer to integrated planning through the use of the EMP and Decision Making Handbook. The idea of putting Fiscal and EdCAP together was rejected by EdCAP.	

D. Planning retreat debrief	D. 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.	
PREVIOUS BUSINESS		
A. Mission / Vision / Values Statement	A. 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.	A. Approved (Rolland moved, Howard seconded)
B. Educational Master Plan	B. 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.	B. Approved (Oleg moved, Rob seconded), with Rolland and Sydney abstaining

	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 to 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.	
C. QFE 2 workgroup for step 1, report back (workplan)	C. 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.	C. Thanksgiving is the tentative goal for action items.
ANNOUNCEMENTS		

NEXT MEETINGS (Items)		
Adjournment		