

# Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 East Chapman  
Orange, CA 92869

(714) 628-4831  
FAX (714) 532-2055

## SENATORS

### **Business and Career Education**

Deeley, Steve 2014  
Salcido, Andrew 2015

### **Continuing Education (OEC)**

Shields, Jolene 2015

### **Counseling & Student Services**

Aguilera, Leonor 2015  
Carrion, Rudy 2014  
Mettler, Mary 2014

### **Humanities and Social Sciences**

Deaver, Doug 2014  
Elchlepp, Elizabeth 2015  
Cannon, Cari 2015  
Dela-Cusack, Lisa 2015  
Shekarabi, Nooshan 2014

### **Fine & Performing Arts and Communication**

Freidenrich, Leah 2015

### **Library**

Sproat, Barbara 2015

### **Mathematics and Sciences**

Cummins, Shawn 2015  
Hovanitz, Eric 2014  
Taylor, Mike 2015  
Nance, Craig 2014  
Frost, Alicia 2015

### **Adjunct**

Matthews, Evangeline  
2014  
Shoro, Natasha 2014

## OFFICERS

### **President**

Evett, Corinna 2014

### **Vice President**

DeCarbo, Michael 2014

### **Secretary/Treasurer**

Wagner, Joyce 2014

### **Curriculum**

Rutan, Craig Chair 2016

## AGENDA

5 November 2013  
1:30 pm – 3:00 p.m.  
Room E-306

### Call to Order

#### **I. Order of the Agenda**

#### **II. Approval of Minutes**

A. 15 October 2013

#### **III. Public Comments (2 minute limit per person)**

#### **IV. AS Executive Board Reports (15 minutes)**

President, Vice President, Secretary/Treasurer, CIC Chair

#### **V. ASG Report (5 minutes)**

#### **VI. Action (15 minutes)**

First Reading

A. **Resolution F2013.10:** Affirmation of Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee Governance Handbook Description

B. **Resolution F2013.11:** Support of Dissolution of SLOARC

Second Reading

C. **Resolution F2013.8:** Adoption of the 9 May 2013 Distance Education Handbook

D. **Resolution F2013.9:** Affirmation of the 9 May 2013 Technology Master Plan 2012-2017

#### **I. Discussion Items**

A. **Student Services Update:** VPSS John Hernandez (10 minute discussion)

B. **FARSSCD Update:** President Barry Resnick (10 minute discussion)

C. **ASCCC Resolutions:** Discussion of additional resolutions and conversations that transpired at the Area D meeting. (1-10 +1) (10 minute discussion)

D. **Academic Senate Scholarship:** Senators share feedback from folks in their area regarding Senate support of student scholarships. (5) (5 minute discussion)

E. **Faculty Responsibilities and Deadlines:** General discussion of faculty responsibilities related to the workings of the college and deadlines associated with the work. (1-10 +1) (5 minute discussion)

#### **II. Summary Reports Discussion (5 minutes total)**

*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, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)*

## **Rancho Santiago Community College District BP2410 (previously BP9001) (Setting Policy)**

**Adopted 03/17/97**

**Revised March 28, 2011**

The Board may adopt such policies as are authorized by law or determined by the Board to be necessary for the efficient operation of the District. Board policies are intended to be statements of intent by the Board on a specific issue within its subject matter jurisdiction.

The policies have been written to be consistent with provisions of law, but do not encompass all laws relating to district activities. All district employees are expected to know of and observe all provisions of law pertinent to their job responsibilities.

Policies of the Board may be adopted, revised, added to or amended at any regular board meeting by a majority.

The RSCCD Board of Trustees believes that a major trustee role is to set policy for the District. In setting policy, the Board wants to create and work within a participatory environment with respect for students and all employee groups. For developing policies regarding the academic and professional matters numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8, the Board will consult collegially with the faculty by relying primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate (per previous agreement with the Senate).\*

For developing policy regarding the other five academic and professional matters, the Board will consult with the faculty through the mutual agreement process previously agreed upon. At RSCCD, the mutual agreement process is the use of the shared governance structure consisting of councils, committees, and the District Council. Further, representatives of staff and student groups are encouraged to work within the established processes to address the issues of the District.

The Board of Trustees values consensus building; however, it realizes its legal responsibility to make final decisions regarding policy.

**\*For the following items the Board of Trustees will rely primarily upon the advice of the Academic Senate:**

1) Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines; 2) Degree and certificate requirements; 3) Grading policies; 5) Standard or policies regarding student preparation and success; 8) Policies for faculty professional development activities;

**For the following items, the Board of Trustees will come to mutual agreement with the Academic Senate:**

4) Educational program development; 6) District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles; 7) Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self study and annual reports; 9) Processes for program review; 10) Processes for institutional planning and budget development.

Administrative regulations are to be issued by the Chancellor as statements of method to be used in implementing Board Policy. Such administrative regulations shall be consistent with the intent of Board Policy. Administrative regulations may be revised as deemed necessary by the Chancellor. The Board reserves the right to direct revisions of the administrative procedures should they, in the Board's judgment, be inconsistent with the Board's own policies.

Copies of all policies and administrative procedures shall be readily available to District employees through the District website.

**Reference:** Education Code Section 70902; Accreditation Standard IV.B.1.b & e.

# Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 East Chapman  
Orange, CA 92869

(714) 628-4831  
FAX (714) 532-2055

## SENATORS

### **Business and Career Education**

Deeley, Steve 2014  
Salcido, Andrew 2015

### **Continuing Education (OEC)**

Shields, Jolene 2015

### **Counseling & Student Services**

Aguilera, Leonor 2015  
Carrion, Rudy 2014  
Mettler, Mary 2014

### **Humanities and Social Sciences**

Deaver, Doug 2014  
Elchlepp, Elizabeth 2015  
Cannon, Cari 2015  
Dela-Cusack, Lisa 2015  
Shekarabi, Nooshan 2014

### **Fine & Performing Arts and Communication**

Freidenrich, Leah 2015

### **Library**

Sproat, Barbara 2015

### **Mathematics and Sciences**

Cummins, Shawn 2015  
Hovanitz, Eric 2014  
Taylor, Mike 2015  
Nance, Craig 2014  
Frost, Alicia 2015

### **Adjunct**

Matthews, Evangeline  
2014  
Shoro, Natasha 2014

## OFFICERS

### **President**

Evett, Corinna 2014

### **Vice President**

DeCarbo, Michael 2014

### **Secretary/Treasurer**

Wagner, Joyce 2014

### **Curriculum**

Rutan, Craig Chair 2016

Dear Faculty,

31 October 2013

Thank you for the time, thought, and energy that you have put into contemplating and discussing faculty positions during our faculty ranking process. I also thank the Senators for their contributions to the discussions as well as to the fulfillment their role in the process.

Per the procedure enumerated in the “Academic Senate Process for Requesting a Faculty Position” document, the following reflects the results of the Senator votes and, therefore, represents the Senate approved faculty hire prioritization list:

1. Accounting
2. Water Utility Science
3. Mathematics I
4. Counselor I
5. American Sign Language
6. English
7. Geography
8. Psychology
9. Anthropology
10. English as a Second Language Instructor I
11. High School/Adult Basic Education
12. Anatomy & Physiology
13. DSPS Counselor
14. Political Science
15. Business Skills
16. Chemistry
17. Public Works
18. Counselor II
19. English as a Second Language Counselor
20. Mathematics II
21. Women’s Studies—Sociology
22. English as a Second Language Instructor II

Again, I thank you all for your invaluable input and participation in this process.

As ever, your Senators, Executive Board, and I are available to answer any questions you may have regarding this decision.

Genuinely,  
Corinna Evett  
Academic Senate President

*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, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)*

|    |                       | Aguilera | Canon | Carrion | Cummins | DeCarbo | Deeley | DeLa-Cusak | Elchlepp | Frost | Hovanitz | Mettler | Nance | Rutan | Salcido | Shields | Sproat | Taylor | Wagner | TOTAL      |
|----|-----------------------|----------|-------|---------|---------|---------|--------|------------|----------|-------|----------|---------|-------|-------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------------|
| 1  | Accounting            | 4        | 14    | 3       | 4       | 3       | 1      | 2          | 2        | 5     | 2        | 4       | 2     | 8     | 1       | 12      | 3      | 8      | 2      | <b>80</b>  |
| 2  | Water Utility Science | 5        | 9     | 2       | 3       | 1       | 7      | 5          | 5        | 1     | 4        | 5       | 1     | 2     | 6       | 17      | 1      | 12     | 4      | <b>90</b>  |
| 3  | Mathematics I         | 6        | 1     | 5       | 5       | 4       | 2      | 11         | 11       | 6     | 6        | 7       | 11    | 15    | 3       | 4       | 2      | 11     | 13     | <b>123</b> |
| 4  | Counselor I           | 2        | 8     | 1       | 6       | 11      | 14     | 8          | 6        | 12    | 13       | 2       | 7     | 4     | 15      | 8       | 16     | 17     | 1      | <b>151</b> |
| 5  | Amer. Sign Lang.      | 7        | 6     | 7       | 2       | 6       | 3      | 1          | 1        | 13    | 15       | 3       | 21    | 3     | 10      | 21      | 17     | 10     | 6      | <b>152</b> |
| 6  | English               | 12       | 13    | 14      | 9       | 5       | 4      | 4          | 4        | 15    | 9        | 12      | 12    | 18    | 4       | 6       | 8      | 5      | 10     | <b>164</b> |
| 7  | Geography             | 10       | 10    | 10      | 1       | 7       | 18     | 14         | 14       | 9     | 9        | 8       | 5     | 1     | 14      | 9       | 13     | 4      | 15     | <b>171</b> |
| 8  | Psychology            | 16       | 4     | 19      | 7       | 15      | 6      | 7          | 8        | 7     | 10       | 11      | 10    | 12    | 8       | 16      | 6      | 2      | 11     | <b>175</b> |
| 9  | Anthropology          | 8        | 17    | 8       | 10      | 14      | 10     | 6          | 7        | 14    | 12       | 6       | 3     | 20    | 12      | 18      | 5      | 7      | 7      | <b>184</b> |
| 10 | ESL Instructor I      | 19       | 2     | 16      | 11      | 9       | 19     | 3          | 3        | 3     | 17       | 19      | 15    | 5     | 19      | 2       | 9      | 19     | 8      | <b>198</b> |
| 11 | High School/Adult Ed. | 12       | 7     | 20      | 20      | 2       | 21     | 13         | 12       | 4     | 22       | 18      | 8     | 6     | 2       | 3       | 7      | 15     | 9      | <b>201</b> |
| 12 | Anatomy/Physiology    | 9        | 21    | 9       | 15      | 13      | 8      | 10         | 9        | 19    | 5        | 10      | 6     | 16    | 11      | 13      | 4      | 6      | 19     | <b>203</b> |
| 13 | DSPS Counselor        | 1        | 5     | 4       | 13      | 10      | 16     | 16         | 16       | 20    | 16       | 1       | 19    | 14    | 18      | 5       | 12     | 16     | 3      | <b>205</b> |
| 14 | Political Science     | 15       | 11    | 17      | 8       | 16      | 9      | 9          | 10       | 17    | 11       | 14      | 9     | 13    | 5       | 7       | 10     | 3      | 21     | <b>205</b> |
| 15 | Business Skills       | 21       | 3     | 18      | 18      | 18      | 22     | 12         | 13       | 2     | 3        | 17      | 13    | 11    | 22      | 1       | 15     | 14     | 5      | <b>228</b> |
| 16 | Chemistry             | 18       | 20    | 13      | 17      | 17      | 11     | 15         | 15       | 16    | 1        | 15      | 4     | 19    | 13      | 15      | 11     | 1      | 18     | <b>239</b> |
| 17 | Public Works          | 13       | 16    | 12      | 22      | 8       | 12     | 20         | 21       | 8     | 8        | 21      | 16.5  | 7     | 7       | 11      | 14     | 13     | 12     | <b>242</b> |
| 18 | Counselor II          | 3        | 15    | 6       | 12      | 20      | 15     | 17         | 18       | 21    | 14       | 9       | 20    | 9     | 16      | 20      | 21     | 18     | 16     | <b>270</b> |
| 19 | ESL Counselor         | 11       | 12    | 15      | 16      | 21      | 13     | 18         | 17       | 11    | 18       | 16      | 14    | 10    | 20      | 10      | 18     | 20     | 14     | <b>274</b> |
| 20 | Mathematics II        | 14       | 18    | 11      | 14      | 19      | 5      | 19         | 19       | 10    | 21       | 20      | 16.5  | 21    | 9       | 14      | 20     | 21     | 22     | <b>294</b> |
| 21 | Women's Studies       | 17       | 19    | 21      | 19      | 12      | 17     | 22         | 22       | 22    | 20       | 13      | 22    | 22    | 17      | 22      | 22     | 9      | 17     | <b>335</b> |
| 22 | ESL Instructor II     | 20       | 22    | 22      | 21      | 22      | 20     | 21         | 20       | 18    | 19       | 22      | 18    | 16    | 21      | 19      | 19     | 22     | 20     | <b>362</b> |

# Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 East Chapman  
Orange, CA 92869

(714) 628-4831  
FAX (714) 532-2055

## SENATORS

### **Business and Career Education**

Deeley, Steve 2014  
Salcido, Andrew 2015

### **Continuing Education (OEC)**

Shields, Jolene 2015

### **Counseling & Student Services**

Aguilera, Leonor 2015  
Carrion, Rudy 2014  
Mettler, Mary 2014

### **Humanities and Social Sciences**

Deaver, Doug 2014  
Elchlepp, Elizabeth 2015  
Cannon, Cari 2015  
Dela-Cusack, Lisa 2015  
Shekarabi, Nooshan 2014

### **Fine & Performing Arts and Communication**

Freidenrich, Leah 2015

### **Library**

Sproat, Barbara 2015

### **Mathematics and Sciences**

Cummins, Shawn 2015  
Hovanitz, Eric 2014  
Taylor, Mike 2015  
Nance, Craig 2014  
Frost, Alicia 2015

### **Adjunct**

Matthews, Evangeline  
2014  
Shoro, Natasha 2014

## OFFICERS

### **President**

Evett, Corinna 2014

### **Vice President**

DeCarbo, Michael 2014

### **Secretary/Treasurer**

Wagner, Joyce 2014

### **Curriculum**

Rutan, Craig Chair 2016

## Resolution F2013.10

### **Affirmation of Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee Fall 2013 Governance Handbook Description**

Moved:

Seconded:

Whereas, The Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee serves as an integral part of the planning process for Santiago Canyon College;

Whereas, The PIE Committee has done due diligence in determining the committee's mission, responsibility, and membership; and

Whereas, It is necessary for the SCC Governance Handbook to maintain currency;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College affirm the 16 October 2013 PIE approved description.

Date Presented: 5 November 2013

Date Approved:

*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, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)*

# **PLANNING & INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

## **Mission**

As Santiago Canyon College's central planning committee, the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) committee is charged with reviewing all requests for resource allocation and making recommendations to the College Council.

## **Responsibilities**

- Review all college planning documents and ensure that recommendations are consistent with those plans
- Review college-wide resource allocation requests and evaluate them based on how well they support the college mission and meet institutional goals
- Utilize, evaluate, and revise rubrics for resource allocation, expansion, and contraction recommendations
- Review all requests to "Apply for a Grant" and assess short / long term implications including financial viability
- Consult with the Santiago Canyon College Budget Committee to determine available funding for PIE prioritized recommendations and refine recommendations based on feedback from the SCC Budget Committee
- Regularly administer a survey to seek input for improvement of planning processes from the college community
- Assess progress toward achieving stated institutional goals
- Provide annual planning cycle to the college community

## **Chair**

One Administrator and Academic Senate President will serve as co-chairs

## **Membership**

4 College Vice Presidents

Assistant Dean of Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment

3 Classified Staff with 1 from Student Services/Support Services (*appointed by CSEA*)

1 Student

12 Faculty—One each from the following areas:

Academic Senate President or designee

Budget Committee Chair or designee

CIC Chair or designee

Continuing Education

EMC Committee Chair or designee

EMPC Chair or designee

Facility Committee Chair or designee

Honors Committee Chair or designee

Library

Student Services/Support Services

Student Success Committee Chair or designee

Technology Committee Chair or designee

**Approved by the committee on 16 Oct. 2013**

# Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 East Chapman  
Orange, CA 92869

(714) 628-4831  
FAX (714) 532-2055

## SENATORS

### **Business and Career Education**

Deeley, Steve 2014  
Salcido, Andrew 2015

### **Continuing Education (OEC)**

Shields, Jolene 2015

### **Counseling & Student Services**

Aguilera, Leonor 2015  
Carrion, Rudy 2014  
Mettler, Mary 2014

### **Humanities and Social Sciences**

Deaver, Doug 2014  
Elchlepp, Elizabeth 2015  
Cannon, Cari 2015  
Dela-Cusack, Lisa 2015  
Shekarabi, Nooshan 2014

### **Fine & Performing Arts and Communication**

Freidenrich, Leah 2015

### **Library**

Sproat, Barbara 2015

### **Mathematics and Sciences**

Cummins, Shawn 2015  
Hovanitz, Eric 2014  
Taylor, Mike 2015  
Nance, Craig 2014  
Frost, Alicia 2015

### **Adjunct**

Matthews, Evangeline  
2014  
Shoro, Natasha 2014

## OFFICERS

### **President**

Evett, Corinna 2014

### **Vice President**

DeCarbo, Michael 2014

### **Secretary/Treasurer**

Wagner, Joyce 2014

### **Curriculum**

Rutan, Craig Chair 2016

## Resolution F2013.11

### **Support of Dissolution of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Review Committee**

Moved:

Seconded:

Whereas, The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Review Committee (SLOARC) is charged with the task of integrating student learning outcomes and a continuous cycle of assessment into SCC's culture;

Whereas, The responsibilities that prompted the development of the SLOARC, as laid out in the Santiago Canyon College Collegial Governance Handbook, have been institutionalized by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment (OIE&A); and

Whereas, SLOARC members passed a vote to dissolve SLOARC with a condition that a plan be put in place to ensure that the OIE&A has the appropriate channels for bringing forward policy and procedural recommendations for consideration and approval through the established collegial governance framework, to strengthen lines of communication between the OIE&A and the Curriculum and Instruction Council (CIC), and to ensure the OIE&A has the appropriate institutional support to implement and maintain TaskStream, an outcomes assessment data management software solution; and

Whereas, such a plan has been developed and approved by SLOARC;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College accept the 29 October 2013 SLOARC recommendation for dissolution of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Review Committee and accept the accompanying Fall 2013 Institutional Effectiveness Plan.

Date Presented: 5 November 2013

Date Approved:

*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, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)*

**Fall 2013 Institutional Effectiveness Plan**  
**Recommended by the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Review**  
**Committee**

**Background**

On September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013 the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Review Committee (SLOARC) held a discussion regarding the mission and responsibilities of the committee, as laid out in the Santiago Canyon College Collegial Governance Handbook. The SLOARC concluded that Santiago Canyon College has reached a milestone in its efforts to integrate student learning outcomes and a continuous cycle of assessment into the campus culture as the majority of the committee's responsibilities have been institutionalized by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment (OIE&A). Recognizing that the hard work and resolve of committee members, past and present, have lead SLOARC to a point where the responsibilities that prompted the development of the committee have long been accomplished, committee members voted to dissolve SLOARC. This decision came with a condition that a plan would be put in place to ensure that the OIE&A, in its efforts to ensure the college meets institutional effectiveness (program review, planning, and student learning outcomes) standards of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), have the appropriate channels for bringing forward policy and procedural recommendations for consideration and approval through the established collegial governance framework. In addition, this plan must also address the pending implementation of TaskStream, an outcomes assessment data management software solution, and the resources that will be required to maintain this software. The SLOARC appointed the Assistant Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment to draft such a plan, to bring the plan forward to be reviewed and approved by the committee, and, once approved, include this plan as an addendum to a resolution to dissolve SLOARC.

**Plan**

**Communication Structure**

In the event that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment (OIE&A) finds it prudent to bring forward changes to current or develop new policies and procedures to improve institutional effectiveness, which includes program review, planning, and student learning outcomes, the OIE&A will consult and seek support from a number of collegial governance bodies as well as the Academic Senate, when appropriate.

For matters directly related to program review, the OIE&A will seek the advice and support of the Educational Master Planning Committee and will incorporate said



advice into any recommendation moving forward for Academic Senate and College Council approval.

For matters directly related to institutional planning, the OIE&A will seek the advice and support of the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee and will incorporate said advice into any recommendation moving forward for Academic Senate and College Council approval.

For matters directly related to curriculum, the OIE&A will seek the advice and support of the Curriculum and Instruction Council and will incorporate said advice into any recommendation moving forward for Academic Senate and College Council approval.

For matters directly related to outcomes assessment, whether student learning outcomes (SLOs), service area outcomes (SAOs), administrative unit outcomes (AUOs), program student learning outcomes (PSLOs), or institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs), that do not impact efforts related to curriculum development, primary advice will remain with the OIE&A. In the event that changes to current or the development of new policies and procedures related to outcomes assessment have the potential to impact faculty workload, support from the Academic Senate will be sought.

### **TaskStream**

During the implementation of the outcomes assessment data management software, TaskStream, the OIE&A has identified a necessity to utilize a quality control measure to ensure that instructional areas are submitting the appropriate information which will allow the OIE&A to repurpose, through the mapping of outcomes, course level assessment data for program level assessment. The OIE&A will retain primary advice over the quality of assessment data for non-instructional areas. For instructional areas, the OIE&A will refer to the guidelines spelled out by the [Course SLO and Assessment Reporting Checklist](#), previously adopted by the SLOARC.

- The OIE&A will ensure that outcome measurement tools are appropriate for collecting the pertinent information related to each SLO or PSLO.
- The OIE&A will ensure that a criterion for success is established for each measurement used to assess learning outcomes.
- The OIE&A will ensure that outcomes assessment findings specify the number of students measured for each SLO, the number of students meeting the established criteria for each SLO, and the proportion of students meeting the established criteria for each SLO.

- The OIE&A will ensure that plans of action are developed for each outcome that, upon analysis of assessment findings, does not meet the criterion for success and that those plans are being followed and updated.
- The OIE&A will ensure that reassessment after plan of action implementation occurs and that analysis of each plan's effectiveness in improving student learning is carried out and reported.

### **Recommendations**

1. SLOARC recommends that the OIE&A utilize the aforementioned guidelines for determining whether information reported by instructional areas within the TaskStream program is adequate or should be sent back to the department chair for revision.
2. SLOARC recommends that the institution supports these quality control efforts by providing appropriate support, whether human, physical, fiscal, technological, or any combination thereof, to ensure the OIE&A has the necessary resources to take on the increased workload associated with outcomes assessment quality control.
3. SLOARC recommends, for the purpose of keeping TaskStream up to date with the most current course, degree and certificate information, that OIE&A work with the CIC to establish a regularly occurring process that would allow the OIE&A to receive notification of changes to approved learning outcomes and changes to the requirements of any course, degree program or certificate program that may impact the TaskStream system or the outcome-to-outcome mapping structure within.

**Approved by SLOARC on 10/29/2013**

# Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 East Chapman  
Orange, CA 92869

(714) 628-4831  
FAX (714) 532-2055

## SENATORS

### **Business and Career Education**

Deeley, Steve 2014  
Salcido, Andrew 2015

### **Continuing Education (OEC)**

Shields, Jolene 2015

### **Counseling & Student Services**

Aguilera, Leonor 2015  
Carrion, Rudy 2014  
Mettler, Mary 2014

### **Humanities and Social Sciences**

Deaver, Doug 2014  
Elchlepp, Elizabeth 2015  
Cannon, Cari 2015  
Dela-Cusack, Lisa 2015  
Shekarabi, Nooshan 2014

### **Fine & Performing Arts and Communication**

Freidenrich, Leah 2015

### **Library**

Sproat, Barbara 2015

### **Mathematics and Sciences**

Cummins, Shawn 2015  
Hovanitz, Eric 2014  
Taylor, Mike 2015  
Nance, Craig 2014  
Frost, Alicia 2015

### **Adjunct**

Matthews, Evangeline  
2014  
Shoro, Natasha 2014

## OFFICERS

### **President**

Evett, Corinna 2014

### **Vice President**

DeCarbo, Michael 2014

### **Secretary/Treasurer**

Wagner, Joyce 2014

### **Curriculum**

Rutan, Craig Chair 2016

## Resolution F2013.8

### Adoption of 9 May 2013 Distance Education Faculty Handbook

Moved: Professor Mettler

Seconded: Professor Freidenrich

Whereas, Santiago Canyon College (SCC) demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity; and

Whereas the mission of the Santiago Canyon College (SCC) Technology Committee is to “promote the use of technology to increase efficiency of college operations and to support teaching and enhance student learning;”

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College, adopt the Technology Committee recommended 9 May 2013 Distance Education Faculty Handbook.

Date Presented: 15 October 2013

Date Approved:

*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, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)*

# Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 East Chapman  
Orange, CA 92869

(714) 628-4831  
FAX (714) 532-2055

## SENATORS

### **Business and Career Education**

Deeley, Steve 2014  
Salcido, Andrew 2015

### **Continuing Education (OEC)**

Shields, Jolene 2015

### **Counseling & Student Services**

Aguilera, Leonor 2015  
Carrion, Rudy 2014  
Mettler, Mary 2014

### **Humanities and Social Sciences**

Deaver, Doug 2014  
Elchlepp, Elizabeth 2015  
Cannon, Cari 2015  
Dela-Cusack, Lisa 2015  
Shekarabi, Nooshan 2014

### **Fine & Performing Arts and Communication**

Freidenrich, Leah 2015

### **Library**

Sproat, Barbara 2015

### **Mathematics and Sciences**

Cummins, Shawn 2015  
Hovanitz, Eric 2014  
Taylor, Mike 2015  
Nance, Craig 2014  
Frost, Alicia 2015

### **Adjunct**

Matthews, Evangeline  
2014  
Shoro, Natasha 2014

## OFFICERS

### **President**

Evett, Corinna 2014

### **Vice President**

DeCarbo, Michael 2014

### **Secretary/Treasurer**

Wagner, Joyce 2014

### **Curriculum**

Rutan, Craig Chair 2016

## Resolution F2013.9

### **Affirmation of the Santiago Canyon College 9 May 2013 Technology Master Plan 2012-2017**

Moved: Professor DeCarbo

Seconded: Professor Frost

Whereas, The mission of the Santiago Canyon College (SCC) Technology Committee is to “promote the use of technology to increase efficiency of college operations and to support teaching and enhance student learning;”

Whereas, It is the responsibility of the Technology Committee to maintain a technology plan that aligns with state recommendations, meets the learning needs of our students, and supports the college’s institutional mission; and

Whereas, The Technology Master Plan is developed to provide the framework for the development of technology and related resources at SCC by which the institution can prioritize the technology initiatives, set annual technology goals, and make progress toward the implementation of these goals;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College affirm the Technology Committee recommended 9 May 2013 Technology Master Plan 2012-2017.

Date Presented: 15 October 2013

Date Approved:

*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, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)*



**Academic Senate**  
for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

**45<sup>th</sup> FALL SESSION RESOLUTIONS**  
***FOR DISCUSSION***

***Thursday, November 7, 2013***

*Disclaimer: The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion by the field, and to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at Academic Senate Fall Plenary Session held November 7 - 9, 2013, in Irvine.*

## Consent Calendar

The resolutions that have been placed on the Consent Calendar 1) were believed to be noncontroversial, 2) do not potentially reverse a previous position and 3) do not compete with another proposed resolution. Resolutions that meet these criteria and any subsequent clarifying amendments have been included on the Consent Calendar. To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the *Resolution Procedures for the Plenary Session*.

- \*2.01 F13 ASCCC Statement on Accreditation
- \*2.03 F13 Sufficient Advance Notice for Changes to Required ACCJC Annual Reports
  - \*2.03.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.03 F13
- \*7.01 F13 Academic Senate Participation in the Online Course Exchange
- \*7.02 F13 Request of CCCCCO to Provide Faculty Obligation Number Data
- \*8.01 F13 Counselors as Discipline Experts
- \*9.01 F13 Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) Development and Implementation Guidelines Resolution
- \*12.01 F13 Community College Faculty Exchanges
- \*18.01 F13 Use of Multiple Measures in Common Statewide Assessment Exams

The resolutions on the Consent Calendar are marked within the following packet by an \*

# Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>2.0 ACCREDITATION STANDARDS</b> .....   | <b>1</b>  |
| *2.01 F13 ASCCC Statement on Accreditation .....   | 1         |
| 2.02 F13 Request of ACCJC to Model Effective Self-Evaluation Practices .....   | 1         |
| 2.02.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.02 F13.....   | 2         |
| *2.03 F13 Sufficient Advance Notice for Changes to Required ACCJC Annual Reports.....  | 2         |
| *2.03.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.03 F13 .....   | 3         |
| 2.04 F13 Employ “Resolve a Deficiency” Rather Than “Recommendation for Improvement” for Evaluation Findings That Must Be Addressed by the Two-Year Rule..... | 3         |
| 2.04.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.04 F13 .....  | 4         |
| <b>3.0 EQUITY AND DIVERSITY</b> .....  | <b>4</b>  |
| 3.01 F13 Demographic Data Collection of Multiple Identities .....  | 4         |
| <b>5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE</b> .....  | <b>5</b>  |
| 5.01 F13 Request of CCCCCO to Alter Definition of “Apportionment” .....  | 5         |
| <b>7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE</b> .....   | <b>5</b>  |
| *7.01 F13 Academic Senate Participation in the Online Course Exchange .....  | 5         |
| *7.02 F13 Request of CCCCCO to Provide Faculty Obligation Number Data .....  | 6         |
| 7.03 F13 Performance Classes .....   | 7         |
| 7.04 F13 Course Repetition to Maintain Workforce Skills Recency .....  | 7         |
| <b>8.0 COUNSELING</b> .....  | <b>8</b>  |
| *8.01 F13 Counselors as Discipline Experts .....   | 8         |
| <b>9.0 CURRICULUM</b> .....  | <b>8</b>  |
| *9.01 F13 Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) Development and Implementation Guidelines.....  | 8         |
| <b>12.0 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT</b> .....  | <b>9</b>  |
| *12.01 F13 Community College Faculty Exchanges .....   | 9         |
| <b>15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES</b> .....  | <b>9</b>  |
| 15.01 F13 Endorse LEAP General Education Outcomes .....  | 9         |
| 15.01.01 F13 Amend Resolution 15.01 F13 .....  | 10        |
| 15.01.02 F13 Amend Resolution 15.01 F13 .....  | 10        |
| <b>18.0 MATRICULATION</b> .....  | <b>11</b> |
| *18.01 F13 Use of Multiple Measures in Common Statewide Assessment Exams .....   | 11        |

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

### 2.0 ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

#### \*2.01 F13 ASCCC Statement on Accreditation

Whereas, The “faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self study and annual reports” is one of the “10+1” academic and professional matters designated to academic senates in Title 5 section 53200;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has been intricately involved in accreditation processes since its founding and continues to actively support faculty and colleges in their accreditation work through breakouts presented at plenary sessions, *Rostrum* articles, Senate position papers, its standing Accreditation and Assessment Committee, and its annual Accreditation Institute;

Whereas, The ASCCC further provides colleges, upon request, with Accreditation Response Teams consisting primarily of faculty experienced in various areas of accreditation, in order to assist colleges that are facing sanctions or are otherwise concerned with the involvement and roles of faculty in regards to accreditation processes within their own college governance structures; and

Whereas, Despite the ASCCC’s strong advocacy for and assistance with “faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes” and extensive set of adopted positions to that effect, the ASCCC currently has no statement regarding the ASCCC’s responsibility with respect to accreditation;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the following statement on accreditation to be published widely and used to guide the ASCCC in its ongoing work to support college accreditation efforts:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) values the peer review process of self-reflection and improvement known as accreditation. Since local academic senates have Title 5-mandated roles within the accreditation process, the ASCCC sees its primary responsibility as helping colleges to meet the adopted standards for which they will be held accountable and to generate comprehensive and forthright assessments of progress toward the standards. The ASCCC’s main tool for supporting colleges is the annual Accreditation Institute through which faculty and other colleagues are encouraged to learn about and address the standards and recommendations from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Additionally, the Academic Senate shares accreditation information and provides support through local college visits and regional presentations. As a professional matter, in support of the ideal of a fair and meaningful accreditation process, the ASCCC’s secondary responsibility is to recommend and advocate for improvements to the accreditation standards and processes by providing thoughtful feedback and input to all accreditation participants.

Contact: Phil Smith, Chair, Accreditation Committee

#### 2.02 F13 Request of ACCJC to Model Effective Self-Evaluation Practices

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has expressed various concerns with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding faculty participation and representation on the Commission’s committees and on on-site evaluation teams through a variety of means, including resolutions passed by the body, concerns expressed to the California Community College



## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

Chancellor's Office, and the Board of Governors, and letters sent by the Academic Senate to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE)<sup>1</sup>; and

Whereas, The ACCJC expects its member institutions to reflect honestly and critically about areas identified as being non-compliant with Commission policies and accreditation standards and to address them in a timely manner;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the ACCJC to model and exemplify for its member institutions effective and transparent self-evaluation practices by acknowledging and addressing any areas of non-compliance identified in evaluations by the USDE's Accreditation Group and the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Improvement (NACIQI), and to document and make public what steps it will take to address any areas of non-compliance.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Past Chair, Accreditation Committee

### **2.02.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.02 F13**

Amend the resolved to read:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges ~~urge request that the ACCJC to model and exemplify for its member institutions effective self-evaluation practices by acknowledging and addressing any areas of non-compliance~~ acknowledge the importance of direct communication, and in particular with the ASCCC as the representative of faculty, by publicizing its steps to address issues of non-compliance as identified in evaluations by the USDE's Accreditation Group and the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Improvement (NACIQI), and to document what steps it will take to address any areas of non-compliance. in the most open and timely manner possible.

Contact: Kale Braden, Cosumnes River College, Area A

### **\*2.03 F13 Sufficient Advance Notice for Changes to Required ACCJC Annual Reports**

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) requires member colleges to file Annual Reports and Annual Fiscal Reports to maintain their status as accredited institutions;

Whereas, Member colleges have difficulty completing such reports in a meaningful and comprehensive way when the requirements and required data for these reports differ substantially from year to year, and sufficient advance notice and instructions are not provided; and

Whereas, Government agencies and professional licensing organizations typically follow a process in which proposed changes to required reports or policies are announced well in advance, with opportunities for comments and suggestions from impacted parties, and with new procedures published with sufficient notice for effective compliance by affected individuals or institutions;

---

<sup>1</sup> Official expressions of concern about lack of faculty representation on ACCJC teams and committees include resolutions passed by the body dating back to 2004 that describe inadequate faculty representation on accreditation visiting teams, a letter sent in 2010 by then-President Jane Patton expressing concerns about the ACCJC not observing its bylaws regarding faculty appointments to the ACCJC Commissioner Selection Committee, and a third-party comment sent to the USDE in September 2013 by President Beth Smith describing the ongoing concerns the Academic Senate has with the ACCJC with respect to faculty representation.

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC provide member institutions opportunities for meaningful input to the ACCJC about any proposed changes to the required annual reports, and that any adopted changes by ACCJC to annual reports be published at least six months in advance of the effective date of implementation of the required annual reports.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Past Chair, Accreditation Committee

### **\*2.03.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.03 F13**

Amend the resolved to read:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC provide member institutions opportunities for meaningful input to the ACCJC about any proposed changes to the required annual reports, and that any adopted changes by ACCJC to the annual reports be published at least six months in advance of the effective date of implementation of the required annual reports, or within four weeks of the ACCJC being notified of a federal mandate if a notice of six months is not possible.

Contact: Matthew Clark, Woodland College, Area A

### **2.04 F13 Employ “Resolve a Deficiency” Rather Than “Recommendation for Improvement” for Evaluation Findings That Must Be Addressed by the Two-Year Rule**

Whereas, Section 602.20(a) of the Secretary’s Criteria for Recognition mandates that recognized accrediting agencies for institutions such as the California community colleges must either take immediate adverse action against the institution, or give the institution two years to bring itself into compliance (the so-called “Two-Year Rule”);

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) currently uses the term “recommendation” in two senses when communicating the Commission’s actions, namely, “to meet the standard” or “to improve institutional effectiveness,” and thus it is unclear which of the “recommendations” issued to member institutions by the ACCJC fall under the Two-Year Rule;

Whereas, ACCJC’s use of the term “recommendation” in two different ways concerned the Accreditation Group of the United States Department of Education enough for it to note in its memo to the ACCJC dated August 13, 2013<sup>2</sup> that “what is not clear is how the recommendations are differentiated between the two types and how an institution, an evaluation team, the Commission, or the public is to know the difference”;

Whereas, Given the high stakes involved with receiving one type of recommendation over the other, the California community colleges and their academic senates would benefit from clear distinctions between the types of findings issued them;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC adopt and employ “requirement to resolve a deficiency” for those ACCJC findings of non-compliance that must

---

<sup>2</sup> Letter to the Dr. Barbara Beno, dated August 13, 2013: [http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/08\\_13\\_2013\\_Letter\\_from\\_USDE\\_on\\_Complaint.pdf](http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/08_13_2013_Letter_from_USDE_on_Complaint.pdf)

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

be addressed under the Two-Year Rule, and reserve “recommendation for improvement” exclusively for Commission suggestions that the institution may implement at its discretion to improve institutional effectiveness.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Past Chair, Accreditation Committee

### 2.04.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.04 F13

Amend title to read:

**Employ the Term “Action Required” ~~“Resolve a Deficiency”~~ Rather Than ~~“Recommendation for Improvement”~~ “Recommendation” for Evaluation Findings That Must Be Addressed by the Two-Year Rule**

Amend resolved to read:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC adopt and employ two consistent terms: One, such as “requirement to resolve a deficiency” “action required,” used for those ACCJC findings of non-compliance that must be addressed under the Two-Year Rule, and a second term reserve “recommendation for improvement” such as “recommendation,” used exclusively for Commission suggestions that the institution may implement at its discretion. to improve institutional effectiveness

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College, Area B

## 3.0 EQUITY AND DIVERSITY

### 3.01 F13 Demographic Data Collection of Multiple Identities

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has recognized the benefits to students, faculty, and the community college system gained from the variety of personal experiences, values, and views of a diverse group of individuals with different backgrounds in its Inclusivity statement of June 1, 2012; and

Whereas, Oftentimes colleges collect demographic data through tools that limit choices and therefore provide an incomplete and distorted understanding of their campus culture(s); and

Whereas, A growing awareness and understanding of the complexity of identity can be a powerful tool for planning inclusive activities and programs; and

Whereas, Many stakeholders do not recognize themselves in a “choose one” box for race, ethnicity, or gender-related demographic categories and therefore feel excluded from the campus community and may, in fact, be excluded by programs that are not designed with them in mind;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge that all demographic data collection instruments in the California Community College System provide expanded categories for identity on race, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, and gender demographic questions and allow students to declare multiple identities so the colleges can use those demographic realities to inform planning;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to inform all students, faculty, and staff of their options to claim multiple identities or to decline answering; and

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office in developing a crosswalk from previous categories to expanded categories and transitioning to a broader scope of data collection throughout the system and its publications.

Contact: Jeff Burdick, Willow International Community College Center, Area A

### **5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE**

#### **5.01 F13 Request of CCCCO to Alter Definition of "Apportionment"**

Whereas, The definition of "enrollment" for both the purposes of apportionment and repetition have been modified by Title 5 §58161 in 2011 and later by §55000(n) in 2013 to occur "only when a student receives an evaluative or non-evaluative symbol for the course"; and, Title 5 §58003.1 declares the census date for apportionment for full-term courses to be the "Monday of the weeks nearest to one-fifth the length of the term", resulting in a census date that is the third Monday of the semester for those colleges with 13 - 17 week semesters;

Whereas, Title 5 §55024 provides that no notation "shall be made on the academic record of the student who withdraws during the first four weeks or 30 percent of a term whichever is less" unless the governing board establishes a shorter time;

Whereas, This combination of Title 5 language has created a situation where some students present at the census date may not yield apportionment to a district, where districts are under significant pressure to change "drop without W" deadlines to the day before census on the basis of "fiscal necessity", and where should a district make such a change, students in Monday only classes during the fall semester observe the "drop without W" date pass prior to their second class meeting due to the Labor Day holiday; and

Whereas, This earlier date inhibits students' success by forcing a premature commitment to courses before students can assess whether they will succeed in the course, and counts against their repetitions of these courses;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges petition the Chancellor's Office and Board of Governors to revise §55000(n) to restore the previous interpretation of "enrollment" for the purposes of apportionment to occur when a student is formally enrolled in a course as of the census date; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges further petition the Chancellor's Office and Board of Governors to add to §55000 to maintain the current interpretation of "enrollment" for the purposes of repetition.

Contact: Eric Kaljumägi, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

### **7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**

#### **\*7.01 F13 Academic Senate Participation in the Online Course Exchange**

Whereas, The 2013-2014 Budget Act enacted the Governor's Online Education initiative to expand access to online education in the California Community College System and allocated \$16.9 million for that purpose and furthermore the Chancellor's Office established the California Community College Online Education Initiative program to realize this legislation through the creation of the Online Course Exchange ("Exchange") operated through the California Virtual Campus, with the development contract for the Exchange awarded to a district or consortium of colleges and/or districts through a competitive grant process<sup>3</sup>;

---

<sup>3</sup> Chancellor's Office request for Application (RFA) released to the field on September 13, 2013

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

Whereas, The Exchange promises to allow students to enroll in high quality online courses from colleges across the state through the centralized California Virtual Campus, with potential for great benefit and opportunities for our students by providing additional access to courses needed for transfer and degree completion;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is the collective faculty voice on academic and professional matters statewide and has long provided leadership for faculty on distance education matters through its position papers, resolutions, *Rostrum* articles and presentations; and

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office request for application process proposes the establishment of governance and advisory bodies for the Exchange that may make recommendations regarding the work of the Exchange related to academic and professional matters, including but not limited to:

- The development of specifications for a statewide course management system (CMS) for the Exchange
- Minimum quality standards for courses selected for the Exchange
- Minimum educational and training qualifications for faculty who will teach online courses on the Exchange
- Minimum level of preparation required of students who will take online courses on the Exchange;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind the Chancellor's Office that faculty primacy in academic and professional matters applies to the development of the Online Course Exchange; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to include the Academic Senate as the central and vital participant in all governance, advisory and steering bodies that would guide the establishment and continuing work of the Online Course Exchange.

Contact: John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Area C

### **\*7.02 F13 Request of CCCCCO to Provide Faculty Obligation Number Data**

Whereas, Hiring criteria, policies, and procedures for new faculty members are within the purview of the academic senate, as denoted in California Education Code 87360;

Whereas, The application of locally agreed to policies and procedures requires accurate and verifiable data;

Whereas, Faculty Obligation Number (FON) calculation worksheets for each district detailing compliance with Title 5 §51025 were posted on the Chancellor's Office website from 2006 - 2011, but were not posted in 2012; and

Whereas, Calculated advance FON for 2013 have been provided to administrators via email, but neither the advance FON nor the data used to calculate it is independently available to local senate leaders;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request the Chancellor's Office to return to its previous practice of publishing both district FONs and the attendant calculations on a publicly available portion of its website each fall semester.

Contact: Eric Kaljumägi, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

### 7.03 F13 Performance Classes

Whereas, Lifelong learners from our communities often provide the necessary talent and personnel required to allow core courses in the performing arts (e.g., dance and theater productions, orchestras, bands, and ensembles) to remain viable and allow community college students to transfer into four-year performing arts degree programs;

Whereas, There are no current guidelines facilitating colleges' development of processes that allow credit and not-for-credit students to be concurrently enrolled in the same section of a course; and

Whereas, Students who participate in performing arts courses often find that these courses reinforce a love of learning and sense of personal efficacy that increases the likelihood of a student completing his/her educational and academic goals.

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's office to develop guidelines that would help colleges to develop processes that allow credit and not-for-credit students to be concurrently enrolled in the same section of a course thus supporting the viability of performing arts programs.

Contact: Michael Mangin, Cabrillo College, Area B

### 7.04 F13 Course Repetition to Maintain Workforce Skills Recency

Whereas, President Obama announced the creation of an \$8 billion Community College to Career Fund in February 2012, co-administered by the Department of Labor and Department of Education to develop partnerships between community colleges and businesses to train two million workers with skills that will lead directly to jobs;

Whereas, Essential workforce skills, such as computer and technology skills, are continually changing, and it is common that employment-related computer applications have significant upgrades every 12 months, thus rendering previously learned employment skills out of date;

Whereas, Title 5 §55043 has been amended to restrict student petitions to repeat courses due to a significant lapse of time to 36 months or more AND only if needed for transfer or as a recency prerequisite, thereby denying students the ability to petition to repeat courses that would update their computer and technology skills for employment after a specified length of time; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize the importance of responding to curricular needs of business and industry as stated in resolution 9.10 F11 adopted by the body in Fall 2011;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to research possible solutions, including potential changes to regulation, that would extend the provisions of Title 5 §55043 to students who must maintain recency in essential workforce skills by allowing reasonable repetition of regular credit coursework, and report the results of the research to the body by Fall 2014.

Contact: Sara McKinnon, College of Marin, Area B

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

### 8.0 COUNSELING

#### \*8.01 F13 Counselors as Discipline Experts

Whereas, The Student Success Task Force recommendations and recent legislation require colleges to increase matriculation services and other tasks typically completed by counselors due to their discipline expertise;

Whereas, Counselors are faculty who are required to meet the minimum qualifications stated in *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* (January 2012), and thus are the discipline subject matter experts whose roles and responsibilities are legally reserved to them because it falls within their subject matter expertise as defined in the state minimum qualifications;

Whereas, the recent Academic Senate for California Community Colleges paper titled *The Role of Counseling Faculty and Delivery of Counseling Services in the California Community Colleges* reiterates the four functions of Counselors notes in Title 5 §51018 and notes some of the discipline-specific competencies that counselors possess and some possible duties for paraprofessionals that are not reserved for counselors; and

Whereas, A recent PERB (Public Employment Relations Board) decision indicated “Unilateral transfer of work between classifications is unlawful.” (Desert Sands, PERB decision No. 1682, 8/25/04);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly encourage local senates to work collaboratively and collectively with their local bargaining units to prevent the improper appropriation of subject matter expertise and the roles and responsibilities legally reserved for counseling faculty to non-faculty paraprofessional advisors.

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College, Area B

### 9.0 CURRICULUM

#### \*9.01 F13 Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) Development and Implementation Guidelines

Whereas, The California Community College Chancellor’s Office based upon the passage of SB 1440 has set Associate in Arts for Transfer and Associate in Science for Transfer degree completion goals;

Whereas, California Community College campuses are mandated to rapidly develop and implement Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) to improve student transfer completion and to streamline the transfer process; and

Whereas, There are minimal guidelines and/or best practices available to assist instructional faculty, counselors, and articulation officers with ADT development issues such as campus coordination and oversight, alignment with and application of the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC), modification of courses to meet C-ID descriptors; and

Whereas, There are no written guidelines and/or best practices available for student services faculty to address ADT implementation issues such as reciprocity, course pass pass-alongs, course substitutions, pass/no pass and C- grading, external examinations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University develop guidelines and/or best practices for the development and implementation of ADTs and report to the body by Fall 2014.

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

Contact: David DeGroot, Allan Hancock College, Area C

### 12.0 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

#### \*12.01 F13 Community College Faculty Exchanges

Whereas, Professional development funds and sabbaticals are limited or nonexistent in many districts; and

Whereas, Faculty can learn much by visiting other campuses and observing their processes, instructional methods and programs in a variety of capacities from short visits to a visiting appointments;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges explore methods for full-time faculty participation in faculty exchanges with a colleagues at other colleges within the California Community College System, and report their findings to the body by Fall 2014.

Contact: Jennifer McCandless, Shasta College, Area A

### 15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES

#### 15.01 F13 Endorse LEAP General Education Outcomes

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has repeatedly noted the essential importance of a robust general education (GE) to becoming a well-rounded, educated citizen, and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has established essential learning outcomes for a student's general education experience called the Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) outcomes, defined as:

##### **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World**

- Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts

*Focused* by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

##### **Intellectual and Practical Skills, Including**

- Inquiry and analysis
- Critical and creative thinking
- Written and oral communication
- Quantitative literacy
- Information literacy
- Teamwork and problem solving

*Practiced extensively*, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

##### **Personal and Social Responsibility, Including**

- Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
- Intercultural knowledge and competence
- Ethical reasoning and action
- Foundations and skills for lifelong learning

*Anchored* through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

##### **Integrative and Applied Learning, Including**

- Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

*Demonstrated* through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems;



## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

Whereas, The California State University (CSU), by Executive Order 1065 (2011), states:

*Each CSU campus shall define its GE student learning outcomes, to fit within the framework of the four “Essential Learning Outcomes” drawn from the **Liberal Education and American Promise (LEAP)** campaign, an initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities;*

Whereas, California community college courses are expected to have course outcomes that connect to program and GE or institutional learning outcomes established by the college, and in the case of GE courses that transfer to CSU, the learning outcomes of those courses should align with CSU expectations; and

Whereas, The LEAP outcomes represent minimal standards for learning in courses and GE programs, and colleges may already have similar learning outcomes for GE or institution-wide;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the AAC&U LEAP<sup>4</sup> outcomes as minimum standards for GE or institutional learning outcomes.

Contact: David Morse, Vice President, ASCCC

### **15.01.01 F13 Amend Resolution 15.01 F13**

Amend the title to read:

#### **Explore Potential Impacts of Endorsing ~~Endorse~~ LEAP General Education Outcomes**

Amend the resolved to read:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges ~~endorse~~ explore potential impacts of endorsing the AAC&U LEAP outcomes ~~as minimum standards~~ for GE or institutional learning outcomes and report the results to the body by Fall 2014.

Contact: Eric Kaljumägi, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

### **15.01.02 F13 Amend Resolution 15.01 F13**

Amend resolved to read:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the AAC&U LEAP outcomes as model ~~minimum~~ standards for GE or institutional learning outcomes.

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College, Area B

---

<sup>4</sup> For more information, go to <http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm>

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

### 18.0 MATRICULATION

#### \*18.01 F13 Use of Multiple Measures in Common Statewide Assessment Exams

Whereas, Title 5 §55502 requires use of multiple measures in the assessment of course placement for individual students;

Whereas, Recent research conducted by the Community College Research Center (February, 2012) suggests that:

- Using placement exam scores as the sole determinant of college access simply for the sake of consistency and efficiency may not be justified;
- Using placement exam scores as the only means for placing students in English and math courses results in significant misplacement of students at rates of 24-33% in these courses;
- Using multiple measures instead of only placement exam scores may reduce English and math misplacement rates by up to 15%,
- Using multiple measures may reduce the need for remediation by 8-12% and may also improve student success in college-level courses;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office is soliciting proposals for developing a common assessment that will enable increased portability of assessment scores in accordance with the Student Success Act; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (Resolution 13.03 F11) supports the establishment of a centralized standard assessment as an option provided that the right to determine cut scores for placement locally is maintained and affirms the importance of faculty primacy with respect to the use of assessment for placement scores and the application of multiple measures;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges insist that the accuracy of placement, including the use of multiple measures, is as important to student success and advancement as the portability of a centralized standard assessment across the state; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert to the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors that any common assessment system developed for use by the California community colleges should maintain local control in the selection of multiple measures for use in placement processes and the manner in which those multiple measures are applied.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

Summary Report for the Senate  
Faculty Development  
October 22, 2013

**Actions Taken:**

- Approved the new mission statement
- Revised responsibilities and membership

**Events Planned:**

| <b>Week</b>                     | <b>Activity</b>                               |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 5 (Sep 23 <sup>rd</sup> )       | Send email for repeat sessions (Done)         |
| 7 (October 7 <sup>th</sup> )    | First general call for proposals (Done)       |
| 9 (October 21 <sup>st</sup> )   | Second general call for proposals (Done)      |
| 11 (November 4 <sup>th</sup> )  | All proposals are due and finalized           |
|                                 | Put calendar together                         |
| 13 (November 18 <sup>th</sup> ) | Senate approval (depends on meeting schedule) |
| 14 (November 25 <sup>th</sup> ) | Send an all faculty email with calendar       |

**Items for Recommendation:** none

**Other Resources needed/acquired/allocated:** None

**Useful Information:**

We will send a resolution forward for senate approval. The resolution will include name change, mission statement, responsibilities and membership of the committee.

## **Summary Report**

**Committee:** Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee

**Meeting date:** 16 Oct. 2013

### **Content**

**1 Discussion items:** We are in the midst of revising the “At a Glance Planning Process” document that was once under the charge of the EMPC. That document ought to be distributed to the college community soon. In that document, it lists the transitional planning process that we will follow this academic year while the committee continues to evaluate, revise, and define a process that we will follow in the future.

At our next meeting, we will discuss a process for request submissions and rubrics to use for prioritizing requests.

**2 Duties met:** We approved our page with our mission, responsibilities, and membership for SCC’s Collegial Governance Handbook that will be forwarded to the Senate and then to this body for adoption.

We also approved our list of goals for the 2013-2014 academic year.

**3 Actions proposed:** Senate and College Council adoption of PIE Committee page with our mission, responsibilities, and membership for SCC’s Collegial Governance Handbook.

Currently, the college community is encouraged to use the following when ranking their requests in their areas: college mission, institutional goals as listed in the EMP document, EMP document as a whole, safety considerations, legal mandates, and student success, as well as DPPs and Program Reviews as applicable.

**4 Events Planned:** N/A

**5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated:** N/A

## **Summary Report**

**Committee: Student Success**

**Meeting date: Monday, October 14, 2013**

### **1 Discussion items:**

- Early Alert (EA) update
  - Eight instructors of current online/hybrid courses use EA within Blackboard. Some other instructors noted that they use their own EA system.
  - It appears that Student Success Act funding will not be tied to the use of EA.
- Student Success Act (SSA) Implementation
  - SCC will need to develop a plan in order to receive funding
  - SSA target implementation date – 2015-16 academic year
- Crossroads
  - Dates for math and English classes have been scheduled
  - 70 RSVPs for the event in November
- Basic Skills Initiative (BSI)
  - Report has been sent to the state
  - This year BSI has allocated additional funds for faculty development

### **2 Actions proposed:**

- Explore the use of completion certificates to note student accomplishments at certain milestones.

### **4 Events Planned:**

- SCC Family Night – Wednesday, November 13, 2013

### **5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated: n/a**

## **Summary Report**

### **Committee: Enrollment Management Committee**

**Meeting date: October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

### **Content**

#### **1 Discussion items:**

- EMC discussed feedback received from department chairs. Most chairs expressed frustration about how courses have been added at the last minute and how classes have been cancelled too soon. Most chairs are not aware of the enrollment management data available and are simply rolling over schedules from years past. Looking at trends in how class enrollment happens (how many are enrolled on each day during the enrollment period and through the semester) was discussed and the committee felt this data would be very helpful.
- EMC discussed the need to create custom reports that will be kept in the RSCCD report repository. It was felt that the enrollment management tool contains so much information that extracting what the chairs need from it would be cumbersome.
- EMC had a presentation from Sergio Rodriguez on the different methods of computing FTES based on how a class is schedule. The presentation is available on the EMC website.
- EMC discussed creating the mission and responsibilities for the committee. It was agreed that the faculty philosophy on enrollment management passed by the senate in spring 2013 should be the basis for these. A task force was created to bring back a recommendation at the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- EMC discussed the possibility of meeting on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays of each month during the spring semester to establish try and have something available for chairs by the end of the academic year.

#### **2 Duties met:**

- Duties are being developed by a task force of EMC consisting of five members (C. Evett, R. Lamourelle, L. Miskovic, K. Irwin, R. Waldren) and these duties will be up for approval on November 19<sup>th</sup>.

#### **3 Actions proposed:**

- EMC will be voting on the Enrollment Management Framework on November 19<sup>th</sup>. Faculty are encouraged to speak with the committee members to provide input on this document. This recommendation (if passed) will be forwarded to the Academic Senate and College Council for adoption.
- EMC will be voting on its mission and responsibilities on November 19<sup>th</sup>. These will be created by the task force mentioned in the duties section.

#### **4 Events Planned:**

- The next joint chairs meeting will include a presentation about the types of enrollment management data that are available.

## **SUMMARY REPORT**

**Committee: Technology Committee**

**Meeting date: October 10, 2013**

### **Content**

- **Introduction:** Nolan Wiles, ASG Representative to Technology Committee, was introduced.

- **Fall 2013 Newsletter**

There are seven confirmed articles; Scott James will contribute an article on distance education; Nolan Wiles, ASG Representative, also committed to contributing an article on SCC students and technology.

- **Business**

- **Discussion item 1: Website Committee: Mission Statement & Responsibilities**

Committee members engaged in a lively discussion regarding the operational responsibilities of the Website Committee. There was general agreement that the advisory responsibilities were appropriate and expected for such a committee but that the operational ones were less so and might even constrain the appeal of the committee to potential committee members.

ACTION: Tabled

- **Discussion item2: Single Computer Login & Security**

The consensus of the Committee's discussion regarding the implementation of the District's single computer login ID for the district network and BlackBoard/email address protocols is that this is a good practice but that it raises privacy/confidentiality issues. Of concern is the partial use of district-wide personal identifier, the WebAdvisor ID, in the email address and exposes it very publicly, e.g., on business cards, course outlines, etc. Likewise, every time an instructor accesses his/her BlackBoard course in the classroom, the instructor's WebAdvisor ID is broadcast to the entire class. The expectation is that the same level of privacy and protection accorded to the use of student WebAdvisor IDs should be accorded to District employees. The Committee

urges the continued use of the existing email address protocol or another that incorporates the individual's name.

**ACTION:** Forward these concerns and recommendation to DO Technology Advisory Group (TAG) and to George Sweeney, Faculty Co-chair of Santa Ana Technology Advisory Committee

- Discussion item 3: Zumasys Technology Trial

Volunteers are being solicited to participate in a 30-day trial of the Zumasys Cloud hosting solution that allows an organization to move its applications to a data center and run its business on a 100% virtual server platform . This very flexible cloud computing model incorporated rental licensing and is perpetually upgraded. Essentially, by outsourcing management of its IT infrastructure, a Zumasys client benefits from the latest software and hardware technologies.

Committee and Academic Senate members are invited to a demonstration of the Zumasys technology at the November 7 TAG meeting at 2:30 pm at DO.

- **Reports**

- **TAG**

TAG will be updating the Strategic Technology Plan to align it with the Colleges' Technology Plans; completion date is January 2014.

After the discussion of the "replacement plan for technology equipment" agenda item submitted by the faculty co-chairs of the technology committees at each College, two action items resulted: 1) initiate discussion at each College on various models for implementing the replacement plan detailed in the Technology Plans and on the need to evaluate technology equipment ; 2) TAG will forward to District Council a recommendation for a one-time distribution of funds to replace 20% of the Colleges' technology equipment.

A district-wide survey on who is using Adobe products, which products are being used, and how much they are being used will be conducted to gather additional informational that can be used to help determine what type of site license is more cost effective to purchase and/or subscribe.

- **Duties met:**

- Providing input concerning the implementation of technologies/technology policies
- Communication with College and district personnel



## **Summary Report**

**Committee: Sustainable rscdd**

**Meeting date: 10/16/13**

### **Content**

**1 Discussion items:** This meeting featured a special presentation by HMC Architects regarding a move from the statement of sustainability practices to a sustainability plan. Discussed were the sustainability template, examples of sustainability analyses and strategies, a proposition 39 overview, and the draft approach we might adopt.

**2 Duties met:** Subcommittees reports were suspended for the day due to the meeting going overtime.

**3 Actions proposed:** Chancellor Rodriguez was suggested we should move forward to consider alternative approaches to the draft stage.

**4 Events Planned:** Workshops are planned to create both interest and understanding relative to the sustainability template.

**5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated:** None

## **Summary Report**

**Committee: SAC Senate**

**Meeting date: October 22, 2013**

**The following are informal highlights:**

### **Content**

#### **1 Discussion items:**

- Hiring was discussed; SAC may need to hire 28+ positions, which will be a burden on their budget and on faculty who need to participate in screening committees. There was concern expressed that SAC is having to carry the district and SCC with regards to the 50% law.
- The Road to Teaching Conference will be held on Saturday, November 16, 8am to 3pm, at Santa Ana College.
- The Freshman Experience Program will be highlighted at the upcoming plenary session.
- The October 28 Board meeting will be held at SAC.
- Faculty asked whether Webadvisor could notify them when a student dropped.
- There was strong opposition expressed to using the Webadvisor ID as our email addresses.
- The new budget model needs to be evaluated.
- It was expressed that the current student evaluation process is faulty. Faculty, especially recent hires, that hear back from only a small percentage of their students are missing valuable feedback. It was acknowledged that typing the comments as done in the previous process was time consuming. However, it was felt that ease was not more important than value.
- Concern was expressed about the lack of reading readiness. Students, especially in the social studies, need to have a fairly sophisticated reading ability. The current policy is that the reading requirement can be met by completing 9 units of GE courses, which seems to be equivalent to only a 10<sup>th</sup> grade reading level. Students are often unaware of their reading level.

#### **2 Duties met:**

#### **3 Actions proposed:**

#### **4 Events Planned:**

#### **5 Resources needed/acquired/allocated:**

# Santiago Canyon College

## Academic Senate

8045 E Chapman Ave  
Orange, CA 92869-4512

(714) 628-4831  
FAX (714) 532-2055

### **Minutes-Tentative**

Senate Business Meeting

October 15, 2013

1:30 pm-3:00 pm E-306

#### **Present:**

##### **Senators**

Aguilera, Leonor  
Cannon, Cari  
Carrion, Rudy  
Cummins, Shawn  
Deaver, Doug  
Deeley, Steve  
Dela-Cusack, Lisa  
Elchlepp, Elizabeth  
Freidenrich, Leah  
Frost, Alicia  
Hovanitz, Eric

Matthews, Evangeline  
Mettler, Mary  
Salcido, Andrew  
Shekarabi, Nooshan  
Shields, Jolene  
Sproat, Barbara  
Taylor, Michael

Rutan, Craig (Curriculum Chair)

##### **Guests:**

James, Scott  
Kawa, Steve  
Voelcker, Aaron  
Wong, Lana

##### **Absent:**

Nance, Craig  
Shoro, Natasha

##### **Officers**

Evelt, Corinna (President)  
DeCarbo, Michael (Vice President)  
Wagner, Joyce (Sec/Treasurer)

The meeting began with a moment of silence in respect of SAC Chemistry Prof. Mike Kelcher, who recently passed away. It was moved to donate \$100 from our Senate to a fund being created for Prof. Kelcher's son. **The motion passed without dissent (moved by Prof. Dela-Cusack and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).**

- I. Order of the Agenda (no changes)
- II. Approval of Minutes
  - A. The minutes of October 1, 2013, were approved (moved by Prof. Sproat and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).
- III. Public Comments
  - A. Prof. Wong: The non smoking policy does not seem to be working well in the library. There seems to be an increasing use of chewing tobacco, which is being found in sinks, water fountains, floors, and trashcans.
  - B. Prof. Rutan: The Governor signed SB 440 which is in conjunction with SB1440 which created associate degrees for transfer. SB 440 requires community colleges to implement the transfer degree in all of their existing majors. CSUs are now required to accept transfer degrees in each of their individual areas. For example, CS Fullerton has 14 different areas in Communication and must now accept the communication transfer degree in all 14 areas.
- IV. AS Executive Board Reports
  - A. President (Prof. Evelt):
    1. Faculty hiring:
      - a. At the District Human Resources Committee meeting last week, it was proposed that SAC hire 28 positions and SCC hire one position to maintain the faculty obligation number (FON).
      - b. The Distance Education position is already funded and does not count toward these numbers.
      - c. An official policy for deciding minimum faculty hires for each college will need to be discussed by the District Fiscal Resources Committee and the Planning and Organizational Effectiveness Committee.
      - d. At our college, the Budget Committee and the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee will need to determine how many positions we can afford to hire and how we will decide whether to hire more than the minimum.
      - e. The SCC budget is very tight right now. The District may be asked for help in funding additional faculty hires.
      - f. The Senate will still rank all 22 of the requested positions.
      - g. The District is currently 11 faculty positions under the FON. If the District gets penalized \$65,000 for each of these positions, the Chancellor will pay the fine out of the District stabilization funds.

2. Intersession:
  - a. The District is funding this winter's intersession.
  - b. So far, SCC has 46 classes scheduled.
  - c. Current calculations show that SCC is ahead of our current FTES target. The potential growth money may enable us to hire more faculty in the future.
  - d. Each college will need to fund its own future intersession.
  - e. Since the benefits seem to outweigh the increased cost of intersession, SCC will probably be planning for future intersessions.
3. Prof. Evett offered thanks to the number of faculty who attended and said kind words about the Academic Senate and its leadership at the most recent Board of Trustees meeting, which was held at SCC.
4. Prof. Resnick will be attending the next Senate meeting, on November 5, to give a brief FARCCD report.
5. Vice President of Student Services, John Hernandez, will also be at the next Senate meeting. Please send any questions to Prof. Evett.
6. Vice President of Continuing Education, Jose Vargas, is scheduled to attend the Senate meeting on November 19. Trustee Phil Yarbrough is scheduled to attend the Senate meeting on December 3.
7. The Chancellor may provide District funds for those who wish to attend the Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity event on December 6, 2013, from 8:00-3:00, at California State University Fullerton. Contact Prof. Evett if you're interested in attending.
8. Other upcoming events include the Wellness Wednesday Workshops, Prof. Rutan's Faculty Excellence talk on November 21, and the Holiday Showcase on November 30.

B. Vice President (Prof. DeCarbo):

1. Prof. DeCarbo expressed to the Web Redesign Committee and the Web Committee the Senate concerns that the upcoming web redesign will merely be cosmetic.
2. There are going to be some systematic changes, and the decisions will be informed.
3. Please check out the DePauw website and complete the survey that was sent out by the Web Redesign Committee. It is important that the committee receives faculty input.
4. Minutes and other information from the Web Redesign Committee can be found at <http://teams.rscsd.edu/scc/webcomm/Web%20Redesign%20Docs/Forms/AllItems.aspx>
5. The librarians looked at the DePauw website, found some flaws, and wanted to know specifics on why students had chosen that site as their favorite.
6. The tags and drop down menus on the DePauw website were noted to be visually clear and easy to read.
7. No faculty attended the recent Web Redesign Committee.

C. CIC Chair (Prof. Rutan):

1. SCC currently have over 180 course outline proposals that still need to be approved this semester by the CIC. Some faculty seem to be ignoring deadlines.
2. The CIC will need to have overly long meetings the remainder of this semester.
3. Next year, every course submitted after the deadline is "dead." If the course was due for quadrennial review and was not submitted in time, it will not be scheduled.
4. Courses with prerequisites, distance education addendums, or honors addendums require additional to review.
5. The CIC has not approved any submitted courses with distance education addendums since the training by Scott James, but is hoping to at their next meeting.

V. ASG Report (no student representative)

- A. Prof. Evett mentioned that the Governor did sign AB 955, a pilot for two-tiered funding in intersession and summer. Of the six community colleges mentioned in the bill, only Long Beach City College is going through with the pilot. Students voiced opposition at the recent Board of Trustees meeting. The SCC and SAC Senate Executive Boards are considering writing a joint resolution in opposition. However, there does not seem to be a sense of urgency because of the limited participation in the pilot and the need to reassess this proposed policy after the pilot is completed.

VI. Action

- A. **Resolution F2013.8:** Adoption of the 9 May 2013 Distance Education Handbook (Scott James)—First reading
  1. The handbook is designed to be more than a policy document. The handbook is a tool to guide online course development and to provide support throughout an online course.
  2. Senators need to pay extra attention to the expectations and policies that have been added or changed.
    - a. All new online instructors will go through an online teaching and certificate program, either off campus or on campus.
    - b. Current instructors will not have to do the training, but will have a currency requirement that can be satisfied with @One courses, or other Technology Committee approved online workshops.
    - c. All new online instructors will have their first online course evaluated.
    - d. Certain expectations for online courses were specified, such as regular and effective content and the last day to drop students who are not making substantive progress.

3. The resolution was moved by Prof. Mettler and seconded by Prof. Freidenrich.
  4. It was suggested that a glossary for acronyms be included.
  5. There was a question on the difference between an online course and a virtual hybrid course:
    - a. An online course has no specifically scheduled time for students to meet.
    - b. A virtual hybrid course has specific times scheduled for students to be online for various class activities.
- B. **Resolution F2013.9:** Affirmation of the 9 May 2013 Technology Master Plan 2013-2017 (Prof. Wong)—First reading
1. The plan is designed to provide a framework for the development of technology and its related resources.
  2. The framework addresses the areas of learning, assessment, teaching, and infrastructure.
  3. The plan looks at unifying the technology infrastructure on campus and the commitment to it.
    - a. There is no one person who is responsible for technology on this campus.
    - b. Infrastructure includes equipment and personnel.
    - c. Specific concerns include instructional design, the website (no one person is in charge), and resource allocation priorities.
    - d. There are significant deficits in how SCC plans and budgets for technology. How do we use data about our different technologies to inform planning?
  4. Kudos to the workgroup from the Technology Committee who developed the plan.
  5. Suggestions from senators:
    - a. Include a glossary to help with all the technology terms.
    - b. Include a more updated College Governance Framework diagram.
  6. Moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Frost.
- C. **Resolution F2013.7:** Adoption of Fall 2013 Revised Academic Program Review Template—Second reading
1. Final graphics are still being created.
  2. SCC will not be on the three year program review cycle until after the next program review in 2015.
  3. The Educational Master Planning Committee determined that the due date for this academic program review will be March 17, 2014.
  4. **The motion to approve resolution F2013.7 was passed without dissent** (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi).

\*\*\*Approved resolutions are posted online: <http://sccollege.edu/Departments/AcademicSenate/Pages/resolutions.aspx> \*\*\*

## VII. Discussion Items

- A. Administrative Services Update (VPAS Steve Kawa responding to questions submitted in advance by faculty):
1. The Library was concerned about not having enough money for databases and other expenses.
    - a. The SCC general fund budget is \$30 million and includes all salaries, part-time instruction, supplies, equipment, and contract services. The salary portion is about \$24.5 million, which includes about \$5.5 million for part time instruction.
    - b. Last year, SCC overran our budget by about \$800,000, but was able to use the \$950,000 that had been saved from previous years.
    - c. Last year was a lean spending year with no extras, so it will be difficult to decrease spending this year.
      - i. SCC had asked the District for an additional \$1.5 million, but was turned down. Some of the money had been earmarked for custodians, a dean in Continuing Education, a distance education coordinator, and a financial-aid analyst for veterans.
      - ii. Our budget expenditures are almost identical to last year's expenditures at this time.
      - iii. Intersession will cost about \$300,000, but that money will be recovered from the District at the end of the academic year.
      - iv. SCC is hoping for additional recovery money from the District.
      - v. SCC is also hoping for growth money for next year.
    - d. Some help may come from lottery funds, which are about \$450,000.
      - i. Some of the money is reserved for supply money for the Humanities Building.
      - ii. The District will fund the refurbishing of the D-building, and some of the lottery money will help with supplies.
      - iii. Ultimately, there will be some lottery funds left to increase the supply money for all departments.
      - iv. The PIE Committee and the Budget Committee will work together to establish priorities and find funds for supplies and other requests.
  2. Should Lot 7 be reserved for staff parking only?
    - a. That will be a possibility after the Humanities Building is finished. Right now, staff may be mostly parking in lot 6, so it is better to allow students to use some of Lot 7.
  3. What is the update on the M&O building?
    - a. A forklift, pallet jacks, and furniture will cost about \$50,000. The plan is to wait to spend this money until after the gym and the Humanities Building are furnished.
    - b. The M&O building should be ready to occupy by February 2014.

4. What safety measures are being taken in light of campus shootings?
    - a. The Chancellor created a task force headed by Alistair Winter which will, among other things, explore the possibility of armed security officers on campus.
      - i. The Santa Ana Police Department, because of force reductions, has a response time of up to 20 minutes.
      - ii. The Orange Police Department usually responds within 5-10 minutes, so SCC is less likely to need armed security officers.
      - iii. One possibility is to contract the Orange PD to be our security force.
      - iv. The task force will be meeting for the first time in about three weeks.
    - b. Melissa Campitelli-Smith, SCC's college psychiatrist, has allocated funds for assistance should there be a terror attack on campus.
      - i. Alistair Winter and an outside firm are holding a training session this Thursday on what to do if there is a shooter on campus. The training will be expanded to other groups.
    - c. The new surveillance cameras, which are only available to security, have proven useful. A person doing graffiti was caught on camera and was later arrested by the Orange PD.
  5. What is the update on the Humanities Building?
    - a. Various people are getting trained on the equipment that is in the building.
    - b. The solar panel system on the roof has not yet been approved by Edison. We can occupy the building, but cannot use the solar power.
    - c. Sharp projector systems were ordered, but the company is getting out of the projector business. A new purchase order, with a different company, will have to be placed.
    - d. Purchase orders for classroom furniture should be going out this week.
  6. How is the PIE committee going to prioritize requests that are often very different from each other?
    - a. That discussion is currently happening in the PIE committee. The thought is that the PIE committee would generate a list using a number of different planning documents. That list would be sent to the Budget Committee to determine which items can be funded, and how. The results would go back to the PIE Committee, which would reevaluate the list and send it to College Council.
  7. Other information:
    - a. The cost to do work on the HVAC (heating and air conditioning) system in the Science Building will be between \$300,000 and \$350,000 and will be District funded. It is not clear when the work will be started.
    - b. The boiler in the D-building will be replaced soon since it is not AQMD certified. The work will be funded using capital outlay.
    - c. \$16 million has been set aside to bring the Orange Education Center up to code.
      - i. \$4 million is coming from redevelopment agency funds, \$5 million from Measure E, and \$7 million from the District stabilization fund.
      - ii. This will deplete the redevelopment agency funds, which we have been collecting over the years.
- B. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Resolutions
1. The Area D meeting is this Saturday at Imperial Valley College. Profs. Evett and Rutan will be representing SCC and want to get feedback from faculty regarding the proposed resolutions.
  2. The complete resolutions can be found at <http://www.asccc.org/fall2013/resolutions>.
  3. Resolutions and Senate input:
    - a. 2.01: ASCCC Statement on Accreditation
      - i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the following statement on accreditation to be used to guide the ASCCC in its ongoing work to support college accreditation efforts.*
      - ii. There seems to be no harm in adopting the statement that is included.
    - b. 2.02: Request of ACCJC to Model Effective Self-Evaluation Practices
      - i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the ACCJC to model and exemplify for its member institutions effective self-evaluation practices by acknowledging and addressing any areas of non-compliance identified in evaluations by the USDE's Accreditation Group and the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Improvement (NACIQI), and to document what steps it will take to address any areas of non-compliance.*
      - ii. It seems fair to ask the ACCJC to do what it asks of community colleges—to complete a self-evaluation and address areas of non-compliance.
    - c. 2.03: Sufficient Advance Notice for Changes to Required ACCJC Annual Reports
      - i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC provide member institutions opportunities to provide meaningful input to the ACCJC about any proposed changes to the required annual reports, and that any adopted changes to the annual reports be published at least six months in advance of the date they are due*

- ii. A suggestion was made to request a change from six months to nine months. Our representatives will bring that up at the Area D meeting.
    - iii. It was mentioned that SCC should also try to give department chairs enough advance notice of changes in required assessment and other reports. This topic will be added to a future Senate agenda.
  - d. 2.04: Employ the Term “Deficiency” Rather Than “Recommendation” for Evaluation Findings That Must Be Addressed by the Two-Year Rule
    - i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC adopt and employ the term “deficiency” for those findings of non-compliance that must be addressed under the Two-Year Rule, and reserve the term “recommendation” exclusively for Commission suggestions to increase institutional effectiveness of noncompliance and leave recommendation for suggestions.*
    - ii. San Francisco City College seemed unclear about whether some of the recommendations they received in 2006 were under the two-year rule.
  - e. 15.01: Endorse LEAP General Education Outcomes
    - i. *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the AAC&U LEAP outcomes as minimum standards for GE or institutional learning outcomes.*  
*<http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm>*
    - ii. LEAP stands for “Liberal Education and America’s Promise.”
    - iii. It was felt that more understanding and deliberation is needed before a decision could be made. Our representatives will bring back information from the Area D meeting.
  - f. Four of the resolutions deal with the ACCJC. There seem to be two goals:
    - i. To state the role of the statewide Academic Senate in the accreditation process.
    - ii. To call to task the ACCJC about how they have handled things.
      - 1. Some people feel that the ACCJC has been too harsh.
      - 2. Others feel that the ACCJC is justified because California community colleges are behind community colleges in other states.
- C. Academic Senate Scholarship (Prof. DeCarbo):
  - 1. History of the Senate scholarship
    - a. In the past, the Senate donated \$500 each year for a scholarship.
      - i. Our main criterion in the past was academic excellence.
      - ii. When screening applicants, leadership and involvement on campus was also taken into account.
      - iii. Financial need was not a major consideration
    - b. Two years ago, the Senate created the Academic Senate/ Castle Foundation Scholarship.
      - i. The Osher Foundation offered to donate \$6,666 if the Senate could raise \$13,334. This money would allow the Senate to offer \$1,000 in scholarships each year in perpetuity.
        - 1. Of the needed \$13,334. \$7,000 was donated by the Castle Foundation, \$2,400 was contributed by individual faculty members, and \$3,934 came from the Senate.
        - 2. The Senate had sent out a survey to the faculty before going forward with the Osher offer.
      - ii. It was later found that to be eligible for this scholarship, applicants needed to be receiving a BOG waiver.
  - 2. Concerns:
    - a. Worthy students would be excluded from consideration because they are not receiving BOG waivers.
    - b. Could Osher add additional requirements in the future?
  - 3. The SCC Foundation is willing to purchase the scholarship and pay back the \$2,400 and the \$3,934.
    - a. There would either no longer be a Senate scholarship, or the Senate would have to decide whether to donate a fixed amount each year.
  - 4. Senators need to ask their constituents whether the BOG waiver requirement is acceptable or unacceptable.
  - 5. The Senate Executive Board will look back at the information gleaned from the prior faculty survey.
  - 6. Some possibilities for the future:
    - a. Keep the scholarship as it is now (with the BOG waiver requirement).
    - b. Sell the scholarship to the Foundation, and go back to donating money each year toward a Senate scholarship with whatever requirements the Senate determines.
    - c. Sell the scholarship to the Foundation and no longer offer any Senate scholarship.
    - d. Keep the current scholarship and also donate money each year toward a Senate scholarship with whatever requirements the Senate determines.

#### VIII. Summary Reports Discussion (see attached summaries)

Meeting Adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Wagner SCC-AS Secretary/Treasurer