**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING SUMMARY**

**02/23/09 Room 222 3:00-5:00 p.m.**

Present:

Alex Sample, Michael Norris, Ginny Richards, Clint Ryan, Bill Fracisco, Mark Lewis, Brendan Brown, Brad Nash, Cindy McGrath, Mara Landers, Nancy Bachmann, Scott Cabral, Andy Ochoa, John Henry, Lydia Macy, Estelle Davi, Phil Gottlieb

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Topic/Activity** | **Summary/Actions Taken** |
| 1 | Call to Order |  |
| 2 | Public Comment |  |
| 3 | Senate Announcements & Reports | **Announcements & Reports**   * Budget update: There were only one or two minor cuts to the funding for community colleges. However, the K-12 and CSUs had a lot of their funding cut significantly. * Roy Sutton has retired and you are invited to celebrate his 32 years of dedicated service to LMC on Saturday March 21st. Please contact Leticia Rodriguez at extension 3226 for details. * Kennedy-King Annual Dinner is on May 15th. Tickets are $75 each and are currently on sale. See Michael Norris for more information.   **FSCC (Faculty Senate Consultation Committee) Report**   * The main topic at the meeting was making the Equivalencies Policies more consistent across the District. FSCC is looking into making the policies more uniform especially, as it pertains to years of experience (# years of experience = # of units) while still maintaining a level of local control at the college level. * As FSCC began to look into the policies among the District because there was an extremely wide range of interpretation equivalency applications among the campuses in the District. * Concern: what happens to the autonomous decision by the departments on the individual campuses as a result of this attempt to unify the policy if there is no agreement between departments across the District? Michael stated that he will take that question to the next FSCC meeting.   **SGC (Shared Governance Committee) Report**   * SGC meets this Wednesday and the meeting is dedicated to RAP proposals.   **DGC (District Governance Committee) Report**   * Most of the DGC meeting was spent discussing the budgets. At the time of this meeting the state budget had not yet been approved. * Michael made an announcement that because of the very large increases in the FTES district-wide there is a certain level of 30,877 FTES that is the “high water mark” for where we as a district were at one point. If we go past the “high water mark” of 30,877 FTES and that state decides that there is no growth money, any FTES above 30,877 would be unfunded FTES. So LMC cannot continue to grow at an annual increase rate of 15% without growth funding available.   **Curriculum Committee Report**   * Curriculum Committee completed all of the lab hours by arrangement materials. CC worked with various departments on their individual proposals in regards to the lab hours by arrangement. * Richard Livingston discussed Accreditation and as it pertains to the course outlines. He will also be returning to CC to finish discussion on this topic.   **Follow-Up Report-Michael Norris**   * Michael stated that he has a call into Mojdeh regarding the subject of the SARS process for lab hours by arrangement becoming completely electronic (discussed at the last meeting under Consultation Committee Report). * Michael spoke to Eileen Valenzuela in the Office of Instruction regarding obtaining a list of outdated COORS (discussed at the last meeting 3rd bullet from the end under Follow-Up Report). Eileen told Michael that she is currently working on an updated list and it should be completed soon. * Michael stated that Peter is working on some Box 2A decisions and will be coming out with a Box 2A announcement very soon. Following Peter’s review and decisions on Box 2A, a ranking list should be made public shortly thereafter. Peter is also on planning on coming to a Senate meeting to discuss Box 2A and the proposed TLP position. (discussed at the last meeting in the last bullet under Follow-Up Report). |
| 4,5 | Approval of previous minutes  Agenda reading and approval | **Minutes approved with corrections:** (14-0-0)   1. Under item 6 in the second bullet from the bottom, The sentence “Janice addressed this by stating that the COORS can be written in a different manner so as to provide a little room…” change “different” to “more open” and delete “a little”. 2. In item 8 under the first bullet “The District before…” replace “District” with “DGC”. 3. In item 8 under the last bullet “…percentage of full-time faculty and the smallest classroom size that is fiscally possible.” Delete “classroom” and replace with “class”. 4. In item 8 under the section for suggested changes under #2 “The item pertaining to the goal of ‘smallest classroom size and the…’” delete “classroom” and replace with “class”.   **Agenda approved with no corrections:** (14-0-0) |
| 6 | Appointments | **Research and Planning Committee Appointment**   * Clint announced the vacancy on the Research and Planning Committee. If anyone is interested please contact Clint Ryan.   **Shared Governance Committee Appointment**   * Brad Nash will be able to finish out this semester on the SGC but we will need to elect a new SGC rep from Occupational Education to fill his position on SGC for Fall 2009. The SGC meetings are held on the second and fourth Wednesday every month from 2-4 p.m.   **Jonnah LaRoche Memorial Scholarship (see Handout)**   * The Academic Senate can nominate one continuing student and one transfer student. The continuing student recipient will receive $500 and the transferring student recipient will receive $1000. The only requirements for the nominees are: they must be from a group that is historically underrepresented in higher education (an ethnic minority group or a have a documented disability), have at least a 3.0 gpa, demonstrate financial need and if they are a continuing student they must have at least 15 units. * The two nominations for the continuing student scholarship are Jack Garrett and April Romero. John Calderon was the only nomination received for the transferring student scholarship. * **Results are: Jack Garrett (8-0-3) and April Romero (3-0-3). Jack Garrett is approved as the nomination for the continuing student scholarship.** * **John Calderon is approved as the nomination for the transferring student scholarship. (10-1-3)** |
| 7 | COORs Plan Continuing Discussion – Richard Livingston  (see Handout) | **History and Update**   * Years ago most colleges were just reaccredited but it has changed significantly in recent years. There is more accountability from the Federal Government, in some ways regional accrediting agencies are almost being accredited themselves. Consequently, the Accreditation Commission is much more concerned about outcomes and accountability. * The first week in February 2009 we received the letter from the Accreditation Commission which had met in January 2009. There are four levels which this cycle could result in and they are: reaccredited, warning, probation and show cause. LMC has been reaccredited which is extremely good news for the college. * The next step is LMC has to file a report by October 2009 to the Accreditation Commission on where we are with course level student learning outcomes. Then LMC has to file a focused Midterm Report in a couple years to address their four recommendations. There are no follow-up visits or sanctions.   **Review of Handout and Discussion**   * Richard passed out the letter from the Accreditation Commission including the 1st College Recommendation. Michael stated that if anyone wanted to see the entire report from the commission it is all on online at the LMC Website and use the Faculty and Staff link and from there use the Accreditation link. * Richard stated that between now and October 2009 LMC must respond to the first recommendation noted on the handout. The visiting team and the Accreditation Commission stated that LMC has done a very good job at institutional level student learning outcomes (Student Services, General Ed., Developmental Ed., etc.) we have done the program level student outcomes through program review but we have not made adequate progress on the course level student learning outcomes. When the subject of CSLOs came up several years ago, TLP and Curriculum Committee said to change the “old fashioned” objectives to student learning outcomes in the course outlines. Since we are supposed to be updating about a fifth of the COORs every single year, over the course of five years we will get where we need to be in terms of having the SLOs in all the COORs. Unfortunately, we did not update a fifth of our COORs every single year so we ended up falling far behind in our COORs and SLOs. We still have around 400 courses that need to be updated and do not include SLOs yet. The Commission made a discrete recommendation in their report that LMC may need to increase the pace to which we are completing this process. In the best interest of LMC, faculty and student we need to get this recommendation completed before 2012 so we remain accredited. * Richard stated that Management would like to work collaboratively with Faculty and the Academic Senate to develop a plan of action for resolving this problematic issue (incentives, etc.). Peter has also recommended a devising a short-term task force to help with responding to the Commission by 2012 that will should be made up of some Curriculum Committee members, Academic Senate representatives, TLP members, etc. * The immediate task is to report to the Commission on how LMC is going to get the CSLOs done and then how are we going to develop a plan to assess them and actually be assessing them by 2012. * Janice stated that it is helpful for faculty to know that the date for COORs to be done is November 1, 2011. * This is an extremely high priority for Peter Garcia and we are aware of the high number of part time faculty that we have and are prepared to pay part-time faculty to complete COORs. We do have a “Camp Course Outline” coming up, CurricuNet, coaching, FLEX activities, etc. * There was a suggestion to put up a really big thermometer that would show the progress we have made and are making on COORs and how many more we have to go before it is done. * Janice stated Camp Course Outline is this Friday and the Foundation is buying lunch. She is encouraging departments to send their part-time faculty and faculty does not need to be there entire time, it would be helpful even if you can only come for a couple hours. Janice also stated to please R.S.V.P. by Wednesday morning before the SGC meeting, so she is aware of how many coaches to have available. She also said that if you are unable to make the “Camp Course Outline” to e-mail her with some dates and times when you are available and she can set up an appointment for individual coaching. * Richard confirmed that Management is paying a $250 stipend to part-time faculty who complete a COORs. * Richard confirmed that this issue regarding Accreditation and the COORs process as well as the assessment of the SLOs will not “be going away”. This is a problem and we at LMC need to quickly approach resolution to this issue. * Richard ended his discussion with thanking the Academic Senate for its participation and assistance through the Accreditation process. He also added that if anyone has an idea on how to we can work together on the COORs process to please let him know. |
| 8 | DVC’s Show Cause  (see Handout) | **DVC Recommendations**   * This was brought to the Senate for discussion because questions about DVC completing previous accreditation recommendations have been raised. * Also on this handout are the most recent accreditation recommendations for the District. * Michael noted the two previous recommendations that were not resolved at DVC that they were “dinged” for. N Those recommendations are on the top of page 5 of the handout.  1. Recommendation 3: “Implementation of a uniform process of program review which includes direct evidence of student learning and is used to inform and influence planning and resource allocation and leads to improvements in programs and services.”  * Michael stated that this particular item has been around for several years and colleges have gotten severely “dinged” for not having program review somehow connected to resource allocation. Fortunate for LMC because of the RAP process and the program review process we do have a significant connection between the two and therefore, we did not receive a recommendation for this.  1. Recommendation 6: “…timely systematic review and efficient procedures for course and program approval with adequate technology and staff support.”  * Michael stated that he did not know exactly what this recommendation means but he is assuming that it refers to a problem with the timeliness of course and program approvals. At LMC we do not currently have an issue with this particular item.   **District Recommendations**   * The District recommendations begin at the bottom of page 5. If you look at the report from LMC and CCC these District recommendations also appear then. * Due to DVC receiving a show cause and the District recommendations appearing on their report as well the District recommendations must also be resolved by October. The District recommendations are listed below.  1. Recommendation 8: “…the district should expedite development of a financial allocation model including the following…a) the model as a whole; b.) Funding for adjunct faculty in a way that will support the district and college intentions to increase student enrollment; c.) Technology funding.  * Michael stated that the key items “funding for adjunct faculty” and the “model as a whole” are mostly referring to the AC and C contracts. Earlier this year there was a meeting regarding this issue. These two items are currently being worked on and should be resolved fairly soon. The “model as whole” item seems to also be referring to the DGC having been asked to have more important role in the District budget process. Kindred is approaching all of the DGC members to assure that all the members know what the various funds are, that the District Cabinet is going to bring their budget items to the DGC and the District Cabinet will be directly involved with the DGC on working out “numbers” for the budget. * Michael noted that he does not know anything about part c of the recommendation 8 for “Technology funding”. He also stated that Mojdeh was unavailable that date and so this item was not discussed.  1. Recommendation 9: “…the district should establish a written code of professional ethics which includes managers.”  * There a couple ways to resolve this issue one is to take the old version that we have that did not have managers included in it and add the word managers and then we have resolved this item. The other way is the short paragraph that was seen by the Academic Senate previously can be added to our old code of ethics and this would also solve this issue. As soon as Michael hears exactly what the District Cabinet will do to resolve this item he will let us know.  1. Recommendation 10: “…the district should integrate student learning outcomes into the evaluation process for those who have a direct responsibility for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes.”  * This particular recommendation is very problematic throughout the state. The Unions refuse to allow this recommendation in but the Accreditation insists that it must be there. Jeff Michels stated at the meeting that he has an idea on a way to meet this recommendation and the Union will approve of it. As soon as Michael hears what this idea might be he will bring it to the Senate. * There was a discussion on this item because faculty feels that it is not right that the SLOs be connected to an instructor’s evaluation. This recommendation may have stemmed from the COORs being a part of the evaluation process and the CSLOs being “folded into” the COORs. Michael stated that he will e-mail Jeff Michels about the concerns voiced on this topic from the Senate.  1. Recommendation 11: “…the district should develop a policy and implement procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the district’s administrative organization, the delineation of responsibilities of the district and the colleges, and the governance and decision making structures. The results should be widely communicated and used as a basis for improvement.”  * Michael stated that this issue may be resolved by distributing a “survey monkey” in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the district administration, the delineation of the district and the colleges and the governance and decision making structures.   **Discussion**   * Question: who generates the standards the Accreditation adheres to? WASC is autonomous and generates the standards. The particular issue is with recommendation 10 and the Senate has questions as to whether the State Senate and Union is directly involved in ratifying this particular standard. Michael did state that he believes that representatives from the State Senate and the UF (state-wide) are becoming involved in rectifying this issue with WASC. |
| 9 | Academic Renewal – Robin Armour  (see Handout) | **History and Review of Handout**   * Robin is the Director of Admissions and Records. She is a member of the committee working with district Admissions and Records Directors from each of the colleges, IT, District personnel and Senior Deans to standardize District policies at all three campuses. The goal is to have matching admissions procedures and policies at all District campuses to make things less confusing and difficult for students enrolling at multiple campuses. * The Academic Renewal policy was brought to the attention of the Director’s Group by William Oye from DVC. The document labeled Academic Renewal Policy has gone through most of the groups here at LMC and the Senate is the last group to approve of the document. * Course Repetition is not included in this policy. For example, if a student who receives a D, F or a No Pass in a course that they may need for graduation and it is recommended that they take that course again and that would remove the D, F or NP from their gpa and replace it with the better grade. This particular situation is not part of the Academic Renewal Policy. * Title V is very specific in stating that each district should have an “Academic Forgiveness Policy” that removes from the gpa calculation any work that is not reflective of a student’s demonstrated ability. Every community college has a policy for this in accordance with state law. For example, a student who comes to the college right out of high school and receives some substandard grades. In the future, this same student becomes a serious student and receives excellent grades but, he/she has these substandard grades on their record from the past. This Academic Renewal Policy is a way that we can forgive these courses and actually remove them from the gpa calculation. We are still required to show a complete academic record on every student so we do not “line” them out. * There are a few things that were added to the previous policy in creating this revised policy. One item is on the handout where it states “**Please note:**…” we had to add the disclosure that this “is a local district policy and may not be accepted by UC, CSU or private institutions.” As well as informing the student it would be in their best interest to meet with a counselor from the transfer institution. Another is the recommendation that a student meet with a counselor to review their options and that the student be made aware that Academic Renewal is irreversible. Another change is that a counselor’s signature is highly recommended on the form the student completes and submits. * Robin also noted that the Academic Renewal is a “once in a lifetime” procedure and should not be repeated. The student can renew a combination of district courses of up to 15 units.   **Discussion**   * One suggestion was to clarify in this policy that a student does not need to renew a class that they plan to retake. Robin stated that one of the A&R Directors in the group had an exception to putting that into the document. Robin did clarify that the statement under “**Please note:**” that states the recommendation that the student meet with a counselor to review their options would allow them the opportunity for a counselor to advise them to not use the Academic Renewal for a specific course but instead use the Course Repetition and retake the course. * A question was brought up how the Academic Renewal Policy affects the application of scholarships. Robin addressed this question by stating the substandard work would still appear on the student’s transcripts but it would be removed from their overall gpa calculation. As Robin understands most scholarships do review their transcripts in addition to the overall gpa. * The Academic Renewal can only be used once for up to 15 units combined throughout the district. The A&R Directors felt that if the student the Academic Renewal multiple times, the substandard work might be indicative of the student’s abilities. Doing multiple Academic Renewal might also infringe on the integrity of the degrees and certificates that come from the District. * Robin also reiterated that the Academic Renewal should be investigated and thought about wisely before the student uses it because it can only be used once. * One question was as to why the counselor’s signature on the Academic Renewal Policy form is not mandatory instead of recommended. Robin answered this question by stating that there was some resistance from one of the other colleges to make this counselor’s signature recommended and not mandatory. It is a suggestion from the Senate that the Academic Renewal Policy and form be changed so that the counselor’s signature is mandatory instead of “highly recommended”. Robin noted this suggestion and stated that she would take it back to the A&R Directors Group.   **Course Repetition (see Handout)**   * Title V new regulations allow a student to receive 4 “W”s and we can get apportionment for it. They can also get 3 substandard grades and we can get apportionment for it. So we can actually get apportionment for that student attending 7 times depending on in what order they take the classes. * If a student gets a “STOP” as seen on the chart they may not enroll in this class unless the student petitions and is approved for enrollment under “lapse of time” or “extenuating circumstances” within the confines of Title V and the district policies on each. After three years a student can repeat a course one more time and we will get paid for it. This handout and chart is for “Non-Repeatable Courses”. * An issue is brought up that if a student receives two “W”s in the same class that it constitutes a real problem. In this case, a student should be required to meet with a counselor. * Robin stated that repeatable classes are only allowed to repeat 4 times maximum. We do get apportionment for all those repeats. Regardless of a substandard grade or a “W” the fourth time you take the course is the last time you may take it. After three years the student may petition to take the course one more time. * Robin stated that both the Course Repetition and Academic Renewal policies have to be approved and in effect by July 2009 for the Fall 2009 catalog and schedule.   **The Academic Renewal Policy is approved by the Senate with the exception of making the Counselor’s signature mandatory in the policy and on the form. (14-0-0)** |
| 10 | Adjournment |  |