



**Academic Senate for Lake Tahoe Community College  
Meeting for February 22, 2013  
2:30 pm – 4:30 pm, Board Room  
AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Reading of the Minutes from the meeting of February 8, 2013
- III. Senate President's Report
- IV. Administration Report (5 mins)
  - A. President
  - B. Vice-President
  - C. Deans
- V. Unfinished Business, General Orders, and Discussion Items
  - A. **Class Size Based on Academic Parameters Agreement** (Dave Hamilton) Action, Second Reading (5 mins)
  - B. **Distance Education Course Evaluation/Remediation Process** (Steve Richardson) Action, Second Reading (5 mins)
  - C. **Administration Reorganization** (Dr. Murillo) Discussion (10 mins)
  - D. **Athletic Program Proposal—Soccer Teams** (Tim Johnson) Discussion (20 mins)
  - E. **Distance Education and a Strategic Threat Part 1** (Steve Richardson) Discussion (15 mins)
  - F. **Distance Education and a Strategic Threat Part 2** (Steve Richardson) Discussion (10 mins)
  - G. **Guidance for Scheduling** (Michelle Risdon/Tom Greene) Discussion (10 mins)
  - H. **Comprehensive Program Review Document** (Michelle Risdon/Aaron McVean) Discussion (10 mins)
  - I. **Program Vitality Assessment Process** (Michelle Risdon) Discussion (10 mins)
- VI. New Business
- VII. Other Officers' and Representative Senators' Reports (5 minutes)

**Treva Thomas** (Vice President)  
**Jon Kingsbury** (Secretary)

**Bruce Armbrust, Sue Kloss** (Mathematics, Physics, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physical Education)

**Nancy Barclay, Christina Tomolillo** (Anthropology/Sociology, Psychology, History/Political Science, English, Art, World Languages, Music, Theatre)

**Lisa Foley** (Counseling, Disabilities Resource Center, Library)

**Steve Fernald** (Early Childhood Education, Culinary Arts, Business, Computer and Information Sciences, Computer Applications)

**Julie Ewing, Eric Hellberg** (Adjunct Faculty)

VIII. Reports of Standing Councils/Committees/Workgroups (5-minute limit per committee)

- A. College Learning Council
- B. Institutional Effectiveness Council
- C. Other Councils/Workgroups
- D. Curriculum Committee
- E. SLO/Assessment Committee
- F. Professional Development Committee
- G. Equivalency Committee
- H. Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee
- I. Other Standing Committees

IX. Hearing of the Public on Items Not on the Agenda

*(Members of the public may address the Senate on items not on the agenda subject to a five-minute time limit {groups to 15-minutes on any one topic or item} that may be extended by the President of the Senate or by Senate action. The Senate, however, cannot act upon any request or proposal unless the item is on the meeting agenda. You will be called upon by the President of the Academic Senate to speak.)*

X. Announcements

XI. Good of the Order

XII. Adjournment

XIII. Disability Access

The Administration Building and Room L104 are wheelchair accessible. The following services are available when requests are made by 4:00 p.m. of the Tuesday before the Senate meeting: American Sign Language interpreters or use of a reader during a meeting; large print agenda or minutes in alternative format; assistive listening devices. Please contact, Jon Kingsbury, Secretary to the Academic Senate, (530) 541-4660 ext. 263, if you need assistance in order to participate in a public meeting or if you need the agenda and public documents modified as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act



**Unadopted Minutes for the Academic Senate  
Meeting for February 8, 2013  
2:30 pm – 4:30 pm, Board Room**

**Officers:** Michelle Risdon, President; Treva Thomas, Vice President; and Jon Kingsbury, Secretary.

**Representatives:** Bruce Armbrust, Nancy Barclay, Julie Ewing (Adjunct Rep), Steve Fernald, Lisa Foley, Eric Hellberg (Adjunct Rep), Sue Kloss, and Christina Tomolillo.

**Representatives Absent:** None.

**Other Faculty:** David Hamilton.

**Guests:** Nicolas Behney (Student Rep), Kurt Green, Tom Greene, Cheri Jones, and Kindred Murillo.

- I. **Call to Order:** The regular bi-weekly meeting of the Academic Senate was held on February 8, 2013 at 2:33:27pm with the President, Vice President, and Secretary present.
- II. **Reading of the Minutes from the Meeting of January 25, 2012:** Jon noted a couple of minor grammatical changes. The minutes were approved by consensus.
- III. **Senate President's Report:** Michelle had no report at this time but will present several items later in the meeting.
- IV. **Administration Report**
  - D. **President:** Kindred presented on the CVRA (California Voting Rights Act) and reported on the change in the College's Board of Trustees election process. She showed a map (with Bruce's assistance) delineating the five districts as the Board moves to district/area elections v. at-large elections in conjunction with LTUSD (Lake Tahoe Unified School District). Kindred noted a public hearing is scheduled for Tuesday night, 2/12. She also reported that the Board is moving to an even-year election schedule which means the College will share the election costs with the District. She noted that the new format should promote the goal of getting more people out to vote. The first even-year elections will be in 2014 and 2016. Lisa mentioned that the library has a street-level map for individuals to identify the area in which they live. Kindred noted that the administration is waiting for the Accreditation Report Action Letter and that it will be posted on the website for all to view.
  - E. **Vice-President:** Tom had no report at this time. Michelle asked about the College's current enrollment status and Tom noted that it is 12% below the same time last year. He noted that the improving economy may be a factor. Lisa asked about online students and Tom mentioned the Passport access problems, the CVC (California Virtual Campus) course-

listing problems, and the competition from other schools that are increasing their online course offerings.

- F. **Deans:** Kurt provided an update on the History/Political Science full-time faculty search. He mentioned that the College received over 100 applications and that he and Scott Lukas did a preliminary review to sort it down to 39 applicants. He acknowledged his appreciation to the faculty on the committee who will be meeting tomorrow, Saturday, 2/09, to develop a final listing of possible candidates to interview.

V. **Unfinished Business, General Orders, and Discussion Items**

- A. **Campus Safety Training.** (Discussion – Risdon). Michelle reported on the following ideas in terms of Campus Safety Training:

1. Bring in someone with a more education-specific perspective/experience to lead a training
2. Focus more on specific challenges that instructors might face in Foundational Skills courses
3. Focus on classroom management in practical, as opposed to theoretical, terms – how to do with specific comments, behaviors, and actions
4. Organize a positive discipline training
5. Conduct an on-the-ground assessment of our current spaces and training on what we would do, explicitly, in a situation of compromised safety
6. Organize an active shooter training – shelter in place training
7. Invite a mental health expert to discuss the practical guidelines of dealing with situations involving mental illness and/or substance abuse

Michelle noted that the results were leaning toward classroom management along with office situations. Lisa asked if the training would be mandatory or not. Michelle did not think it would be initially but campus-wide may be more likely. Steve commented on faculty never having enough training and that it is a good subject for faculty. Michelle will pursue this and report back on her progress.

- B. **Department Chair Access to Rosters.** (Discussion – Risdon). Michelle shared a list of 16 faculty requesting course rosters of all department classes along with comments. Tom asked about the currency of the rosters and whether it would be okay if they were 24 hours old. Steve commented that it would depend on issue and that some may not be while others may be time sensitive. Jon mentioned that having access is the primary concern and that a reasonable time lag is okay. Tom wanted to be very clear – at this time we do not have a solution to the request. However they are actively pursuing this but we may not have a solution for awhile. Treva asked about next quarter and Tom stated that they do not have a timeline. Nancy asked about the access issue and Tom noted that it is not a legal and not a philosophy problem but merely a technological problem.
- C. **Non-funded Drops Policy.** (Discussion – Risdon & Greene). Michelle asked the Senate Representatives for their feedback from their groups on moving the “Drop with No Record” date up to day before the census date. Various Representatives noted positive feedback and Michelle stated that the Academic Senate is in support of moving the “Drop with No Record” date up to day before the census date.
- D. **CVRA—California Voting Rights Act.** (Discussion – Murillo). Kindred already discussed this topic in her President’s report earlier in the meeting.
- E. **CLC/Senate Relationship.** (Discussion – Risdon). Michelle noted that although she was on sabbatical during the fall quarter, she was aware of the ongoing dialogue regarding the new governance process. She was also kept in the loop with Treva and Jon. Recently Michelle talked with Tom about the Academic Senate getting ahead of the agenda items for

both CLC (College Learning Council) and Senate with regard to the “10+3” issues. Sue commented on her fall experiences and felt things were being worked out although there are concerns over duplicate efforts and questions on the process of agenda items. Tom noted that it would be ideal for Senators to have items before the CLC meetings so that they can go to their constituents for feedback. Steve reflected on the old days of full Senate meetings and likes this format better. However, he did note that he feels some confusion/detachment from many of the new councils and is not sure what they all have as responsibilities. Michelle commented on faculty representation on the CLC. Lisa asked about the idea of rotating representatives on the CLC but keeping the President/Vice President. It was noted that the downside of that idea is the lack of consistency of serving. Bruce mentioned that everyone can attend to stay informed. He also acknowledged his personal challenge of making meetings as his students come first. Jon agreed and noted his 50-50 split of F2F v. online allows him greater flexibility in making meetings. Sue also mentioned how an overload can create a similar challenge of making meetings.

- F. **Senate Communication with Faculty at Large.** (Discussion – Risdon). Michelle presented on the survey results (only 5 respondents) and was seeking additional information from the representatives. Steve noted that he has some sense that some faculty are on the periphery and not engaged. There appears to be an allowance for faculty to not be attached and to not really participate. He emphasized that it is not everyone but some faculty and that the current meeting format is more effective. Julie commented that faculty have to want to know things. Sue felt that there is a higher level of engagement **for many faculty members in college and faculty activities** now than years past. Michelle agreed with Sue as she noted that faculty are always willing to volunteer. Christina mentioned that she hears from some adjuncts. Julie noted that she tries to communicate with adjuncts but that not all of them want to hear. Michelle acknowledged the comments and will keep checking in with the Senate for feedback and suggestions.
- G. **Class Size Based on Academic Parameters Agreement.** (First Reading – Hamilton). David began by mentioning a variety of ways to determine class size, such as the number of seats in room or the number of computers available for students. However he noted that specific academic requirements are not addressed where course have a practicum element which requires individual participation/presentation assessments that consume a lot of class time. He suggested that the Academic Senate work with the administration to develop an enrollment policy to cap limits for these types of courses. David noted that instructors and their Dean could discuss and determine a manageable limit. Steve and Eric both offered examples of where they went to Ricki to change rooms in order to manage class size. Michelle asked about a maximum class size policy and David noted that Folsom Lake College has a fairly loose policy with instructors and their Deans agreeing on class size. Steve noted that he likes that arrangement as long as it maintains consistency across the curriculum. Tom encouraged the Academic Senate to research other schools. Bruce reminded the Senate that we are having this discussion at this time and that it will be brought back for a second reading. Michelle noted the importance of thinking about the purpose of such a policy. Is it to be like other schools or is it to do what is right for our students and our disciplines? This agenda item will be brought back for a second reading at the next Senate meeting.
- H. **Distance Education Course Evaluation/Remediation Process.** (First Reading – Richardson). Jon reviewed the process and Julie asked if it the evaluation process is for the class or the instructor. Jon explained that the online environment is unique and that the evaluation is for both the instructor and the class (designed by the instructor). Kurt mentioned that the evaluation process is changing and focusing on new faculty. Tom

commented on the unique environment of online classes and the need for a process for improving the quality of our online teaching. He also noted that the DE Coordinator could be the mentor for those instructors in need of remediation. Tom liked the proposed structure as such an evaluation process needs to be articulated. Kurt asked Senate representatives to contact their constituents to volunteer as we have more adjuncts needing to be evaluated. This agenda item will be brought back for a second reading at the next Senate meeting.

VI. **New Business**

A.

---

Due to meeting time constraints, Senate skipped over Other Officers' and Representative Senators' Reports. Please scroll down to the Reports of Standing Committees and Workgroups, and the Good of the Order. Thank you.

---

VII. **Other Officers' and Representative Senators' Reports (5-minute limit per person)**

A. **Treva Thomas** (Vice President): .

B. **Jon Kingsbury** (Secretary): .

C. **Bruce Armbrust, Sue Kloss** (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Physical Education, and Physics): .

D. **Nancy Barclay, Christina Tomolillo** (Anthropology/Sociology, Art, English, History/Political Science, Music, Psychology, Theatre, and World Languages): .

E. **Lisa Foley** (Counseling, Disabilities Resources Center, and Library): .

F. **Steve Fernald** (Business, Computer Applications, Computer and Information Sciences, Culinary Arts, and Early Childhood Education): .

G. **Julie Ewing and Eric Hellberg** (Adjunct Faculty): .

VIII. **Reports of Standing Committees/Workgroups (5-minute limit per committee)**

A. **College Learning Council:** Michelle noted that there has not been another meeting since our last Senate and won't be another one until after our next meeting.

B. **Institutional Effectiveness Council:** Jon reported that the Council, as part of its charge of assessing institutional effectiveness, had a meeting yesterday where Strategic Issues #1 (Student Access) and #2 (Student Success, Learning, and Achievement) were assessed. Jon also noted that a year-end report will be prepared summarizing the Council's assessment of all four strategic issues. Michelle also noted that Michael O'Laughlin has stepped in to replace Cathy Cox (schedule conflict) for the remainder of the academic year.

C. **Other Councils:** No reports at this time.

D. **Curriculum Committee:** No report at this time.

E. **SLO/Assessment Committee:** It was noted that course SLO assessments for the fall were due a couple of weeks ago.

F. **Professional Development Committee:** Treva noted that there was a delay in scheduling their meeting until next Tuesday and that she will inform applicants of the delay in notification.

G. **Equivalency Committee:** No report at this time.

H. **Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee:** No report at this time.

I. **Other Standing Committees:** No reports at this time.

IX. **Hearing of the Public on Items Not on the Agenda**

■

X. **Announcements**

▪

XI. **Good of the Order**

- **Michelle:** Kudos to Suzanne and the Writers' Series held last evening in the Aspen Room with Tracy Ross, author of *The Source of All Things*.

XII. **Adjournment:** Adjourned at 4:30:10pm.

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



Directions for completing electronic form: Type your information in the shaded field and then hit the TAB key to jump to the next field; to select Type of Consideration box(s) just click in the appropriate box(s).

Requested By: David Hamilton

Date: 1/9/13

Subject: Agreement on class size based on academic parameters

Time Required for Discussion: 15 minutes

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item
  - First Reading Only
  - Second Reading/Action
  - First Reading/Action/Suspension of the Rule
- Discussion Item (No Actions)
- Information Item Only

Desired Outcome: State the Motion you want passed (Action Items) or the direction you need from the Academic Senate (Discussion Items)

Resolution:

Whereas; due to current maximum class size, some courses are less effective for students to have the best opportunity to be successful in course objectives and,

Whereas, there is no formal policy to establish maximum class size based on effective learning environment,

Therefore be it resolved; the Academic Senate work with the Administration to develop a policy regarding maximum class size based on learning environment that will be implemented beginning Fall 2013.

Background:

Maximum class size is determined by a variety of factors. Initially maximum class size is determined by the capacity of the classroom (or number of work stations). Some classes have specific legal requirements based on the program, (i.e. nursing classes). Other classes have negotiated maximums based on instructor load, (i.e. some English classes).

Another factor to consider in a maximum class size is the learning environment in achieving student success. In a standard academic class with lecture, discussion, group work etc. the size of the class (within standard classroom capacity) is not generally an issue for students to be successful in achieving the course objectives. However, some classes have a practicum element which requires individual student participation/presentation and feedback from both the instructor and the rest of the class. Or the class may require individual or small group projects, which must be presented and analyzed, as specific objectives for the course. Examples would be public speaking classes where individuals are required to present speeches, or performance classes where the performance and evaluation are mandatory for students to achieve course objectives. There is a point where the size of these classes interferes with student's abilities to be successful in achieving all the learning objectives.

There is currently no policy regarding maximum class size based the learning environment. In the past it has not been a significant issue since classes at LTCC have historically been of a size where the learning environment has not been compromised. However, there are places where this is an issue.

The issue of class size based on effective learning environment is a Senate issue. It is not determined by any aspect of the faculty workload and is solely for academic effectiveness. Maximum class sizes for classes falling under these parameters should be agreed upon by the department faculty and the Dean of the area. Historically this has been done, but on an informal level, (i.e. theatre acting classes are currently capped at 25). If a written policy is in place, then any issues can be resolved on an open and formal basis. Other colleges have policies regarding this issue.

It is suggested that the maximum for these classes be 25 and each individual class would be approved by the faculty and Dean in the area and the VPI. However there could be language where under special circumstances the faculty/Dean and VPI could set a different maximum.

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



Directions for completing electronic form: Type your information in the shaded field and then hit the TAB key to jump to the next field; to select Type of Consideration box(s) just click in the appropriate box(s).

Requested By: Steve Richardson

Date: January 22, 2013

Subject: DE Course Evaluation/Remediation Process

Time Required for Discussion: 15 min

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item
  - First Reading Only
  - Second Reading/Action
  - First Reading/Action/Suspension of the Rule
- Discussion Item (No Actions)
- Information Item Only

Desired Outcome: State the Motion you want passed (Action Items) or the direction you need from the Academic Senate (Discussion Items)

Approval of DE Course Evaluation/Remediation Process as recommended by the DE Workgroup.

Background:

The Distance Education Workgroup has produced a recommended DE Course Evaluation/Remediation Process (see relevant document). This must go through several avenues of approval, including Academic Senate and the CLC, and ultimately be negotiated for approval in contract language.

## DE Course Evaluation/Remediation Process

1. Instructor is selected for evaluation.

- a. Routine schedule
- b. Result of student evaluation results

Full-time faculty or instructional administrator assigned as the evaluator

Evaluation takes place.

If the evaluation finds a commendable instructor and course, the instructor is commended and the course added to LTCC's list of exemplary courses. No further action is taken.

If the evaluation is acceptable, no further action is taken

If the evaluation is not acceptable, the evaluator and/or administrator in the area write(s) a remediation plan to which the instructor being evaluated must agree.

- . The plan is designed to address shortcomings revealed in the evaluation. Specific steps are outlined to address each deficiency found in the course
  - a. A full-time faculty member is assigned as mentor.
  - b. Full access to the course is granted to the mentor.
  - c. The mentor and the faculty member teaching the class collaborate to address each item in the remediation plan.
  - d. Once the mentor and faculty member agree that the remediation is complete, the course is reevaluated.
  - e. If the mentor and faculty are unable to agree that remediation is complete the administrator in the area will be notified and take appropriate action.

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



Directions for completing electronic form: Type your information in the shaded field and then hit the TAB key to jump to the next field; to select Type of Consideration box(s) just click in the appropriate box(s).

Requested By: Dr. Kindred Murillo

Date: Feb. 13, 2013

Subject: Administrative Reorganization

Time Required for Discussion: 15-20 minutes

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item
  - First Reading Only
  - Second Reading/Action
  - First Reading/Action/Suspension of the Rule
- Discussion Item (No Actions)
- Information Item Only

Desired Outcome: State the Motion you want passed (Action Items) or the direction you need from the Academic Senate (Discussion Items)

Permanent Certificated Administration

Background:

The Superintendent/President (President) is considering permanently reorganizing the certificated administrators. The college has had an interim structure in place for the last seven months since the early retirements. For purposes of stability and continuity the President is proposing to move forward with a more permanent organizational structure. The positions to be impacted are the two academic deans.

The President would like to get input from the Academic Senate about a proposal. Further information will be provided at the meeting.

ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM



Directions for completing electronic form: Type your information in the shaded field and then hit the TAB key to jump to the next field; to select Type of Consideration box(s) just click in the appropriate box(s).

Requested By: Tim Johnson

Date: 2-19-13

Subject: Athletic Program Proposal - Soccer Teams

Time Required for Discussion: 20

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item
  - First Reading Only
  - Second Reading/Action
  - First Reading/Action/Suspension of the Rule
- Discussion Item (No Actions)
- Information Item Only

Desired Outcome: State the Motion you want passed (Action Items) or the direction you need from the Academic Senate (Discussion Items)

A proposal is being brought to the Senate. I don't believe this falls under the Senates "charge"(10+\_\_\_). Therefore, this is a Discussion Item only. The desired outcome is for the Senate to "give its blessing" on such a proposal.

Background:

Over the years, the topic of an LTCC Athletic Program (primarily soccer teams) has been brought up at Strategic Planning sessions. Four years ago, such a proposal was more formally considered by the administration, yet due to budget or other issues, was put on hold or in a sense "denied". Our new Administration has chosen to explore such a proposal at a greater depth. The accompanying document attached to this agenda item is the proposal for such a program. At present, the Administration has reviewed the proposal and it is presently being brought to the different committees on campus for review. This proposal is being presented to the Senate as a discussion item. It is a chance for the faculty to understand the proposal. It is also a chance to receive any feedback on the proposal. The desired outcome as stated above, is for the faculty to weigh in on the proposal and in a sense "give its blessing".

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



Directions for completing electronic form: Type your information in the shaded field and then hit the TAB key to jump to the next field; to select Type of Consideration box(s) just click in the appropriate box(s).

Requested By: Richardson, Steve

Date: 2-13-13

Subject: Distance Education and a Strategic Threat - Part 1

Time Required for Discussion: 15 min

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item
  - First Reading Only
  - Second Reading/Action
  - First Reading/Action/Suspension of the Rule
- Discussion Item (No Actions)
- Information Item Only

Desired Outcome: State the Motion you want passed (Action Items) or the direction you need from the Academic Senate (Discussion Items)

A presentation on the following topics will be presented.

Background:

1. The existence of 15,932 online courses which are offered via the California Virtual Campus.
2. The fact that our students know they may take online courses at other Community College Districts, courses which then apply to their LTCC degree or certificate.
3. Our dwindling enrollments in the face of a statewide lack of capacity within the CC system.
4. The movement towards privatization of tertiary education in our nation and in our state (for-profit companies such as Udacity and Coursera, and the non-profit edX consortium).
5. The popular perception of MOOCs as a solution to the 'problems' with public tertiary education
6. The fact that CSU San Jose has contracted out all remedial courses to Udacity.
7. The fact that one overhears faculty at LTCC stating their 'discipline cannot be taught online' despite the fact that their discipline in fact is successfully taught online.

8. The fact that with our current online-approved course offerings LTCC students may complete General Education Requirements, and in fact seven different AA degrees and one Certificate, entirely online (with a single course excepted).

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



Directions for completing electronic form: Type your information in the shaded field and then hit the TAB key to jump to the next field; to select Type of Consideration box(s) just click in the appropriate box(s).

Requested By: Richardson, Steve

Date: 2-13-13

Subject: Distance Education and a Strategic Threat (Part 2)

Time Required for Discussion: 10 min

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item
  - First Reading Only
  - Second Reading/Action
  - First Reading/Action/Suspension of the Rule
- Discussion Item (No Actions)
- Information Item Only

Desired Outcome: State the Motion you want passed (Action Items) or the direction you need from the Academic Senate (Discussion Items)

1. Do we perceive online education as a threat or as an opportunity?
2. Do we embrace online education, or merely tolerate it?
3. Do we support the granting of degrees and certificates acquired wholly via online courses?
4. Do we wish to adopt stringent standards for hiring of online faculty? For evaluating online faculty?
5. Do we wish to adopt a comprehensive rubric for assessing online courses?
6. Do we support the idea of integrated courses which have both f2f and online enrollees, and allow students to elect their own blend of online and f2f components of a course?
7. Do we wish to be accredited in the future? Do we wish to exist in the future? As an autonomous district? At all?
8. Do we need to change? Do we wish to change?

Background:

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



Directions for completing electronic form: Type your information in the shaded field and then hit the TAB key to jump to the next field; to select Type of Consideration box(s) just click in the appropriate box(s).

Requested By: Risdon/Greene

Date: 2-19-2013

Subject: Guidance for Scheduling

Time Required for Discussion: 10 min

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item
  - First Reading Only
  - Second Reading/Action
  - First Reading/Action/Suspension of the Rule
- Discussion Item (No Actions)
- Information Item Only

Desired Outcome: State the Motion you want passed (Action Items) or the direction you need from the Academic Senate (Discussion Items)

Document to share that has the administration's guidance for scheduling as we head in to next year.

Background:

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



Directions for completing electronic form: Type your information in the shaded field and then hit the TAB key to jump to the next field; to select Type of Consideration box(s) just click in the appropriate box(s).

Requested By: Risdon/McVean

Date: 2-19-2013

Subject: Comprehensive Program Review Document

Time Required for Discussion: 10 min

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item
  - First Reading Only
  - Second Reading/Action
  - First Reading/Action/Suspension of the Rule
- Discussion Item (No Actions)
- Information Item Only

Desired Outcome: State the Motion you want passed (Action Items) or the direction you need from the Academic Senate (Discussion Items)

<https://portal.ltcc.edu/ltccresources/research/Documents/LTCC%20Comprehensive%20Program%20Review%20Guide.pdf>. This is a document that is being developed that concerns the 10+3 item of Program Review Processes, so the Senate needs to weigh in.

Background:

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



Directions for completing electronic form: Type your information in the shaded field and then hit the TAB key to jump to the next field; to select Type of Consideration box(s) just click in the appropriate box(s).

Requested By: Risdon

Date: 2-19-2013

Subject: Program Vitality Assessment Process

Time Required for Discussion: 10 min

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item
  - First Reading Only
  - Second Reading/Action
  - First Reading/Action/Suspension of the Rule
- Discussion Item (No Actions)
- Information Item Only

Desired Outcome: State the Motion you want passed (Action Items) or the direction you need from the Academic Senate (Discussion Items)

I am hoping that the enrollment management work team will have a preliminary document to share with us regarding the process being developed for program vitality assessment.

Background: