LTCC Academic Senate

Academic Senate for Lake Tahoe Community College
Meeting for May 3, 2013
2:00 pm – 3:30 pm, Room A251
AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Reading of the Minutes from the meeting of April 19, 2013

III. Senate President's Report

IV. Administration Report (5 mins)
   A. President
   B. Vice-President
   C. Deans
   D. CACE (Special Report)

V. Unfinished Business, General Orders, and Discussion Items

VI. New Business
   A. **Soccer Team Proposal** (Tim Johnson) Discussion (10 mins)
   B. **Update on ASCCC Spring Plenary** (Michelle Risdon) Discussion (5 mins)
   C. **Faculty Retreat to Discuss Distance Education and Its Future at LTCC** (Michelle Risdon) Discussion (5 mins)
   D. **Updated Online Hiring Process and Rubric for Quality Instruction** (Michelle Risdon) Action, First Reading (15 mins)
   E. **Program Vitality Assessment/Process** (Michelle Risdon) Discussion (10 mins)
   F. **Officers and Senators Elections** (Jon Kingsbury) Discussion (10 mins)

VII. Other Officers' and Representative Senators' Reports (5 minutes)
   Phyllis Shafer (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 April 19, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm, Board Room

Officers: Michelle Risdon, President; Phyllis Shafer, Vice President; and Jon Kingsbury, Secretary.

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

Representatives Absent: Eric Hellberg (Adjunct Rep).

Other Faculty: None.

Guests: Virginia Boyar, Kurt Green, Tom Greene, Aaron McVean, and Kindred Murillo.

I. **Call to Order:** The regular bi-weekly meeting of the Academic Senate was held on April 19, 2013 at 2:08:13pm with the Vice President and Secretary present (President was attending the State Senate Spring Plenary in San Francisco).

II. **Reading of the Minutes from the Meeting of March 22, 2013:** Jon noted one minor grammatical change. The minutes were approved by consensus.

III. **Senate President's Report:** Jon read the following report from Michelle:
"Hi everyone, I am sorry not to be in Senate today (and sorry to miss the get-together after!). The state Senate Spring Plenary is this weekend in San Francisco, so I am there currently. Here is a brief President's report:

- At the last Board meeting, as you saw in the LTCC Times-Digest, the Board heard comments from various public officials and others on Snowglobe and agreed to proceed with discussions about bring the event back, provided LTCC's needs can be met. Does the Senate want to take a position on Snowglobe?
- Mark Williams presented his PDL report on his study of ProTools and his creation of a ProTools certificate program and the work the music department is doing around the commercial music industry.
- Budgets will be due May 1st, and given the cuts that will be necessary, all programs are being asked to look for ways to make a 3.6% reduction.
- There was no decision on the hiring of a History/Political Science instructor.
- Reduced teaching load was approved for 3 faculty, and a change in the percentage of reduced load was approved for a faculty member already on reduced load. There was some discussion of this program among Board members in terms of concerns about how many faculty are going to be eligible for this program soon and what impact that will have on instruction and budget. (My understanding is that there are currently 6 faculty approved for and/or already on reduced load.)

1

- There is a lot of thanks expressed by the administrators to the faculty for the hard work that is being done in light of declining enrollments.
- The "visioning session" will take place on June 8th, and everyone is encouraged to attend.

Thanks, and I will be checking email, so please feel free to email me if you have any questions or need any specific information from the plenary session. Thank you to Phyllis for taking on the VP's role! Best, Michelle"

NOTE: More of Michelle's report is presented in agenda items VI.B. Support for SB329 and VIII.A. College Learning Council (CLC) report.

Bruce asked about the History/Political Science faculty position and it was reported that it had not been finalized in time for the Board meeting on April 9th and it is expected to go to the Board on May 14th.

IV. **Administration Report**
   A. **President:** There was no report at this time.
   B. **Vice-President:** Tom had no report at this time.
   C. **Deans:** Kurt reported on the Basic Skills Work Team and its research into accelerated program development courses for both Basic Skills Math and English sequences. The problem has been that students often are unable to complete the existing 2-3 basic skills courses and do not continue with school. Michelle, Jan, Julie, and Mary Gillespie will be part of a 3CSN Acceleration Project where they will be attending 3 workshops focusing on the development and creation of an Accelerated English course that will be piloted winter quarter 2014. As this workgroup moves through the process, they will inform both the Basic Skills Work Team and the Academic Senate. Lisa asked for more clarification and Kurt explained that it is portfolio-based work with a Pass/No Pass grading structure. He also noted that more than 30 schools are currently using this program and that the success rate is "stunning." It is an opportunity for students to take one basic skills class before moving to college-level courses. Bruce noted that the Math Department currently offers a two-week course designed to help refresh students in MAT 152A, MAT 152B, and MAT 154A (basic and intermediate algebras). The idea is to get students back up to speed for the assessment test.

V. **Unfinished Business, General Orders, and Discussion Items**
   A. **Integrated Planning Guide (IPG).** (McVean – Second Reading). Aaron noted that the IPG had been previously presented to the Academic Senate and to the IEC (Institutional Effectiveness Council) with a change in the planning process to include the Academic Senate (Figure 2, p.13). Nancy first/Sue seconded, motion passed unanimously. The current draft of the IPG can be found at the following link: https://portal.ltcc.edu/ltccresources/research/Documents/LTCC%20Integrated%20Planning%20Guide%20-%20DRAFT.pdf

VI. **New Business**
   A. **Proposal for Change to Student Evaluation Process.** (Greene – First Reading). Tom presented a brief overview of the new evaluation process that uses the online Qualtrics software. Nancy asked about the purpose of this agenda item and Tom

noted that he wanted input from the Academic Senate. Shelley presented the details to the process where students will receive individual emails for each class taken. Nancy asked if the faculty will be notified when the emails go out. Shelley referred to the timeline proposals identifying certain weeks in the quarter with specific examples for spring 2013. Bruce noted the three proposals of courses to be included in this evaluation process and expressed concerned about it being used for all classes. He mentioned faculty on tenure review or in remediation otherwise he felt it is a great process. Nancy expressed concern with having a real hard line on the time for evaluations and if there can be more flexibility. She proposed a 2-3 week period in which to administer the survey. Julie was concerned with low student response. Shelley explained the apparent change in student behavior from fall to winter quarter where there was a much better response rate in winter (closer to 40%) than fall (20%). Tom acknowledged that this process is on an adoption pace thus the idea of trying to incentivize it for students (raffle for $50 Barnes & Noble gift card). Nancy noted that faculty can promote it to our F2F and DE students. There was more discussion on which weeks were best for administering the evaluation process. Nancy felt the 7th week was good and Sue asked about having a choice of weeks and Jon agreed that giving us a 2-3 week window might be the best option.

B. **Support for SB329.** (Risdon – First Reading). Jon read the following note from Michelle:

"And last, I need to request that the item I put on the agenda for today, the Resolution in support of SB329, be moved to a First Reading/Suspension of the Rules item, and I ask that the Senate vote on and, I hope, approve this resolution today in the interest of timeliness. I thought we had more time to go through the regular process, but it looks like our support would be needed earlier than I had thought."

Kindred provided a brief overview of SB329. Bruce made a motion to suspend the rules/Nancy seconded with all in favor. Lisa asked about the process for establishing residency and Kindred said the College will have residency processes in place. Resolution passed unanimously.

VII. **Other Officers' and Representative Senators' Reports** (5-minute limit per person)
A. **Phyllis Shafer** (Vice President)**:** No report at this time.
B. **Jon Kingsbury** (Secretary)**:** No report at this time.
C. **Bruce Armbrust, Sue Kloss** (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Physical Education, and Physics)**:** No reports at this time.
D. **Nancy Barclay, Christina Tomolillo** (Anthropology/Sociology, Art, English, History/Political Science, Music, Psychology, Theatre, and World Languages)**:** No reports at this time.
E. **Lisa Foley** (Counseling, Disabilities Resources Center, and Library)**:** No report at this time.
F. **Steve Fernald** (Business, Computer Applications, Computer and Information Sciences, Culinary Arts, and Early Childhood Education)**:** No report at this time.
G. **Julie Ewing and Eric Hellberg** (Adjunct Faculty)**:** No report at this time.

VIII. **Reports of Standing Committees/Workgroups** (5-minute limit per committee)
A. **College Learning Council:** Jon read the following report from Michelle on the last CLC meeting:
   ▪ A group, including me, Nancy, Aaron Barnett, Tom, and Virginia, will be meeting on April 26th to work on the rubrics the Senate has recently supported regarding

online courses and hiring. The goal is to look at how those rubrics could be adapted to apply to all course creation and evaluation and hiring of adjuncts. The group will come up with a proposal that will then come back through the Senate for discussion and, if appropriate, approval.

- I have received a second draft of the Program Vitality Assessment process from the Enrollment Management Work Team, and this document will also be coming through Senate for discussion and, if appropriate, approval.

B. **Institutional Effectiveness Council:** Jon reported that the Council had its first reading of the IPG (Integrated Planning Guide) with its second reading coming on May 9th. He also mentioned there was a brief discussion on the planning of the preparation for the next accreditation visit and more specifically, the role of the IEC in providing direction to the other councils and in developing an evidence collection process.

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

D. **Curriculum Committee:** Tom reported on the progress of the multi-degree policy. He believes a couple of more meetings will be needed to finalize the policy and then it will be presented to the Academic Senate.

E. **SLO/Assessment Committee:** No reports at this time.

F. **Professional Development Committee:** Phyllis noted that today is the deadline for submitting the last applications for the year.

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

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

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

IX. **Hearing of the Public on Items Not on the Agenda**
- None.

X. **Announcements**
- **Phyllis:** The three Art Galleries are now open. The Haldan Art Gallery has "How to Collect: Selections from the Hanna Porter & Growdon Family Collections." The Foyer Gallery has "Rockscapes & the Muse Series" by Jay Weldon. And the Student Gallery (in the Commons) has the Faculty & Staff Exhibition. Phyllis noted the great turnout at last night's opening.
- **Jon:** There is an excellent article on Steve's Culinary Arts program in the most recent issue of the LTCC Times-Digest.
- **Nancy:** Janice Tait continues to need our support as she goes through chemotherapy. You can contact Nancy if you want to help.

XI. **Good of the Order**
- **Sue:** We will be gathering at the bowling alley at 3:30pm! First round is on her!

XII. **Adjournment:** Adjourned at 2:50:28pm.

ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM

LTCC Academic Senate

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: 4-25-13

Subject: Soccer Team Proposal

Time Required for Discussion: 10

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)

To give a brief update on the Intercollegiate Soccer Team Proposal.

Background:

A follow-up on the soccer team proposal.

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: M. Risdon   Date: April 29, 2013

Subject: Update on Academic Senate of California Community Colleges Spring Plenary

Time Required for Discussion: 5 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)

I would like to update the Senate on the main resolutions passed at the Spring Plenary of the ASCC on April 18-20, 2013.

The final resolutions can be found at the following link:
<http://www.asccc.org/session/resolutions>

Background:

ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM

Requested By: M. Risdon   Date: April 29, 2013

Subject: Faculty Retreat to Discuss Distance Education and Its Future at LTCC

Time Required for Discussion: 5 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)

The Senate and the Distance Education Work Team leader would like to invite all of the faculty to attend a retreat on May 10th to discuss the outlines of a Distance Education handbook and the academic vision and plan for Distance Education at Lake Tahoe Community College. The specific details will be announced later.

Background:

The rapid changes that are happening in the fields of technology and distance education have the potential to change the nature of online education at LTCC. Rather than embrace the status quo and wait for changes to come to us, the Senate and the Distance Education Work Team would ask the faculty (those who teach online but also, equally importantly, those who do not) to attend this meeting and engage in a deep and honest discussion about the status and future of distance education at the college.

ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM

LTCC Academic Senate

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: M. Risdon   Date: April 29, 2013

Subject: Updated Online Hiring Process and Rubric for Quality Instruction

Time Required for Discussion: 15

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)

Discussion regarding a revised version of the online hiring process and the rubric for online instruction. Feedback is requested on the changes made and on the idea of bringing the rubric forward to be negotiated as part of the formal evaluation process.

Background:

The Senate already discussed and approved the online hiring process and the rubric for online instruction (to be used as a development and/or self-evaluation tool).

A group from the CLC met last week to discuss a revision of these documents so that they might be applied to all online courses and, in terms of the rubric, to face-to-face courses and evalutaiton as well. This was an idea that came up in the Senate discussions as well as in the College Learning Council.

The group (Aaron Barnett, Nancy Barclay, Michelle Sower, Michelle Risdon, Tom Greene, and Virginia Boyar) made some suggested revisions to the attached documents so that they might be used to ensure quality instruction throughout the institution.

The question also needs to be discussed regarding whether or not these documents and processes should be sent forward as a potential item to be negotiated as part of the formal process of evaluation.

Rubric for Quality Instruction

Rationale

What should a quality course look like?

Rubric for Quality Instruction offers a framework for addressing this question. Use of this rubric represents a developmental process for course design and delivery, and provides a means for an instructor to self-assess course(s) based on expectations.

Furthermore, the rubric provides a means for supporting and recognizing a faculty member's effort in developing expertise in instruction as part of our commitment to high quality learning environments.

The Rubric for Quality Instruction can be used in four ways.

1. As a course "self-evaluation" tool - advising instructors how to revise an existing course to the Rubric for Quality Instruction.

2. As a way to design a new course, following the rubric as a road map.

3. As a means for getting recognition for exemplary instruction. Going through a nomination/recognition process on campus, faculty can receive recognition.

4. As part of the formal evaluation process.

Attribution
This document is adapted from CSU Chico's "Rubric for Online Instruction." The original may be viewed at <http:www.csuchico.edu/roi>.

Category 1	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exemplary
Learner Support & Resources*	A. Course contains limited information for learner support and links to campus resources.	A. Course contains adequate information for learner support and links to campus resources.	A. Course contains extensive information about being a learner and links to campus resources.
	B. Course provides limited course-specific resources, limited contact information for instructor, department, and/or program.	B. Course provides adequate course-specific resources, some contact information for instructor, department and program.	B. Course provides a variety of course-specific resources, contact information for instructor, department, and program.
	C. Course offers limited resources supporting course content and different learning abilities.	C. Course offers access to adequate resources supporting course content and different learning abilities.	C. Course offers access to a wide range of resources supporting course content and different learning abilities.

*The evaluation should consider, among other things:
-Whether the instructor provides information on
- expectations for student behavior
- attendance policies
- college student policies
- campus resources

Category 2	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exemplary
Online Organization & Design*	A. Much of the course is under construction, with some key components identified such as the syllabus.	A. Course is organized and navigable. Students can understand the key components and structure of the course.	A. Course is well-organized and easy to navigate. Students can clearly understand all components and structure of the course.
	B. Course syllabus is unclear about what is expected of students.	B. Course syllabus identifies and delineates the role the online environment will play in the course.	B. Course syllabus identifies and clearly delineates the role the online environment will play in the total course.
	C. Aesthetic design does not present and communicate course information clearly.	C. Aesthetic design presents and communicates course information clearly.	C. Aesthetic design presents and communicates course information clearly throughout the course.
	D. Web pages are inconsistent both visually and functionally.	D. Most web pages are visually and functionally consistent.	D. All web pages are visually and functionally consistent throughout the course.
	E. Accessibility issues are not addressed. (Including: sight, mobility, hearing, cognition, ESL, and technical.)	E. Accessibility issues are briefly addressed. (Including: sight, mobility, hearing, cognition, ESL, and technical.)	E. Accessibility issues are addressed throughout the course. (Including: sight, mobility, hearing, cognition, ESL, and technical.)
	*This category is not applicable to face-to-face courses.		

Category 3	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exemplary
Instructional Design & Delivery*	A. Course offers limited opportunity for interaction and communication student to student, student to instructor, and student to content.	A. Course offers adequate opportunities for interaction and communication student to student, student to instructor, and student to content.	A. Course offers ample opportunities for interaction and communication student to student, student to instructor, and student to content.
	B. Course goals are not clearly defined and do not align to learning objectives.	B. Course goals are adequately defined but may not align to learning objectives.	B. Course goals are clearly defined and aligned to learning objectives.
	C. Learning objectives are vague or incomplete and learning activities are absent or unclear.	C. Learning objectives are identified and learning activities are implied.	C. Learning objectives are identified and learning activities are clearly integrated.
	D. Course provides limited visual, textual, kinesthetic and/or auditory activities to enhance student learning and accessibility.	D. Course provides adequate visual, textual, kinesthetic and/or auditory activities to enhance student learning and accessibility.	D. Course provides multiple visual, textual, kinesthetic and/or auditory activities to enhance student learning and accessibility.
	E. Course provides limited activities to help students develop critical thinking and/or problem-solving skills.	E. Course provides adequate activities to help students develop critical thinking and/or problem-solving skills.	E. Course provides multiple activities that help students develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

*The evaluation should consider, among other things:
- Instructor's preparation, organization, and knowledge of subject area, enthusiasm, and involvement
- Variety and appropriateness of teaching methods and modalities
- The level to which students are encouraged to think and analyze critically

Category 4	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exemplary
Assessment & Evaluation of Student Learning*	A. Course has limited activities to assess student readiness for course content and mode of delivery.	A. Course has adequate activities to assess student readiness for course content and mode of delivery.	A. Course has multiple timely and appropriate activities to assess student readiness for course content and mode of delivery.
	B. Learning objectives, instructional and assessment activities are not aligned.	B. Learning objectives, instructional and assessment activities are adequately aligned.	B. Learning objectives, instructional and assessment activities are closely aligned.
	C. Assessment strategies are limited to use to measure content knowledge, attitudes, and skills.	C. Ongoing strategies are used to measure content knowledge, attitudes, and skills.	C. Ongoing multiple assessment strategies are used to measure content knowledge, attitudes, and skills.
	D. Opportunities for students to receive feedback about their own performance are infrequent and sporadic.	D. Opportunities for students to receive feedback about their own performance are provided.	D. Regular feedback about student performance is provided in a timely manner throughout the course.
	E. Students' self-assessments and/or peer feedback opportunities are limited.	E. Students' self-assessments and/or peer feedback opportunities exist.	E. Students' self-assessments and peer feedback opportunities exist throughout the course.

*The evaluation should consider, among other things:
- The appropriateness of pace of class to content and student level
- Whether the instructor recognized when students didn't understand and took effective steps to clarify what was not understood
- Students appeared comfortable asking questions and making comments

Category 5	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exemplary
Innovative Teaching with Technology and Multimedia*	A. Varied teaching methods applied to enhance student learning are limited.	A. Varied teaching methods are adequately applied to innovatively enhance student learning.	A. Varied teaching methods are applied and innovatively enhance student learning, and interactively engage students.
	B. There are limited multimedia elements and/or learning tools for accommodating different learning styles.	B. Multimedia elements and/or learning tools are used and are relevant to accommodate different learning styles.	B. A variety of multimedia elements and/or learning tools are used and are relevant to accommodate different learning styles throughout the course.
	C. Course engages students in the learning process in a very limited way.	C. Course effectively engages students in the learning process.	C. Course effectively engages students in the learning process in a variety of ways throughout the course.

*The evaluation should consider, among other things:
- Whether the instructor incorporates the thoughtful use of technology
- The variety of teaching methods and modalities

Category 6	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exemplary
Faculty Solicitation and Use of Student Feedback*	A. Instructor offers limited opportunity for students to give feedback on course content.	A. Instructor offers adequate opportunities for students to give feedback on course content.	A. Instructor offers multiple opportunities for students to give feedback on course content.
	B. Instructor uses student feedback to help plan instruction and assessment of student learning for the next term in a limited way.	B. Instructor requests and uses student feedback a couple times during the term to help plan instruction and assessment of student learning for the rest of the term.	B. Instructor uses formal and informal student feedback in an ongoing basis to help plan instruction and assessment of student learning throughout the term.

*The evaluation should consider, among other things:
- Whether the instructor recognized when student didn't understand and took effective steps to clarify what was not understood
- Whether students appeared comfortable asking questions and making comments

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: M. Risdon   Date: April 29, 2013

Subject: Program Vitality Assessment/Process

Time Required for Discussion: 10 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)

Discussion of the draft document for Program Vitality Assessment.

Background:

The Enrollment Management Work Team has been working on a Program Vitality Assessment process. The draft that accompanies this document is for discussion and feedback. The document will come back to the Senate for a first reading at the next Senate 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(es) just click in the appropriate box(es).

Requested By: <u>Jon Kingsbury</u>   Date: <u>5/03/13</u>

Subject: <u>Officers and Senators Elections</u>

Time Required for Discussion: <u>10 minutes</u>

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

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

We need to identify those Senate Representative seats that will be open for elections and those seats that will remain with one more year of service as described in the Academic Senate Bylaws, Article III, Section 4 - see below.

<u>Background</u>:

SECTION 4 – Senate Terms

The Senate Officers shall serve one-year terms. Officers will be elected every spring quarter. Senators shall serve one-year terms. Full-time faculty Senators will be elected every spring quarter. Adjunct faculty Senators will be elected every fall quarter. Elections for the Senators shall be staggered as follows:

A. All Senators shall be elected to serve the 2012-13 term.
B. One Senator from each of the following academic groups 1, 2, and 3/4 will be elected to serve 2013-2014, with the other Senator from each of those groups serving an initial two years in order to stagger terms.
C. The Senator's position that was filled for an initial two-year term will be elected to serve the 2014-2015 term.
D. After this initial exception, all Senators will be elected for one-year terms, with three elected in one year, and the remaining three elected in the subsequent year.
E. Adjunct faculty Senators will be elected every fall quarter, beginning in 2012.

The academic groups are as follows:
1. Mathematics, Physics, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physical Education (2 Senators)
2. Anthropology/Sociology, Psychology, History/Political Science, English, Art, World Languages, Music, Theatre (2 Senators)
3. Counseling, Disabilities Resource Center, Library (1 Senator)
4. Early Childhood Education, Culinary Arts, Business, Computer and Information Sciences, Computer Applications (1 Senator)
5. Adjunct Faculty (2 Senators)