



**Academic Senate for Lake Tahoe Community College
Meeting for February 8, 2013
2:30 pm – 4:30 pm, Board Room
AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Reading of the Minutes from the meeting of January 25, 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. **Campus Safety Training** (Michelle Risdon) Discussion (5 mins)
 - B. **Department Chair Access to Rosters** (Michelle Risdon) Discussion (5 mins)
 - C. **Non-funded Drops Policy** (Michelle Risdon & Tom Greene) Discussion (5 mins)
 - D. **CVRA—California Voting Rights Act** (Murillo) Informational (5 mins)
 - E. **CLC/Senate Relationship** (Michelle Risdon) Discussion (10 mins)
 - F. **Senate Communication with Faculty at Large** (Michelle Risdon) Discussion (10 mins)
 - G. **Class Size Based on Academic Parameters Agreement** (Dave Hamilton) Action, First Reading (10 mins)
 - H. **Distance Education Course Evaluation/Remediation Process** (Steve Richardson) Action, First Reading (15 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 January 25, 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: Susan Boulanger, Wynn Walker.

Guests: Nicolas Behney (Student Rep), Virginia Boyar, Kurt Green, Tom Greene, Cheri Jones, Kindred Murillo, and Tracy Thomas.

- I. **Call to Order:** The regular bi-weekly meeting of the Academic Senate was held on January 25, 2013 at 2:38:00pm with the President, Vice President, and Secretary present.
- II. **Reading of the Minutes from the Meeting of November 30, 2012:** Jon noted one minor change. The minutes were approved by consensus.
- III. **Senate President's Report:** Michelle offered thanks to Treva and Jon for covering while she was on sabbatical. She reported attending a couple of Board meetings since her return. At one meeting they agreed to a district election format for Board members v. at-large in response to the CVRA (California Voters Rights Act). She noted that the Board is working with the LTUSD (Lake Tahoe Unified School District) to have both boards use the same format. Michelle also noted that the Board decided to go to even-year elections and the first election will be in 2014 followed by one in 2016. She strongly suggested that individuals check the Board packet for the 1/22 meeting for details. Michelle reported that she and Jon attended a Brown Act workshop on Friday, 1/18 where there were some questions on the application of the Brown Act for various councils and committees. She noted that the pilot for the cross-country ski program will begin in February; individuals can check with Megan in Community Education for details. Michelle mentioned that there will be some faculty committee assignment changes coming soon. She thanked all of the senators for working through the fall meetings and the transition of our new governance process with more coming later in the meeting. You can check with Michelle if you have any comments and questions. Michelle then asked for a motion to move the agenda item V.B. Foundational Skills Work Team Report to be next due to time constraints for the presenter. Motion passed.
- IV. **Administration Report**

- D. **President:** Kindred welcomed back all faculty members from the holiday break. She noted her appreciation for seeing the many agenda items on student-related issues. She also noted that the change in Board elections provides the College with an opportunity to share election costs with LTUSD. Kindred also explained that the CVRA addresses underrepresentation of minority groups and that South Lake Tahoe has a high percentage of a Hispanic population.
- E. **Vice-President:** Tom reported on the status of a couple of grants. The College is considering two grants over next few months. One is a re-submission of a Title III Co-op grant with Columbia College (serving as the grant lead) that focuses on building a culture of evidence and improving data-informed decision making. The application received a perfect score but there is no guarantee given the high level of competition. The other grant is also a co-op with Columbia College (with LTCC as lead) with a focus on student learning and success. Tom noted the opportunity of grants to support activities we want to do given the need for student access and success such as possibly a comprehensive first-year college experience program. He alerted faculty to a bag lunch meeting to be held on Friday, March 1, to discuss the College's philosophy on grants. Tom reported on the proposed soccer program and the significant shift in demographics and demand. He noted the research work of Tim Johnson during the fall quarter and how the benefits and costs will be detailed. Tom mentioned the viability of both men's and women's programs with a fall schedule of roughly 16-20 games. He also mentioned a possible booster club to help finance the programs. Tom commented that program addresses our strategic goal of reaching out to low-income and 1st generation students. He reminded everyone of our challenge to maintain consistent enrollment and revenue streams and that athletic programs help get students into school and to achieve their educational goals.
- F. **Deans:** No reports at this time.

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

- A. **Earning Multiple Degrees.** (Second Reading - Dixon). Pete was unavailable to report on this item.
- B. **Foundational Skills Work Team Report.** (Discussion - Walker). Wynn reported on results of the Team's tracking efforts and identified four recommended areas:
1. Curriculum: A. ESL Program: Maxine will put together a committee that will work together along with Kurt and Tom and do a program vitality assessment of the ESL program. B. Revisit the Pre-Stats Class: Wynn will do research on the various alternate pathways to college transfer level math that are being pursued.
 2. Scheduling and Enrollment: A. Kurt will review the projected schedules for next year and work with department chairs to establish consistency of time of day, day of week, classroom location, and instructor for sequences of foundational skills classes. B. Wynn is working with Aaron Barnett to formulate an enrollment policy for basic skills classes.
 3. Infuse a College Success Experience: The Team suggested a required mandatory counselor meeting for all students entering Basic Skills classes. Counselors should actively promote students to enroll in the next level basic skills class immediately after passing a basic skills class. SSTF (Student Success Task Force) requires that basic skills students have an educational plan.
 4. Workshops and Trainings: The Team recommended that the College establish 2-3 ETWs (Excellence in Teaching Workshops) per year that focus on teaching basic skills classes and revive the apprenticeship program for adjuncts.
- Michelle mentioned that all of these proposed ideas relate to the responsibilities and charges of the Academic Senate ("10+3"), the CLC (College Learning Council), and the

various Work Teams. She noted the ongoing learning process for all on the relationship between Academic Senate, CLC, and Work Teams; more on this later.

- C. **High School Students Attending College Courses.** (Discussion - Boulanger). Susan reported her concern and challenges with having High School students in her classes and more specifically those students not being prepared for college-level classes. Tracy noted the classes with an advisory of ENG101 must take the LTCC assessment. She also commented that she feels our standards are rigorous. Some discussion ensued on specific positive experiences with High School students. Tom suggested that courses with significant writing requirements consider adding an ENG101 advisory. Michelle commented on the effective use of the course syllabus to properly describe the writing requirements.
- D. **Campus Safety Training.** (Discussion - Risdon). Michelle presented the idea of having professional development funds to continue campus safety training for the faculty and she wanted to gauge faculty interest. There seems to be interest for both full-time and part-time faculty participation. Michelle solicited ideas from faculty and it was noted that the previous guest was good and could be invited back. Nancy expressed interest in having more specific classroom management discussions. Michelle noted that she will send out an email to all faculty early next week since the deadline for funding is next Friday, 2/01.
- E. **Department Chair Access to Rosters.** (Discussion - Risdon). Michelle reported on the challenge of department chairs not having access to all of their department's class rosters. Steve noted that the old system was absolutely necessary. Nancy explained that it should not be restricted to just the chair but available for all full-time faculty. Bruce commented that he has never needed access and wondered why we would need it. Steve explained that he uses it to make sure the student is in the right course and on the right track. Treva mentioned the need to strategize the best fit of students to classes to address enrollment management issues. Michelle suggested that some departments may not have a need but clearly others do. Tom mentioned that it seems to be a good idea but there may be technology problems related to access but that they are working on it.
- F. **Non-funded Drops Policy.** (Discussion – Risdon/Greene). Michelle updated the Senate on possible funding impact due to the change in the census date beginning in 2013-14. It is proposed that the college move the “Drop with No Record” date to the day before the census date beginning in 2013-14. Regulations concerning apportionment funding changed in 2013-14. Consequently, the college no longer is funded for any student enrollment that does not result in a transcribed grade. Michelle presented the pros/cons of a change in dates. Nancy commented that in the CLC meeting the policy change was viewed as a “no-brainer.”
- G. **Waitlist Policy.** (Discussion – Risdon/Boyar). Bruce presented an update on the Waitlist policy and emphasized that it is still a work in progress. He noted that the policy will be piloted in the spring. He stressed that many classes will not even be impacted since they rarely fill to their limit. Bruce explained the details of the process and the importance of faculty honoring their waitlists. Some discussion ensued on specific components of the policy. Bruce reminded everyone that there will be a Waitlist training session at the All Faculty Meeting next Friday, 2/01, at 1:00pm in the Board Room.

The meeting was called at this time as it had run over its scheduled two hours. The remaining agenda items will be addressed at the next Academic Senate meeting on Friday, February 8th. Please scroll down to the Announcements and the Good of the Order. Thank you.

- H. **CLC/Senate Relationship.** (Discussion – Risdon).

- I. **Senate Communication with Faculty at Large.** (Discussion – Risdon).

- VI. **New Business**
 - A. **Class Size Based on Academic Parameters Agreement.** (First Reading - Hamilton).
 - B. **Distance Education Course Evaluation/Remediation Process.** (First Reading - Richardson).

- 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:** .
 - B. **Institutional Effectiveness Council:** .
 - C. **Other Councils:** .
 - D. **Curriculum Committee:** .
 - E. **SLO/Assessment Committee:** .
 - F. **Professional Development Committee:** .
 - G. **Equivalency Committee:** .
 - H. **Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee:** .
 - I. **Other Standing Committees:** No reports at this time.

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

- X. **Announcements**
 - **Nancy:** Janice Tait will be undergoing chemotherapy and to contact Nancy if you would like to help with meals.
 - **Michelle:** Writer's Series tonight, Friday, Jan. 25th at 7:00 p.m. in the Library.

- XI. **Good of the Order**
 - **Sue:** Kudos to Treva and Jon for their work in the fall!

- XII. **Adjournment:** Adjourned at 4:43:13pm.

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/Sower

Date: January 22, 2013

Subject: Continued Professional Development training around campus safety

Time Required for Discussion: 5

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 has been asked to discuss the possibility of applying for professional development funds for continued training (following the last all-faculty flex day) on campus safety.

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/Sower

Date: January 22, 2013

Subject: Department Chair Access to All Departmental Course Rosters

Time Required for Discussion: 5

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 has been asked to weigh in on the idea of requesting that department chairs have access to all course rosters in their department.

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: January 22, 2013

Subject: Non-funded drops

Time Required for Discussion: 5

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)

Please see the attached document.

Background:

This item is being discussed in the CLC the day before the next Senate meeting. We would have liked to have brought it before the Senate first, but the timing didn't work out, so the Senate is being asked to consider it today.

Background: Beginning in summer 2012, enrollments which do not result in a transcripted symbol (grade or W) are no longer eligible for apportionment. Prior to summer, these enrollments were eligible if the student was enrolled at census or if the class was positive attendance.

	Drop before class begins	Drop before census (20%)	Drop before receiving a symbol (30%)	Add after the census date (20%)	Enrolled at census (20%) and receive a symbol (30%)
Before	No funding	Funded for positive attendance	Funded for positive attendance Funded for census-based sections if enrolled at census	Funded for positive attendance only	Funded
Now	No funding	No funding	No funding	Funded for positive attendance only	Funded

Other colleges responded to this change by moving their drop with no record date to the day before the census date. This allows all students enrolled as of census to be eligible for apportionment. Some colleges have set their drop with no record date to align with the refund deadline (10%). Examples:

- 10% (refund deadline) = MiraCosta, Gavilan, Allan Hancock
- 17% = Hartnell
- Almost 20% (day before census) = San Mateo, Rio Hondo, Redwoods, Delta, Santa Ana, DeAnza, College of the Desert, Fullerton, Irvine, Cypress, Barstow
- 20% (census date) = Bakersfield

Some colleges align the P/NP deadline with one of the dates above, while others maintain it at 30%.

Should LTCC consider moving the drop with no record date to be prior to the census date?

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May increase FTES • Reduces workload – A&R manually coded 318 enrollments for fall to remove them from the FTES calculation • Encourages students to commit early in the quarter allowing instructors to focus their efforts on students who intend to complete • Simplifies management of financial aid • Provides incentive for students on BOG waivers to drop prior to the census date (currently no penalty for dropping after census) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawals are counted in progress probation and repeatability calculations • While withdrawals are non-punitive, transfer institutions with highly competitive admissions consider patterns of withdrawals • Some impact on return to Title IV • Would need to be clearly communicated to students to avoid unintentionally missing deadlines

Note: This item needs to be considered fairly quickly to include changes in the 2013-14 catalog.

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: Kindred Murillo

Date: 1/29/2013

Subject: CVRA

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)

Information Item

Background:

On January 8, 2013 staff presented the Board of Trustees with a background of the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) and implications of moving from at-large elections to trustee area elections. On January 22, 2013, the Board approved two resolutions: CVRA and move from at-large elections to trustee area elections and the consolidation of trustee elections to general even-year elections. Additionally, a ten day public notice has been sent for the February 12, 2013 board meeting to provide the college and local community an opportunity to comment prior to sending the resolutions to the County Board of Supervisors for adoption.

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: January 22, 2013

Subject: Relationship between CLC and Senate: Efficacy and Efficiency

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)

I would like to begin to clarify more officially the relationship between the work being done through the College Learning Council and the work that falls under the purview of the Academic Senate. This is a relatively new structure and will require further discussions, but I think we need to understand the relationship more clearly sooner rather than later.

Background:

I have heard there is concern over the progress of 10+1 items through the CLC and the Senate. I have also heard there is concern about overlap calling into question the Senate's efficacy. I would like to begin addressing those concerns.

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: January 22, 2013

Subject: Communication between the Senate, Senators, and the faculty at large

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)

I would like to discuss possible avenues for creating more effective communication between the Senate, the Senators, and the faculty at large (for example, the more effective use of the portal, discussion boards, faculty meetings, etc.).

Background:

Now that we have been a Representative Senate for a few months, I feel it is important to make sure that we are providing the most effective communication to the faculty at large and that we are inviting the most open participation possible.

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.