



**Adopted Minutes for the Academic Senate
Meeting for March 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: Steve Richardson.

Guests: Kurt Green, Tom Greene, and Cheri Jones.

- I. **Call to Order:** The regular bi-weekly meeting of the Academic Senate was held on March 3, 2013 at 2:31:00pm with the President, Vice President, and Secretary present.
- II. **Reading of the Minutes from the Meeting of February 22, 2013:** Jon noted an addition to the discussion on the soccer program along with a couple of minor grammatical changes. The minutes were approved by consensus.
- III. **Senate President's Report:** Michelle reported on the Board's emergency meeting of 2/26 and noted that the funding had been approved for the new phone system scheduled to be implemented in April. The cost is approximately \$210,000 and will include phones in classrooms. Michelle suggested that those interested in the details should review the Board packet (http://www.ltcc.edu/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=9e5df961-947f-4edd-8fcc-675ecd00b735&groupId=14526). Michelle noted that during the February 26 Study Session meeting, Susan Walter presented a compensation report on administration, faculty, and classified. The details of that report can be viewed in the Board's Study Session packet (http://www.ltcc.edu/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=82440d27-98bd-4e02-99f8-57ae2ca1dfb0&groupId=14526). Michelle attended a meeting on SB 329, a bill introduced by Ted Gaines, who was in attendance as well. This bill proposes an exemption from non-resident status for residents in several designated Nevada communities in the Tahoe Basin. Finally, Michelle reported that the Academic Senate is seeking candidates for the Vice President position that will be open for the spring quarter only as Treva will be on her sabbatical.
- IV. **Administration Report**
 - A. **President:** No report at this time.

- B. **Vice-President:** Tom reported on SB 329 and that the Legislative Advocacy is in support. Sue asked about some technology problems she has been experiencing with time lapses on emails and Tom recommended that any problems with technology be submitted through the helpdesk. Tom mentioned Sierra Nevada College (SNC) and the idea of strengthening our relationship with SNC and coordinating educational pathways in the basin. He would like the faculty to be involved in this discussion.
- C. **Deans:** Kurt mentioned the Comprehensive Program Review process that is going forward for the spring quarter. He reported that the History / Political Science faculty interviews are scheduled for next week and that there are six interviewees. He also acknowledged the efforts of Jeff and the maintenance crew for getting the plumbing fixed in the F & G wings.

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

- A. **Athletic Program Proposal—Soccer Teams.** (Discussion – Risdon/Johnson). Michelle handed out a list of questions and concerns that she developed from the previous meeting's discussion (please see Attachment A at the end of these minutes). Jon asked where the proposal is in the governance process. Michelle noted that the CLC (College Learning Council) has had preliminary discussions. Jon asked about the level of detail in the budget. Tom reminded the Senate that the proposal is at its initial stages and that more detail will be included but that not all questions will be answered. Nancy asked about the proposal's timeline and Tom said it should be during the spring quarter. Nancy asked what would happen if the Academic Senate says no to the proposal. Tom clarified that the Senate is a recommending body to the president so that the process is important. He also mentioned that a "yes or no" to this soccer proposal is not the most important point. Michelle noted the stronger philosophical question of why we should or should not do this. Nancy asked if Tom was in favor of this proposal and Tom said he is supportive of the program and of what it is trying to achieve. He explained that he sees it as a means to an end and that it holds a potential to change the culture of the college. As he put it, "I want to take a serious and honest look at this." Michelle commented on wanting to look at more ideas like this. Michelle requested that faculty look this proposal over and get back to her with any additional comments or questions. She would then forward our feedback to Tim and Tom.
- B. **Guidance for Scheduling.** (Discussion – Risdon/Greene). Michelle handed out a document listing some questions and concerns regarding scheduling guidelines (please see Attachment B at the end of the minutes). These concerns, along with the repeatability issue, create challenges in certain disciplines and that there are adjuncts who are concerned about the loss of classes. Tom emphasized that the email should be considered a starting point and that the "15" was least important point as each class is considered individually. The goal is to have cost effective classes but in balance with meeting student needs. Eric noted that the arbitrary nature of the decision process puts adjuncts at risk and the need for advertising/promoting of their classes. Julie expressed concern about competing with other classes within the department. Eric acknowledged that he was not sure what to do or how to go about this. Tom agreed that we are in very challenging times and that we don't know what is going to happen next year. He explained that we want to recover enrollment but to do so in a cost-effective way. Michelle commented on trying to advertise single sections of English but she is not sure how to sell it and that students seem to know what they want for classes. Michelle reminded faculty about the planning session on

Wednesday the 13th (8:30-10am) and encouraged faculty to attend. She noted that we have the knowledge to know what works best for our programs so we need to be involved. Michelle mentioned that Foothill has similar enrollment problems. Tom commented on the enrollment trends over the past year and that these are very challenging times for all of us. Kurt recommended that we encourage our students to register ASAP which will make it easier to make those decisions. Kurt noted the importance of letting students know because the past pattern of student behavior has been to wait.

- C. **Comprehensive Program Review Document.** (Discussion – Risdon/McVean). Michelle handed out a document describing the Comprehensive Program Review process. The complete Comprehensive Program Review Guide is posted online in the OIRP (Office of Institutional Research and Planning) Passport homepage (<https://portal.ltcc.edu/ltccresources/research/Documents/LTCC%20Comprehensive%20Program%20Review%20Guide.pdf>). The process is new in light of the change in our governance process. Michelle briefly reviewed the process and asked if the Academic Senate should be involved. Jon noted that the CLC is already part of the process and it can inform the Academic Senate. Nancy suggested that it could be the case only if there is something controversial to report. Michelle mentioned that the CLC could merely inform the Senate of those programs completing their program review. Treva asked why the PC (President's Council) has two places on the process and Tom noted that the second one is to give it a final blessing after specifics have been discussed at the other levels.
- D. **Strategic Goals for Instruction.** (Discussion – Risdon). Michelle reported that while completing the English Department's AUP (Annual Unit Plan) she noticed that several department goals were not easily connected to goals within the Strategic Plan. There is a lack of instruction-based goals, along with a lack of performance indicators. Michelle asked if the Academic Senate wants to move something forward. Sue felt this is a great idea. Bruce recommended that Michelle talk with others experiencing the same concerns and to identify what is needed. Tom commented on the importance of identifying what are the ends and what are the means. He noted that instruction is an end in of itself but also a means. Tom recommended that we look at the CCSSE survey. Michelle expressed her concerns given the current focus on the budget and cost-effective enrollment and less on instruction quality. Sue agreed to work with Michelle on this.
- E. **Distance Education (DE)—Continued Discussion.** (Discussion – Richardson). Steve R. recommended that the Academic Senate have a role in deciding what the College wants to do with DE. Michelle suggested we have a study session involving faculty who teach online and asked if we should have a mission statement or policy to guide us. Lisa expressed the importance of #4 (Agenda Item: V.E.) which addresses questions raised by the ACCJC. Steve R. commented on the difficulty of categorizing those deficiencies. Nancy agreed with Michelle's idea and that it should include faculty less interested in DE as well. Michelle encouraged the DE Work Team to take the lead on this. Steve R. expressed concern over the lack of faculty participation in determining the direction of DE. Michelle suggested using the AFF (All Faculty Flex) day in the spring quarter for DE and using the ACCJC Guide as a framework for the meeting. Michelle said we could start with what the college sees for DE. Sue asked Steve R. if he got what he wanted from this discussion and he mentioned that he did not really having any specific goal in mind. Michelle saw this as a starting point for moving forward as an institution. Sue expressed concern of offering online courses at

a risk of losing face-to-face courses and not sure of how we should address these questions. Steve R. asked Sue where she sees her program in 20 years and that vision may be a good starting point for discussions within the department. Nancy suggested that we review successful online programs as models.

VI. New Business

- A. **Rubric for Online Instruction.** (First Reading - Risdon/Richardson). Steve R. presented a well-constructed and detailed rubric from CSU Chico that is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 United States License. He emphasized the importance of the district adopting a rubric for evaluating online instruction. Nancy asked who else would need to approve an adoption such as negotiations. Tom recommended that we first address its role. As he noted, is it a guide in the evaluation process or does it become embedded in the evaluation process? Julie asked how many current DE courses are exemplary and Steve R. said he did not know. Michelle said the question is not how many but if this is the standard we want and if we can get classes to this level. Nancy asked about the process when someone does not teach at that level. She wondered about who decides to assign a mentor and if it is required. Bruce commented that the adjuncts can either accept the mentor or we do not invite them back to teach. Michelle noted that many online instructors already do these actions. Treva recommended that we send this out to faculty reminding them to review the rubric and to get back to us with their feedback. This item will be brought back for a second reading.
- B. **Online Hiring Procedures.** (First Reading - Risdon/Richardson). Steve R. presented the proposal for having a structure to the hiring process for online instructors. Julie asked about the 'portfolio' idea (#1.) and Steve R. noted that it would be having access to the applicant's existing online courses. Bruce asked about the exclusivity of Etudes (#3a.) and that some existing online courses are not in Etudes. Michelle asked about the genesis of this document and Steve R. said it came from meetings with the DE Work Team. Bruce asked about the process for FT faculty and Michelle commented on having a similar process. This item will be brought back for a second reading.

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

- A. **Treva Thomas** (Vice President): No report at this time.
- B. **Jon Kingsbury** (Secretary): Jon reported on the results of the bookstore survey, thanking the 15 faculty members (10 FT & 5 PT) for their participation. He noted that most of the responses were positive with a few negative comments about the available amount of art supplies and their relative costs. The specific survey results will be forwarded to Lor Collin, the bookstore manager.
- 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): Steve F. reported on an email he received that mentions two important decisions that will be made at the CCC

- Academic Senate Plenary meeting in early April. One would change the Family and Consumer Sciences discipline descriptor. The other decision would create a new discipline, Teacher Education that has minimum qualifications designed to specifically exclude a Master's Degree in Child Development or Early Childhood Education. Steve F. noted that it is recommended that Academic Senate Presidents oppose both resolutions. Steve F. has forwarded the related documents to Michelle.
- G. **Julie Ewing and Eric Hellberg** (Adjunct Faculty): No reports at this time.

Due to meeting time constraints Sections VIII & IX were omitted.

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**

- **Michelle:** She noted that the Academic Senate budget has funds available for the Spring Plenary meeting being held in San Francisco on 4/18-4/20. Any senators interested in joining her at the meeting should let her know as soon as possible.
- **Michelle:** She reminded everyone of the Planning Session scheduled for next Wednesday, 3/13, from 8:30am-10:00am in the Board Room.

XI. **Good of the Order**

- **Sue:** Wishing a wonderful sabbatical to Treva!

XII. **Adjournment:** Adjourned at 4:33:34pm.

Attachments Follow.

ATTACHMENT A**Questions and Concerns Regarding Soccer Program Proposal
(Copied verbatim)**

1. We still have many unanswered questions and it would be best to take our time making this commitment to a soccer program. We need to slow down the implementation while we gather more information about the viability. Anything less ends up costing the college at a time when we can ill afford it.

QUESTION: Can we extend the timeline so that questions are answered before we move forward?

2. I spoke to someone with an understanding of how CCC athletic programs are normally started; they were very clear that we were following an atypical, unwise path, if we wanted *external* financial support. Normally, local athletic teams/coaches approach a college asking the college to consider establishing a sports team and then these outsiders offer to fund start up costs. We, on the other hand, are saying to our community, we are setting up a soccer team or two. "Would you please help fund this?" And it's understood that even if they don't contribute much, it's still a go. They don't have strong incentive to fund, in other words, and this town has a lot of needy causes.

QUESTION: Where are the start-up costs going to come from, and can we be clearer about how much willingness there will be for the community to fund this program?

3. The plan is well-meaning, but frankly racist in espousing stereotypes that Latinos want organized soccer teams more than the college education itself.

QUESTION: Are we considering the target population in a balanced, non-discriminatory way?

4. Does the Senate have a voice in this matter or do we just have to sit back and watch it happen? Our agreed upon 10+3 states that on "Educational program development" we will "mutually agree" with our Academic Senate.

REQUEST: This item needs to come to the Academic Senate in its completed form as an action item on which the Senate can take a formal position.

5. My primary concern is as a parent of community college student athletes whose schedules were so booked, they had no time to earn money. This might overburden families of our student athletes or cause students to drop out or fall into debt. I am wondering if most of the proposed parents were low income, how will these athletes manage financially?

QUESTION: What, specifically, are going to be the financial requirements of participants and their families?

6. Further, the college athletics program my kids attended was Cabrillo, an affluent beach town south of Santa Cruz. Local families and businesses were asked over and over to donate to Cabrillo's teams, which were very healthy relatively, far better funded than our

incipient one. I don't see we have that parental wealth to tap in this town. I am wondering about students' ability to cope with their financial burdens, their parents', and most importantly our college's.

QUESTION: What will be the contribution needs required from the families and the community as a whole to support this program?

7. I would like to see a detailed cost benefit analysis of what this program would bring in and what it would cost, over the next 3 years at least. I would like both a best case scenario and a worst case.

QUESTION: Can we see in the proposal a more complete budget and cost-benefit analysis with a best- and worst-case scenario?

8. I have no problem with soccer if it doesn't lose money for the college, can actually be a reality, and doesn't create an overabundance of workload issues for all various elements of the college. I have concerns about all of those but I guess would actually start with whether this could actually happen here with our student (and town) population decreasing. It may not be the best way forward for the college.

QUESTION: How much will this program cost the College? Can we get a clearer sense of its viability, particularly given the community's (and the College's) declining population?

9. I question the feasibility of bringing a brand new program on board when so many of us are working with less than perfect conditions. I can't use the computer the college has provided, phones won't work, and terminal server is a joke. We all are being asked to do more and more with no compensation nor end in sight.

QUESTION: How does this program fit into the College's other infrastructure and salary needs?

10. I am concerned, as there were other similar concerns expressed, that we will enter yet another "new big thing" that seems somewhat improbable to be successful and will cost the college time and money.

QUESTION: How much will the program cost the College, and is it likely to be successful?

11. I have been asked to expand my program to increase enrollments for next year without any additional \$ or support. I am living with a broken phone system that Dr. Murillo raised the alarm about (we're bleeding with all of the related expenses and lack of \$ to fix); a piece of junk computer and goofy system at the college which moves me to work at home when I want to use real computers and systems; broken things in the kitchen and classroom (Creekside) which there seems to be no \$ or capacity to repair; no \$ for the staffing that is necessary to not only expand, but maintain, the program that I manage. I suppose if the funding isn't additional and can come out of the presumed FTEs from soccer team students it could work, but there are serious doubts.

QUESTION: How does this program fit into the College's other infrastructure and salary needs, and will it be sustainably funded from the FTES it brings in?

12. Is there genuine community support? 40 students is a lot. Anecdotal evidence is not enough to convince me.

QUESTION: Is there genuine community and student support?

13. College athletes have to be full time students, and, as athletes, would not have time to work. Furthermore, if they are undocumented, they're ineligible for the Pell grant. Is it realistic to think that all these 40 students would be citizens, with their own resources, or on financial aid? Most students not eligible for financial aid have to work, period.

QUESTION: How will the program manage immigration and financial aid issues for potential students?

14. How can we afford this? I need to be convinced that the FTE we'd garner is equal to, or more than, the costs.

QUESTION: How much will the program cost the College, how is it being prioritized in terms of the College's other budgetary needs, and will it be funded sustainably through its FTES?

15. Student Services would be impacted, a lot. From the front office staff to the dean, this would be more stuff to do. The designated athletics counselor would need release time and training at the same time the department begins to implement the requirements of the Student Success Task Force. The SSTF by itself will change how our department operates, and will require extensive intervention and monitoring of the entire student population.

QUESTION: What are the specific requirements on Student Services, and what is the plan for covering those requirements in terms of staff and workload?

16. Over the years I have worked here, I have seen the college pursue ambitious initiatives that were not well researched, resulting in a great investment of dollars with few positive outcomes. I would suggest involving local Latino leaders in discussions to ensure the viability of this proposal.

REQUEST: Please involve local Latino leaders in the development of this proposal, if that is truly the targeted audience.

17. I am concerned about whether being a full time student and spending the necessary hours involved in training and travel is feasible for the population in question. I wonder whether our Latino students typically take a full load or whether they are more likely to be enrolled in fewer than 12 units in order to hold down a job to help support families.

QUESTION: Does the data demonstrate that Latino student typically take full loads? Is it feasible to expect that they will be able to do so consistently while participating fully in this program?

18. I would want to have our institutional researcher analyze this to make sure the athletic program requirements are aligned with the target population's life circumstances.
REQUEST: Can we have more concrete data demonstrating that the program aligns with the target population's circumstances?
19. I am also concerned about the overall cost of the program. It seems quite expensive.
QUESTION: How much is the program going to cost the College, and is that cost in line with similar programs at colleges our size across the state?
20. I must say that faculty have not had a raise in many years, while the cost of living continues to go up. Why do we seem to find monies for new initiatives when we can't find monies to bring up our comparatively low salaries?
QUESTION: How is this program being prioritized in light of the College's other budgetary needs, particularly around faculty salaries?
21. Coming from an athletic background, I see the value and importance of a vibrant athletic program and its impact on the college experience. However, it's one thing to add a sport to an existing athletic department and another thing entirely to start a department from scratch.
QUESTION: What are the potential benefits of this single program in relationship to the budgetary and workload demands of starting from scratch? Do the benefits outweigh the costs?
22. This is a big proposition that affects Student Services in many ways, and I must agree that there are many concerns that need to be thoroughly discussed when undertaking something of this magnitude.
QUESTION: What are the specific requirements on Student Services, and what is the plan for covering those requirements in terms of staff and workload?

ATTACHMENT B**Questions and Concerns Regarding Scheduling Guidelines
(Copied verbatim)**

1. My first blush with raising class enrollments from 12-15 could really hurt PE classes. We don't know the effect of how repeatability will affect our department and classes, but I do know that forcing us to move to 15 students will definitely affect certain classes. It will be like a double whammy – repeatability and class size enrollment. I am definitely against the increase.
2. In the area of PE, we do not know how the repeatability rules are going to affect our department and classes. If you look at the bigger picture of the college enrollment, over the years when we need to cut numbers OR add numbers, our department has always been on the receiving end. If due to repeatability we see a reduction in our classes, this will affect the overall college enrollment. If we raise our minimum enrollment number to make a class run, I do see the potential of certain classes being cancelled because we do not have the numbers. We are already being affected by repeatability, this feels like a double edged knife – the puncture wound may be larger and the cut deeper. I am in favor of keeping our enrollment minimum number at 12.
3. The Art Dept. is in the same position as PE. Additionally, due to the repeatability rules going into effect this summer, we shifted some of our art courses to Community Ed, further reducing FTES in our department.
4. I am confused by the line “So while not ‘chasing FTES’, the college is looking to grow its enrollment next year by approximately 12 percent to achieve this target.” If we are looking to grow, why aren't we “chasing”? I don't understand why we aren't chasing enrollment if we are anticipating lower FTES next year. Why aren't we launching an all-out campaign to raise enrollment?
5. If we need to have 15 in each class, then we need more enrollment. I agree that this will mean adjuncts will lose work, departments will lose classes. I think several of my own classes will be safe if we don't make the 15 (despite that it also restricts me from offering classes I know won't get close enough to that number). But I don't think the same flexibility will be extended to my adjuncts, which will result in lower FTES for my department overall.
6. If memory serves, when we raised the minimum number of students for a class to go, we were doing it in hopes of lowering our enrollment. And the result was that FTES actually went up.
7. If we raise it to 15, I'm not sure we can predict what will happen with FTES, but we CAN predict that more adjuncts will be cut, and our workload will continue to go up. I'm guessing that is what is meant by “cost-effective.”