



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

- I. Call to Order
- II. Reading of the Minutes from the meeting of February 22, 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. **Athletic Program Proposal—Soccer Teams** (Michelle Risdon/Tim Johnson) Discussion (10 mins)
  - B. **Guidance for Scheduling** (Michelle Risdon/Tom Greene) Discussion (10 mins)
  - C. **Comprehensive Program Review Document** (Michelle Risdon/Aaron McVean) Discussion (10 mins)
  - D. **Strategic Goals for Instruction** (Michelle Risdon) Discussion (10 mins)
  - E. **Distance Education—Continued Discussion** (Steve Richardson) Discussion (15 mins)
- VI. New Business
  - A. **Rubric for Online Instruction** (Michelle Risdon/Steve Richardson) Action, First Reading (10 mins)
  - B. **Online Hiring Procedures** (Michelle Risdon/Steve Richardson) Action, First Reading (10 mins)
- VII. Other Officers' and Representative Senators' Reports (5 minutes)

**Treva Thomas** (Vice President)  
**Jon Kingsbury** (Secretary)  
**Bruce Armbrust, Sue Kloss** (Mathematics, Physics, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physical Education)  
**Nancy Barclay, Christina Tomolillo** (Anthropology/Sociology, Psychology, History/Political Science, English, Art, World Languages, Music, Theatre)  
**Lisa Foley** (Counseling, Disabilities Resource Center, Library)  
**Steve Fernald** (Early Childhood Education, Culinary Arts, Business, Computer and Information Sciences, Computer Applications)  
**Julie Ewing, Eric Hellberg** (Adjunct Faculty)

- VIII. Reports of Standing Councils/Committees/Workgroups (5-minute limit per committee)
- A. College Learning Council
  - B. Institutional Effectiveness Council
  - C. Other Councils/Workgroups
  - D. Curriculum Committee
  - E. SLO/Assessment Committee
  - F. Professional Development Committee
  - G. Equivalency Committee
  - H. Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee
  - I. Other Standing Committees

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

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

X. Announcements

XI. Good of the Order

XII. Adjournment

XIII. Disability Access

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



**Unadopted Minutes for the Academic Senate  
Meeting for February 22, 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), and Christina Tomolillo.

**Representatives Absent:** Sue Kloss.

**Other Faculty:** Aaron Barnett, Pete Dixon, Tim Johnson, and Steve Richardson.

**Guests:** Nicolas Behney (Student Rep), Julie Booth, Gayle Bradshaw, Kurt Green, Kindred Murillo, and Lori Thorne.

- I. **Call to Order:** The regular bi-weekly meeting of the Academic Senate was held on February 22, 2013 at 2:36:18pm with the President, Vice President, and Secretary present.
- II. **Reading of the Minutes from the Meeting of February 8, 2013:** Jon noted a couple of minor changes. The minutes were approved by consensus.
- III. **Senate President's Report:** Michelle reported on the Board meeting on February 12<sup>th</sup> where Sara Pierce presented on her PDL trip to Chile. Sara also reported on the progress of SLOs and their assessments. Jeff DeFranco presented on campus safety issues including short-term resolutions (i.e., locking classroom doors on the inside, placing shades on windows) as well as long-term resolutions that will be addressed in the upcoming future. Michelle noted that she is still working on a follow-up campus safety training session.
- IV. **Administration Report**
  - D. **President:** Kindred noted that the telephone system is continuing to be worked on and she will keep everyone updated as things move forward. Nancy expressed concern over possible lost messages from her students during the transition to a new phone system and Kindred will make sure that we are given an advance notice of the move so we can alert our students. Kindred announced that Senator Ted Gaines has introduced Senate Bill 329 to assist Lake Tahoe Community College (LTCC) in better serving the Tahoe Basin. The new policy is for NV residents in the basin to attend LTCC at a reduced fee. The bill is located at: [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/sen/sb\\_0301-0350/sb\\_329\\_bill\\_20130219\\_introduced.pdf](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/sen/sb_0301-0350/sb_329_bill_20130219_introduced.pdf).
  - E. **Vice-President:** There was no report at this time.

- F. **Deans:** Nancy asked Kurt about the Comprehensive Program Review that is due for some departments/areas this spring. She noted that some people are not sure what to expect or what will be required of them in terms of reporting and information yet they are interested in getting started sooner rather than later. Kurt noted that Tom was going to be scheduling a meeting. Lori Thorne clarified that a meeting is in the process of being set up to gather those faculty whose programs are up for review.

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

- A. **Class Size Based on Academic Parameters Agreement.** (Second Reading – Hamilton). Michelle reviewed the discussion from the last meeting and Kurt noted that the Senate was going to research relevant data. Jon clarified that the Senate would vote on the process first and then, once approved, would research the necessary data. Bruce moved/Nancy **seconded**. Eric asked if anyone goes to the administration requesting a class limit and Michelle clarified that the purpose here is to make it a consistent policy. Motion passed with one opposed and one abstention. Michelle asked for direction on the Senate’s next step and Bruce suggested that Dave Hamilton help facilitate a sub-committee’s development of a policy. Michelle asked for volunteers to help draft that policy.
- B. **Distance Education Course Evaluation/Remediation Process.** (Second Reading – Richardson). Jon reviewed the previous meetings discussion and Steve R. clarified that this process would go to negotiations next from the Senate. Steve F. moved/Lisa **seconded**, motion passed unanimously.
- C. **Administration Reorganization.** (Discussion – Murillo). Kindred presented her reorganization proposal which is based on last year’s early retirements and the decision to hire a Dean of Student Academic and Support Services:

<u>Organization as of July 31, 2012</u>		<u>Organization Proposal</u>		<u>FTE</u>
Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Ser	1.00	Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student S		1.00
Dean of Instruction	1.00	Dean of Instruction		1.00
Interim Dean of Instruction	1.00	Dean CTE and Instruction		1.00
Interim Dean of Student and Academic Support Se	1.00	Dean of Student & Academic Support Services		1.00
Director of Career and Technical Education	0.92			
Total FTE	4.92	Total FTE		4.00

Her reasoning for the reorganization was to focus on leadership strength, stability, and continuity. She also noted that she does not want to increase administrators’ FTE and this reorganization reduces it from 4.92 FTE to 4.00 FTE. Nancy clarified that the college does not open these positions up because there is no increase in FTE and Kindred agreed. Michelle asked if this is typical and Kindred did not call it typical but when downsizing, yes it is more typical. Kindred explained that these are the times to think differently. Michelle asked if the three-year contract includes a probationary period and Kindred clarified that these positions always have a 12-month notice. Kindred also noted that a three-year contract indicates a commitment in the individual. Michelle asked the Senators if anyone wanted to go back to their constituents and Bruce suggested that their constituents be informed of this and if they have any questions to go directly to Kindred. Kindred said to please feel free to come by her office if you have any concerns. She noted that her goal is to have this process done by April.

- D. **Athletic Program Proposal—Soccer Teams.** (Discussion – Johnson). Tim presented his initial proposal and noted that it has been to the PAC and is moving thru the various councils. Tim had a brief presentation that focused on addressing strategic issues. The soccer program is for both men and women and would be planning to start in the fall of 2014. Steve F. asked **whether the \$10-15,000 was going to come completely from**

fundraising (not out of college budget) and Tim responded that he expected it would. He also pointed out that Tim's calculations for revenue did not take into account the fact that some of the 40 potential student athletes would already be students here so that should not be calculated as revenue to offset expense and Tim agreed. Tim was then asked if they hadn't raised the \$10-15,000, would it still go ahead and Tim said it would. Nancy asked about the coaches and how they will be paid. Tim noted that in-season would be a stipend and off-season may be as an adjunct. Nancy thanked Tim for his work on this proposal. Lisa shared some comments she received from some of her constituents. Those comments addressed many issues including concerns about the impact on Student Services and the counselors' responsibilities, the viability of these two programs (male and female) from both a cost and student participation perspective, and the level of community support. Tim explained that he had already met with community leaders and their response was positive. Michelle noted the important questions in the comments Lisa shared with the Senate and requested that Lisa send Tim the email specifically detailing those comments. Michelle asked about the Foundation's involvement and TRiO participation with the potential student athletes. Aaron B. expressed some concerns from a student support perspective and Gayle B. had similar concerns about the administration's support of this program with the necessary resources.

- E. **Distance Education and a Strategic Threat Part 1.** (Discussion – Richardson). Steve R. presented some concerns on distance education including our dwindling enrollments along with the increased online competition from other community colleges, CSUs, and for-profit organizations. He also noted the movement toward privatization of tertiary education at a national and state level and the popular perception of MOOCs (Massive Open Online Course) as a solution to the 'problems' of public tertiary education. It was noted that there is not only a philosophical perspective to online education but also a procedural qualitative management concern as well. Steve's presentation extended into the next agenda item where a lively discussion ensued.
- F. **Distance Education and a Strategic Threat Part 2.** (Discussion – Richardson). Steve R. led a discussion that addressed many of the following questions:
- Do we perceive online education as a threat or as an opportunity?
  - Do we embrace online education, or merely tolerate it?
  - Do we support the granting of degrees and certificates acquired wholly via online courses?
  - Do we wish to adopt stringent standards for hiring of online faculty and for evaluating online faculty?
  - Do we wish to adopt a comprehensive rubric for assessing online courses?
  - Do we support the idea of integrated courses which have both f2f and online enrollees, and allow students to elect their own blend of online and f2f components of a course?
  - Do we wish to be accredited in the future? Do we wish to exist in the future? As an autonomous district? At all?
  - Do we need to change? Do we wish to change?

---

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, March 8<sup>th</sup> Thank you.

---

- G. **Guidance for Scheduling.** (Discussion – Risdon/Greene).  
H. **Comprehensive Program Review Document.** (Discussion – Risdon/McVean).  
I. **Program Vitality Assessment Process.** (Discussion – Risdon).

- VI. **New Business**
- 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/Workgroups**: .
  - 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**
  -
- XI. **Good of the Order**
  -
- XII. **Adjournment**: Adjourned at 4:36:25pm.

ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM



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

Requested By: Tim Johnson

Date: 2-19-13

Subject: Athletic Program Proposal - Soccer Teams

Time Required for Discussion: 20

Type of Consideration:

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

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

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

Background:

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

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



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

Requested By: Risdon/Greene

Date: 2-19-2013

Subject: Guidance for Scheduling

Time Required for Discussion: 10 min

Type of Consideration:

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

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

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

Background:

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



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

Requested By: Risdon/McVean

Date: 2-19-2013

Subject: Comprehensive Program Review Document

Time Required for Discussion: 10 min

Type of Consideration:

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

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

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

Background:

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



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

Requested By: Michelle Risdon

Date: 3/08/13

Subject: Amendment to the LTCC Strategic Plan and, possibly, Scorecard

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)

There is no strategic planning goal nor measurable performance indicator directly related to teaching and the quality of instruction within the College's Strategic Plan and Scorecard. A discussion is required to develop possible additions the Senate would like to see.

Background:

The faculty use the LTCC Strategic Plan in the development of, among other things, the Annual Unit Plan. The Institutional Effectiveness Council uses the Scorecard as a tool for measuring the overall effectiveness of the College's actions in relation to its Strategic Plan. Currently, there are no strategic planning goals nor performance indicators that seem to relate directly to the quality of instruction.

**ACADEMIC SENATE OF LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**REQUEST FOR AGENDA ITEM**



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

Requested By: Richardson, Steve

Date: 2-13-13

Subject: Distance Education and a Strategic Threat

Time Required for Discussion: 15 min

Type of Consideration:

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

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

A continued dialog regarding distance education, which will include the following questions:

Background:

1. Do we really embrace DE? Is this a fait accompli we intend to live with without enthusiasm and participation?
2. Do we support increasing and broadening our online course offerings at all? Do we support increasing the availability of entirely online AA degrees and certificates?
3. Do we support my idea of courses which are both online and face-to-face concurrently?
4. Do we wish to tackle those questions raised by the ACCJC in their 'Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education' which reveal deficiencies?

**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/Thomas/Richardson

Date: 3/08/13

Subject: Rubric for Online Instruction

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)

Whereas, LTCC does not currently have a consistently applied tool in place for the development, assessment, and support of online courses, and

Whereas, the attached Rubric for Online Instruction created by California State University, Chico, licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 United States License, provides a detailed and effective rubric for developing, assessing, and supporting online courses, and

Whereas, such a rubric would be beneficial to the consistency and quality of the online programs at LTCC,

Resolved that the attached Rubric for Online Instruction be adapted to LTCC's need and adopted for use in the online environment.

Background:

A number of faculty with experience in Distance Education and teaching online believe this rubric to be comprehensive and appropriate for use at LTCC (with some adaptation), particularly in terms of quality management of Distance Education offerings and in terms of meeting accreditation standards around Distance Education.

## Rubric for Online Instruction

### Rationale

California State University, Chico's first strategic priority is to create and enhance high quality learning environments. Academic technologies, especially online or web-enhanced courses, have a significant role in the creation of those learning environments. The University's Strategic Priorities challenge faculty and staff to use academic technologies to create and enhance high quality learning environments in a demonstrable manner.

### What should a quality online course look like?

Chico's Rubric for Online Instruction offers a framework for addressing this question. Use of this rubric represents a developmental process for online course design and delivery, and provides a means for an instructor to self-assess course(s) based on University expectations. Furthermore, the rubric provides a means for supporting and recognizing a faculty member's effort in developing expertise in online instruction as part of our commitment to high quality learning environments.

### The Rubric for Online Instruction can be used in three ways.

1. As a course "self-evaluation" tool - advising instructors how to revise an existing course to the Rubric for Online Instruction.
2. As a way to design a new course for the online environment, following the rubric as a road map.
3. As a means for getting recognition for exemplary online instruction - going through a nomination/recognition process on campus. Faculty can receive recognition to go in their RTP file.

### Historical Perspective

The process by which faculty and staff came together to write this rubric is available for your review. This describes the history and work of a dedicated committee.

The Rubric for Online Instruction initiated the **Exemplary Online Instruction Awards**, a recognition made public at the annual **CELT Conference** at CSU, Chico. The website demonstrates examples of exemplary online instruction and is available for viewing.

### License

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 United States License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/us/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

**The complete rubric is attached**

**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/Thomas/Richardson

Date: 3/08/13

Subject: Online Instructor Hiring Procedure

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)

Whereas, LTCC does not currently have a formalized policy nor procedure in place for the hiring of online instructors, and

Whereas, the hiring of online instructors is unique due to the mode of delivery, and

Whereas, such a policy would be beneficial to the consistency and quality of the online programs at LTCC,

Resolved that the attached Online Instructor Hiring Procedure be adopted.

Background:

Online Instructor Hiring Procedure

1. Applicants desiring to teach online for the district shall supply a portfolio of online courses they have taught as supplementary materials to their application..
2. The hiring committee shall include:
  - a. The DE Coordinator
  - b. A faculty member in the discipline is such exists, or the dean overseeing the discipline
3. The district shall inform such applicants that the following additional requirements must be met prior to their teaching online for the district:
  - a. Completion of a three-week Etudes training course conducted by etudes.org
  - b. Submission of the online course materials for the proposed course
4. The district shall supply applicants with:
  - a. the district's *standards for evaluation*
  - b. the district's *online course evaluation rubric*
5. Newly hired instructors shall have their courses evaluated in the first quarter they are offered.