College of the Canyons Academic Senate Agenda

October 10, 2013 3:00 P.M. to 4:30 P. M. BONH 330

A.Routine Matters
   1. Call to order
   2. Approval of Agenda
   3. Approval of the Consent Calendar
      a) Approval of the Academic Senate Summary: September 26, 2013 (p.2)
      b) Approval of the Curriculum Summary: October 3, 2013 (p.4)
   4. President’s Report
   5. Vice-President’s Report

B.Committee Reports
   1. Program Review Committee – Paul Wickline, Committee Chair
   2. Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies Committee (MQE) – Edel Alonso, Committee Chair
   3. Curriculum Committee – CTE Course Requisite Validation Form – Ann Lowe, Curriculum Committee Chair (p.6)

C.Unfinished Business
   1. Senate’s Proposal for New Procedures: Counseling Services – in Policy Committee
   2. Proposal for Revision of Prerequisite Policy – in Policy Committee
   3. Calendar Options 2014-2015 – in Calendar Committee
   4. Orphan Courses – in SLO Committee
   5. 20+ policies from Administration – in Policy Committee
   6. ISLO LEAP - under discussion at division level
   7. Heritage Committee Procedures – in Heritage Committee

D.Discussion Items
   1. Annual Student Survey – Jasmine Ruys, Daylene Meuschke and Denee Pescarmona (3 attachments)
   2. Draft of Proposed Change to Curriculum Committee Procedures – Ann Lowe, Curriculum Committee Chair (p.7)
   3. Draft of Proposed Revision to BP 4400 Discontinuance Policy: BP 4400 Program Viability and AP 4400 Program Viability - David Andrus, Policy Review Committee Chair (p.15)
   5. Draft of Proposed Revision to BP 4030 Academic Freedom and AP 4030 Academic Freedom – David Andrus, Policy Review Committee Chair (p.31)

E.Action Items:
   1. Approval of Discipline Assignments for Adjunct Faculty Fall 2013 (attachment)
   2. a) 2012-2013 ESL/Basic Skills Allocation End-of-Year Report and
      b) 2013-2014 ESL/Basic Skills Allocation Goals/Action Plan and Expenditure Plan - Anzhela Grigoryan, S4S Committee Chair (attachment)

F.Division Reports

G.Announcements:
   1. Academic Calendar forums in BONH 330 10/22, 11:00 AM and 10/28, 2:00 PM
   2. Reminder: Academic Senate meeting will be November 7 the first Thursday in November.
   3. Senate Plenary Session on November 7-9, 2013

H.Open Forum

I.Adjournment

The next Academic Senate meeting will be October 24, 2013
As always everyone is welcomed.
Summary of the Academic Senate Meeting September 26, 2013

Attendance: Edel Alonso, Regina Blasberg, Deanna Riviera, Thea Alvarado, Christy Richter, Michael Sherry, Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, Audrey Green, Anzhela Grigoryan, Shane Ramey, Lee Hilliard, Amy Shennum, David Andrus, Paul Wickline, Chelley Maple, Ruth Rassool, Rebecca Eikey, Cindy Stephens, Ron Karlin, Rebecca Shepherd, Ann Lowe, Howard Fisher and Anais Amin

A.Routine Matters
3. Call to order: 3:00 p.m.
4. Approval of the Agenda: Approved with addition of #5 under Action Items -
   5a) 2012-2013 ESL/Basic Skills Allocation End-of-Year Report and
   5b) 2013-2014 ESL/Basic Skills Allocation Goals/Action Plan and Expenditure Plan
5. Approval of the Consent Calendar: Approved
6. Report of the Senate President, Dr. Edel Alonso:
   ➢ There was a special Board of Trustees meeting last Wednesday for the purpose of a self-evaluation. Academic Senate President and Vice President attended. Joan McGregor was absent. Dr. Van Hook was in attendance. The meeting was devoted to an examination of the role of the members of the Board of Trustees particularly in view of the accreditation process. It was stated that the role of the Board members, as defined by the League, is to set policy for the institution and not to be involved in the operations of the college.
   ➢ Groups of faculty, staff, and administrators have been formed to work on each of the four standards for accreditation: Standard 1 Institutional Mission and Effectiveness, Standard 2 Student Learning Programs and Services, Standard 3 Resources and Standard 4 Leadership and Governance. The Standard Committees are meeting to write a draft of their sections for the self-study report.

Report of Paul Wickline, Senate VP: None

B.Committee Reports: None

C.Unfinished Business
1. Senate’s Proposal for New Procedures: Counseling Services – in Policy Committee
2. Proposal for Revision of Prerequisite Policy – in Policy Committee
3. Calendar Options 2014-2015 – in Calendar Committee
4. Orphan Courses – in SLO Committee
5. 20+ policies sent from administration – David Andrus

D.Discussion Items
1. ISLO/LEAP
SLO Committee Chair, Rebecca Eikey, reported that we have already gone through the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO) assessment process and finished closing the loop last year. There were some workshops in fall 2012 to discuss the outcomes of the learning outcomes assessment process and the feedback was to look into other methods and to improve the dialog and the usefulness of the whole process. In spring 2013, there was another workshop to explore and discuss three different new approaches or methods. One method reviewed and deemed to be of the most interest was based on
essential student learning outcomes proposed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) as a set of principles and referred to as LEAP. Beginning in school and continuing at successively higher levels across their college studies, the AACU states that students should prepare for twenty-first-century challenges by gaining 1) Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World, 2) Intellectual and Practical Skills, 3) Personal and Social Responsibility and 4) Integrative and Applied Learning. The SLO Committee just sponsored another workshop just yesterday with a faculty member from Cal State Channel Islands who explained how their faculty is using LEAP for their SLO assessment. Paul Wickline informed the Senate that all CSU campuses are modeling their ISLO assessment process using this model. The SLO Committee asks the Senators to share this report on the LEAP method in their Division meetings and to encourage the faculty to learn about it while we discuss it further and consider adopting it at COC.

2. Heritage Committee Procedures
Committee Chair, Juan Buriel, reviewed the draft of the proposed new Heritage Committee Procedures. Suggestions for changes to the procedures were made. Juan will take these back to the committee and let the Senate know when he would like to bring this back for discussion.

3. Revision to the Discontinuance Policy: BP 4400 Program Viability AP Program Viability
Policy Review Committee Chair, David Andrus, reviewed the draft of proposed changes to the existing Discontinuance Policy and AP including the name change from Program Discontinuance to “Program Viability”. He explained the ASCCC’s recommendation for development of such a comprehensive policy to comply with Title 5 and cited Education Code sections 78015-78016.5 which were distributed for the senators to read. There are some concerns and some of the changes have been made to the policy. Discussion about the proposed changes ensued.

4. Basic Skills Report
S4S Committee Chair, Anzhela Grigoryan, reviewed the 2012-13 ESL/Basic Skills Allocation End-of-Year Report and 2013-2014 ESL/Basic Skills Allocation Goals/Action Plan and Expenditure Plan. The S4S committee has met since the report included in the Senate’s agenda was sent and the committee has recommended minor changes. Anzhela will forward the changes to the Senate for the next Senate agenda. The final report requires the signature of the Academic Senate President. This item will appear as an Action Item on the next Senate agenda to meet the October 10 deadline.

E. Action Items
   1. Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies Committee Procedures: Approved
   2. SLO Resolution Approved with the addition of “AFT” added along with the other two faculty groups, COCFA and Academic Senate.
   3. Discipline assignment for Dr. Jerry Buckley: Approved
   4. Faculty Emeriti Status for Susan Crowther: Approved
   5. Election results for Adjunct. Ruth Rassool, Shane Ramey and Thea Alvarado: Approved
F. Division Reports: N/A
G. Announcements: Oktoberfest, October 4, 2013. Please encourage all to attend.
   Please note Calendar Option Forums for October.
H. Open Forum: N/A
I. Adjournment: 4:25 p.m.
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE SUMMARY

October 3rd, 2013 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm  BONH-330

Items on "Consent" are recommended for approval as a result of a Technical Review meeting held on September 23rd, 2013.

Members present: Backes, Patrick – Curriculum/Articulation Coordinator, Non-voting member; Brill, David – Fine & Performing Arts; Broder, Robert – Allied Health (substitute for Tina Waller); Eiseey, Rebecca – Math, Science & Engineering (substitute for Mary Bates); Hilliard, Lee – Career & Technical Education; Karin, Ron – Member at Large; Lowe, Ann – Co-Chair, Faculty; Marenc, Anne – Social Science & Business; Matsumoto, Saburo – Member at Large; Ramey, Shane – Adjunct Faculty; Ryan, Jasmine – Admissions & Records; Solomon, Diane – Member at Large; Voth, Joseph – Humanities

Members absent: Green, Audrey – Co-Chair, Administrator; Richter, Christy – Enrollment Services; Staniich, Diana – Physical Education & Athletics

DELETED COURSES on consent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>History of Art: Field Trips</td>
<td>Course will no longer be offered. - Approved</td>
<td>J. Sorensen</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOSCI</td>
<td>098</td>
<td>Quality Control and Validation</td>
<td>Course will no longer be offered. Course was part of the Biotechnology Certificate which has been deleted. - Approved</td>
<td>A. Sorensen</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Chemistry for Technology</td>
<td>Course will no longer be offered. Course was part of the General and Emerging Technologies Certificate which has been deleted. - Approved</td>
<td>A. Sorensen</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC.BCSK</td>
<td>E19</td>
<td>Study Techniques</td>
<td>Course will no longer be offered - Approved</td>
<td>D. Keating</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC.BCSK</td>
<td>E20</td>
<td>Spelling Techniques</td>
<td>Course will no longer be offered - Approved</td>
<td>D. Keating</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC.BCSK</td>
<td>SBC</td>
<td>Summer Bridge Counseling</td>
<td>Course will no longer be offered - Approved</td>
<td>D. Keating</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC.BCSK</td>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>Summer Bridge English</td>
<td>Course will no longer be offered - Approved</td>
<td>D. Keating</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC.BCSK</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>Summer Bridge Math</td>
<td>Course will no longer be offered - Approved</td>
<td>D. Keating</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC.ESL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ESL Beginning Language Lab</td>
<td>Course will no longer be offered - Approved</td>
<td>D. Keating</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MODIFIED COURSES on consent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Elementary Chinese I</td>
<td>Revised objectives and content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>P. Sorensen</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURS</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Transition Strategies for Intercollegiate Athletes</td>
<td>Revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>A. Sorensen</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULARTS</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Principles of Baking II</td>
<td>Revised SLO’s (2), revised objectives and content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>C. Sorensen</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Elementary German II</td>
<td>Revised objectives and content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>C. Sorensen</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLHSCI</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician Refresher Course</td>
<td>Added Lab component, revised descriptions, revised objectives and content, updated textbooks. Changed prerequisite of HLHSCI-151 or current/expired EMT certification to recommended preparation. - Approved</td>
<td>P. Keating</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Elementary Italian I</td>
<td>Revised objectives and content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>C. Sorensen</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Bass Guitar Studies I</td>
<td>Revised SLO, Added SLO, revised objectives and content. - Approved</td>
<td>D. Neff</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURV</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Advanced Applications in Surveying II</td>
<td>Revised descriptions, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, Updated textbook. Changed SURV-102 prerequisite to recommended preparation, added SURV-103 &amp; MATH 102 as recommended preparation. - Approved</td>
<td>P. Blakley</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURV</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Boundary Control and Legal Principles I</td>
<td>Revised descriptions, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. - Approved</td>
<td>P. Blakley</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURV</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Boundary Control and Legal Principles II</td>
<td>Revised schedule description, added SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. - Approved</td>
<td>P. Blakley</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURV</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Construction Surveying</td>
<td>Revised SLO, Added SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Added SURV-102 as recommended preparation. - Approved</td>
<td>P. Blakley</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NEW COURSES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Keyboard Instruction III</td>
<td>2 unit: 10 hours lecture, 54 hours lab, not repeatable.</td>
<td>R. Hense</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Keyboard Instruction IV</td>
<td>2 unit: 10 hours lecture, 54 hours lab, not repeatable.</td>
<td>R. Hense</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MODIFIED COURSES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NURSNG</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Nursing</td>
<td>Revised course content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>N. Rocha</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSNG</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Beginning Medical Surgical Nursing</td>
<td>Revised course content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>T. Wood</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSNG</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Psychiatric Nursing</td>
<td>Revised course content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>A. Lowe</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSNG</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Pharmacological Principles</td>
<td>Revised SLO, revised course content, updated textbook. - Approved</td>
<td>T. Wood</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSNG</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Intermediate Medical Surgical Nursing</td>
<td>Revised course content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>T. Wood</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSNG</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Advanced Medical Surgical Nursing and Leadership</td>
<td>Revised course content, updated textbooks. - Approved</td>
<td>A. Nunez</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATR</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Movement for the Performer</td>
<td>Changed from 3 units to 2 units, revised descriptions, revised SLO's (2). - Approved</td>
<td>J. Rosilly</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATR</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Voice for the Performer</td>
<td>Changed from 3 units to 2 units, revised descriptions, revised SLO's (2). - Approved</td>
<td>J. Rosilly</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW/MODIFIED PREREQUISITES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Suggested Enrollment Limitation</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLHSCI</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
<td>Changed prerequisite of HLHSCI-151 to current/expired EMT certification to recommended preparation. - Approved</td>
<td>S. Milly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURV</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Advanced Applications in Surveying</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changed prerequisite of SURV-102 to recommended preparation, added SURV-103 &amp; MATH-102 as recommended preparation. - Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURV</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Construction Surveying</td>
<td>Added SURV-102 as recommended preparation. - Approved</td>
<td>N. Staino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW DISTANCE LEARNING ADDENDUMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>TYPE OF DELIVERY</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNS</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Transition Strategies for Intercollegiate Athletes</td>
<td>Online/Hybrid. - Approved</td>
<td>S. Stahl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Items:

1. **Curriculum Committee Handbook Review – Sequencing and Organization of the Handbook.** The draft Curriculum Committee handbook will be updated based on the suggestions given from the committee. A revised version will be sent out to the committee for further review. The draft handbook is scheduled to be reviewed again for accuracy at the October 17th Curriculum Committee meeting.

2. **CTE Course Requisite Validation Form.** The form was reviewed and approved by the committee members present (see attached).

3. **Noncredit Resolution from Academic Senate.** Ann Lave read the noncredit resolution from the Academic Senate that opposes the elimination of noncredit course offerings.

4. **Division Representative Report – Courses in Need of the Five Year Revision.** The updated five year revision list was reviewed by the committee members. Division representatives reported on the status of courses on the list within their divisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Courses</th>
<th>Include DD’s</th>
<th>Modified Non Credit Courses</th>
<th>Modified Prerequisites</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Programs</td>
<td>Include DD’s</td>
<td>Deleted Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Courses</td>
<td>15 New SLO’s</td>
<td>Deleted Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Programs</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>Modified DD’s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proposals Reviewed in Technical Review Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Non Credit Courses</td>
<td>-0- Modified Prerequisites</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>Proposals Returned from Technical Review Session</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTE Course Requisite Validation Form

Date: ________  Department: ________
Course Prefix, Number and Course Title: ________
Prerequisite Course Prefix, Number and Course Title: ________
Co-requisite Course Prefix, Number and Course Title: ________
Recommended Preparation Course Prefix, Number and Course Title: ________

Prerequisite Content Review:
☐ The SLO’s and objectives in the prerequisite course are equivalent to the entrance skills necessary to succeed in this course.
☐ The tests, quizzes, projects, and/or assignments are appropriate to develop the required skills for the prerequisite course.
☐ The textbook requires a base of knowledge that the student would have obtained in the prerequisite course.

Co-requisite Content Review:
☐ The SLO’s and objectives in the co-requisite course match the knowledge and skills reflected in the goals and objectives of this course.
☐ The test, quizzes, projects, and/or assignments reflect skills that are taught in both this course and the co-requisite course.
☐ The textbook contains a base of knowledge the student would have used in the co-requisite course.

Recommended Preparation Content Review:
☐ The objectives in the advisory course are such that the ability of the student to meet those objectives would contribute to the student’s success in this course.
☐ The tests, quizzes, projects, and assignments reflect skills that the student may have acquired in the advisory course.
☐ The textbook requires a base of knowledge the student may have obtained in the advisory course.

Department Chair Signature: ___________________________  Date: ________________
DRAFT of Proposed Revisions

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

I. SCOPE AND DUTIES
1. Review and recommend action on existing curricula
2. Review and recommend action on proposed curricula
3. Encourage and foster the development of new curricula
4. Request, consider, and respond to reports from various college groups whose work bears directly on the curriculum
5. Disseminate curricular information and curricular recommendations to the faculty, Academic Senate, administration, and to the Board of Trustees
6. Implement state-mandated regulations or policies that affect curriculum
7. Recommend associate degree requirements to the Academic Senate, administration, and Board of Trustees
8. Recommend additions, deletions, and modifications in general education patterns for the associate degree, the California State University General Education Breadth Requirements, and the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)
9. Review all curriculum proposals to ensure congruence with the college’s mission, need, quality, feasibility, and compliance with Title V.

II. MEMBERSHIP:
1. As an academic and professional matter, the composition of the Curriculum Committee will be mutually agreed upon by the Senate and the District.

2. The Academic Senate will develop procedures to select the faculty members of the committee.
   a. Elections will be held in the spring of even numbered years
   b. Term of service will be for two years
   c. If a position is vacated and filled with a new member, the new member’s term of service will be completed at the end of the original two-year term.

3. The following are considered voting members of the committee:
   a. Faculty Chair of the Curriculum Committee
   b. One representative from each division.
   c. 3 At-Large Faculty Representatives
   d. 1 Adjunct Representative
   e. Chief Instructional Officer or designee from the Office of Instruction
      i. The Chief Instructional Officer or designee from the Office of Instruction may serve as Administrative Co-Chair of the Curriculum Committee.
ii. Every two years during the Spring Semester the Chief Instructional Officer will confer with the Senate as to the status and performance of the Administrative Co-Chair.

4. If they are not already voting members, the following shall be appointed as Non-Voting members:
   a. Curriculum Coordinator
   b. Representative from the Associated Student Government
   c. Representative of the Counselors (if no elected member is a Counselor)
   d. Matriculation Officer
   e. Director of Admissions and Records
   f. Articulation Officer

5. The following committees will provide a representative to serve as a resource to the Curriculum Committee. They are considered non-voting resource members, and are not expected to attend meetings unless they are requested:
   a. Disciplines Committee
   b. Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator(s)
   c. Ed-Tech Committee

III. MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Attend and fully participate in committee meetings
2. Serve as a consultant to members of his/her division during curriculum development. Committee members may answer questions, provide information on curriculum policies and procedures, and prepare faculty to present their courses at curriculum meetings.
3. Inform and update their division about curriculum issues such as (but not limited to):
   a. Proper preparation of course outlines
   b. Prerequisite/corequisite policies
   c. Curriculum Committee deadlines
   d. Developing Student Learning Outcomes
4. All members of the committee shall make decisions based on a college wide perspective.
5. It is expected that all members are prepared to make informed decisions. This will require members to, at a minimum:
   a. Read all the course/program outlines before the meeting;
   b. Stay current on Title V and Education Code requirements regarding curriculum;
   c. Participate in required training (e.g. Stand Alone Certification);
   e. Be knowledgeable about current curriculum policies, procedures, writing standards, resources, forms, and deadline dates.
6. Members are expected to find and orient a substitute if they are unable to attend a meeting.
7. If a member misses more than 50% of the meetings in a single semester, it will be assumed that they have tendered their resignation.

IV. FACULTY CO-CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES
1. Serves as a resource person to assist faculty in the development of curriculum proposals.
2. Develops a recommended curriculum committee schedule each year.
3. Reviews all courses and programs prior to establishing agendas
4. Establishes the agenda for Curriculum Committee meetings.
5. Schedules and conducts the technical review meetings
6. Conducts the Curriculum Committee meetings
7. Provides advice and guidance on curriculum issues, such as: Education Code regulations, Title V compliance, course numbering sequence, and prerequisite regulations
8. Updates the Academic Senate regularly regarding committee activities.
9. Reviews minutes of meetings prior to submitting to the Academic Senate.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE CO-CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES
1. Works with faculty co-chair to fulfill college Curriculum Committee responsibilities
2. Manages course and program review workflow.
3. Interfaces with the Curriculum and Articulation Coordinator to:
   a. Maintain all curriculum files
   b. Submit curriculum materials for state and local approval
   c. Maintain the curriculum database and forms in WebCMS
   d. Prepare and submit curriculum materials for review and approval by the Academic Senate.
4. Facilitates technology training for all committee members and faculty authors.
5. Supervises/assists Academic Deans in fulfilling their curriculum responsibilities.

VI. AUDIT TRAIL
1. Proposals will not be considered until they have completed the Audit Trail.
   a. Faculty meeting the minimum qualifications to teach the proposed/revised course must write proposals.
   b. In a case where there are no full time faculty qualified in the course discipline, adjunct faculty who are qualified may act as content experts to assist the full time faculty in creating or revising the course outline of record.

2. Selection of Auditors
   a. Some positions on the audit trail are automatically appointed such as the Dean, Chair, Articulation Officer, and resource positions. They will be included in the audit trail due to their role in the college.
   b. The following audit trail positions are appointed positions. The Curriculum Committee Faculty Co-Chair will solicit input from relevant
campus committees for a faculty member to fill these positions. The chairs will mutually agree on a recommendation.

i. Distance Learning
ii. Disciplines
iii. SLO

c. The initial term of service shall be two years. Auditors may be reappointed for additional two-year terms.

d. **Appointments will be made in the spring of odd numbered years.**

3. Auditor responsibilities
   a. Department Chair
      i. Check course outlines for accuracy in all sections
      ii. Check to see that course is in line with the program review
      iii. Check for appropriateness to college mission
      iv. Ensure that SLO’s, objectives, and content are divided into lecture/lab sections if appropriate and that all aspects of the outline are consistent with each other.
      v. Check that outline meets curriculum standards as well as represents the current standards for that discipline.
      vi. Verify that the SLO(s) is consistent with the relevant program and institutional SLO(s).
   b. SLO
      i. Ensure that SLO’s are properly written and that the objectives are distinct from, but related to, the SLO’s
      ii. Compare content with SLO’s & objectives to ensure consistency.
      iii. Check that methods of assessment are consistent with SLO’s.
   c. Discipline
      i. Ensure correct discipline placement
   d. Distance Education
      i. Ensure distance education addendum adheres to principles of distance education.
      ii. Compare DLA to course outline of record to ensure that assignments can be completed in this format.
   e. Academic Dean
      i. Review entire proposal following the guidelines from the preceding steps in the audit trail.
      ii. **Note whether or not there are sufficient resources to support the course or program.**
   f. Articulation Officer
      i. Review program, general education, and articulation information for accuracy.
      ii. Ensure that proposal (description, content, assignments) meet articulation requirements.
   g. Learning Resources (Library, Computer Support)
      i. Ensure that adequate resources for course/program are available.
4. If a proposal does not progress from one stage to the next within 6 months, the Curriculum Coordinator will contact the author to determine if the author anticipates completing the course. At that time the author may request that the Curriculum Coordinator delete the proposal.

5. Proposals do not require approval to be forwarded to the next stage. However, auditors may opt to return a course to the author **must note** if it does not meet curriculum standards. For example:
   a. Incorrect format. For example no or poorly written SLO’s, lecture/lab not separated,
   b. Does not meet Title V requirements. For example minimal critical thinking objectives, no evidence of writing or problem solving in the methods of evaluating student achievement.
   c. Does not meet articulation requirements
   d. Course is inconsistently written. For example a course with lecture units is written as a lab class.

6. **Once the course has been through the audit trail, it will be sent to the author to review auditor comments and make the suggested changes.**

7. The final stage of the Audit Trail is review by the Curriculum Coordinator.

8. The Curriculum Coordinator will certify that the audit trail for the proposal has been completed. This will include:
   a. All required supplements (e.g., DLA and Prerequisite form) have been completed
   b. Appropriate changes to a relevant program have been made. New, deleted, and/or modified courses will not be reviewed if relevant program changes have not also been simultaneously submitted.

9. The Curriculum Coordinator will return all proposals that have been identified as incomplete to the author. The Division Dean, chair, and the author will be notified what areas need to be completed (see Appendix A).

10. **Credit and non-credit courses will be put on the Curriculum Technical Review agenda, and ISA courses will be put on the ISA Technical Review Agenda.**

VII. TECHNICAL REVIEW
1. Held prior to each regularly scheduled Curriculum Committee meeting.

2. The purpose of the technical review is to review proposals for clarity and provide guidance for further revision.

3. The faculty co-chair will establish the agenda.
4. To be eligible for the technical review, all proposals will be certified as complete by the Curriculum Coordinator.

5. At a minimum, the Technical Review Committee will consist of the faculty Co-Chair, a rotating member from the Curriculum Committee, and the Curriculum Coordinator.

6. The Technical Review Committee will make one of the following determinations for every proposal reviewed:
   a. Return to author for further refinement
   b. Place on consent calendar
   c. Schedule on agenda for full discussion

V. CURRICULUM MEETING AGENDA:
   1. The faculty co-chair will develop the meeting agendas. Only those proposals that have been certified by the Technical Review Committee will be placed on the agenda.

   2. The agenda will consist of:
      a. Technical changes
      b. Consent items
      c. Modified-courses
      d. New courses
      e. Modified programs
      f. New programs
      g. DLAs
      h. Pre-requisites/co-requisites
      i. Stand Alone courses
      j. Program/course approvals
      k. Discussion items

3. Courses will generally be reviewed in the order in which they are received. However other issues may take priority. Priority is established based on the following list:
   a. Title V and other legislative mandated changes including updates
   b. Revisions required for articulation
   c. New courses in new programs
   d. Courses in existing programs
   e. Stand-alone courses
   f. New Distance Learning Addendums

4. Agendas will be posted publically and online 72 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.
VIII. MEETINGS:
1. Meetings are held during the fall and spring semesters on the first and third Thursday of each month.
   a. The last meeting of the academic year will address
      i. The calendar for the next academic year
      ii. Courses meeting the diversity requirement
      iii. Courses meeting new GE requirements
      iv. An update from CSU/UC & Chancellor’s Office regarding new articulation and course/program approvals.
      v. CTE prerequisite/corequisite certification every two years (even years)

2. In order to conduct business the Curriculum Committee will require a quorum of the voting members. A quorum is defined as 50% + one of the voting membership. A proxy vote may not count in order to establish a quorum; however, faculty acting as substitutes for a regular member may be counted in establishing a quorum.

3. There may be times when unscheduled meetings may be warranted to address issues in a timely manner. Meetings may be called only:
   a. If the two chairs agree
   b. Once the chairs agree to call a meeting, the members will be polled to ascertain if a quorum can be established. If a quorum cannot be reached, an email meeting may be held. (Violates the Brown Act)
   c. If this additional meeting falls during a non-service day, the faculty members required to be present may be compensated according to the appropriate contractual procedures.

4. Authors, or designee, must be present for the committee to discuss a proposal. Only faculty may represent proposals to the Curriculum Committee. If the author of the proposal is an adjunct, the department chair (or designee) must be present for the committee to consider the proposal.
   a. Proposals may only be authored by faculty

5. Presentations to the committee should include sufficient information to allow the committee to review all aspects of the proposal.
   a. Basic information requirements:
      i. Relevance to the mission of the college, need, adequate resources, compliance with any regulatory agencies (see appendix A)
      ii. Semester sequencing plan
      iii. Articulation information
      iv. Proposal as to which existing sections to allocate to new courses
   b. CTE curriculum:
      i. Labor market research
      ii. Advisory committee minutes
   c. Programs:
i. Completed “New Program Assistance Form”
ii. Proposed deletion of outdated degrees or certificates

d. Grant related curriculum:
   i. Executive summary of grant
   ii. Timeline for implementation

IX. CERTIFICATION OF DECISIONS

1. At the conclusion of the meeting, a written summary will be presented to the Academic Senate. Proposals will not be forwarded to the Board until the Senate confirms that all procedures were correctly followed.

2. The Senate will only confirm that the procedures were followed – the Senate will not confirm the content of the meeting.

3. As per Title V, courses cannot be placed on the schedule until approved by the Board of Trustees.

VIII. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. At the end of the academic year, the Curriculum Committee will present the Senate with a proposed calendar for the upcoming academic year, along with the copy of these operating procedures.

2. An annual calendar will be developed to meet the UC/CSU deadlines, the catalog schedule, as well as other external requirements. This calendar will be submitted for approval to the Academic Senate in the spring semester of the proceeding academic year.

3. The Curriculum Committee may create ad hoc subcommittees to review and report back on specific curricular items. Examples:
   a. Diversity Class listing
   b. AA/AS Requirements
   c. Other topics as deemed appropriate by the Curriculum Committee

4. A technical change memo may be used in place of a full course revision in the following circumstances:
   a. When the Datatel version of the course does not match the official course outline of record.
   b. When minor changes are made to the course outline in the following areas: book, adding more detail to the methods of instruction or assignments, modifying the methods of evaluation, adding detail to the existing content headings, or correcting grammar/spelling.
   c. To make non-substantive changes required for C-ID approval
   d. Changing a prerequisite to recommended preparation. In this case supporting data must be supplied to show that students can be successful in the course without the prerequisite.
DRAFT of Proposed Revisions

BP 4400 Program Discontinuance Viability – Initiation, Modification and Discontinuance

Reference:
Education Code Section 78015(a)(1), 78016(a); Title 5, Section(s) 51022, 53203(d)(1), 55130; ASCCC “Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective”; ACCJC Standard II.A.6.b.

Pursuant to Title 5, Section 51022(a), the governing board shall adopt a policy and carry out its policies for the initiation, modification, for the or discontinuance of courses or programs. Santa Clarita Community College District is committed to supporting programs that fulfill its Mission and Institutional Learning Outcomes for students. Because program initiation, modification and discontinuance is a curricular, student success and educational issue, it must follow a careful and extensive review of the program’s status in relation to the overall educational mission of the District.

4400.1 A program is defined as an organized sequence of courses, or a single course, leading to a defined objective, a degree, certificate, diploma, license, or transfer to another institution of higher education (CCR Title 5, Section 55000). (e.g., completing a program of study leading to a certificate in Computer Maintenance Technology, an AS degree in Business, or transfer). For purposes of this policy “Program” shall also be understood to mean any academic department that conducts a program review as well as any thematic cluster of courses within the purview of the Office of Instruction that support a common set of outcomes. College districts are also required by regulation and statute to develop a process for program discontinuance and minimum criteria for the discontinuance of occupational programs. Additionally, Education Code §78016 stipulates that every vocational and occupational program shall meet certain requirements prior to termination. (This strike out text has been moved below and is now 4400.10.)
4400.2 Program Initiation – is the institution or adoption of a new program as defined by this policy, or new discipline established in adherence to AP 4400.

4400.3 Program Modification – Program modifications shall be categorized in the following two manners:

(a) Substantial Modification - is an alteration to an existing program that substantially modifies the program in terms of current faculty workload; academic outcomes and process; student outcomes; new curriculum or current curriculum; articulated coursework required for certificate, degree or transfer; or students' ability to achieve their educational goals in a reasonable amount of time. A "Substantial Modification" must be proposed and meet the procedural requirements found in Administrative Procedure 4400.

(b) Nominal Modifications – are non-substantial modifications determined to be normal customary revisions, scheduled or otherwise, that exist and are managed via the existing curriculum review process administered by the Curriculum Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. Such revisions are generally for the purpose of maintaining currency and, or legally mandated changes. This category of program modification shall be determined "nominal" in its effect and institutional impact and thus fall outside the purview and requirement of Administrative Procedure 4400. The Curriculum Committee may elect to deny a review of proposed modifications it deems "substantial" and refer proposing party to Administrative Procedure 4400 for action.

4400.4 Program Viability Review – is the process of determining the appropriateness of a Program Initiation, Program Adjustment or Program Discontinuance.

4400.5 Program Discontinuance – is the termination of an existing program, discipline, or department.
4400.2  Program discontinuance shall not be driven merely by budgetary considerations. Low or declining enrollment or other degenerating measurements that are due primarily to budgetary reasons will not by itself justify program discontinuance.

4400.3  Special attention must be given to the impact of program discontinuance upon those students who are currently enrolled in the program. Specifically, ACCJC Accreditation Standard II.A.6.b states: “When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution [should make] appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.”

4400.4  Program discontinuance is an issue of both academic and professional concern for the Academic Senate. It is also a matter of collective bargaining in so far as the policy impacts employment or other negotiated work conditions. Above all, it affects educational goals of students’ ability to achieve their educational goals. Therefore, program discontinuance requires participation of members from all segments of the educational community of the District, including students in particular. It must be supported by a thoughtful process of vital academic considerations and a careful analysis of a range of data about the program in question and the impact on the educational mission of the District.

4400.5  A recommendation to discontinue is mandated if so ordered by an external regulatory, governing or licensing body to which the program is subject. The process for program, discontinuance mandated or otherwise, is set forth in Administrative Procedure 4400. If discontinuance of a program or course is determined, implementation of the discontinuance must occur in a timely manner, per Administrative Procedure 4400.

4400.10  College districts are also required by regulation and statute to develop a process for program discontinuance and minimum criteria for the discontinuance of occupational programs. Additionally, Education Code §78015(a)(1) and 78016(a) stipulates that every vocational and occupational program shall meet certain labor market requirements prior to initiation and every two years thereafter to ensure its necessity termination.

See Administrative Procedure 4400 Approved 04/11/12
DRAFT of Proposed Revisions

AP 4400 Program Discontinuance Viability – Initiation, Modification and Discontinuance

Reference: Education Code Section 78015(a)(1), 78016(a); Title 5, Section(s) 51022, 53203(d)(1), 55130; ASCCC “Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective”; ACCJC Standard II.A.6.b.

I. DEFINITIONS

A. Program: An organized sequence of courses, or a single course, leading to a defined objective, a degree, certificate, diploma, license, or transfer to another institution of higher education (CCR Title 5, Section 55000). (e.g., completing a program of study leading to a certificate in Computer Maintenance Technology, an AS degree in Business, or transfer). For purposes of this procedure “Program” shall also be understood to mean any academic department that conducts a program review as well as any thematic cluster of courses within the purview of the Office of Instruction that support a common set of outcomes.

B. Program Initiation – is the institution or adoption of a new program as defined by this policy, or new discipline established in adherence to AP 4400.

C. Program Modification – Program modifications shall be categorized in the following two manners:

(a) Substantial Modification - is an alteration to an existing program that substantially modifies the program in terms of current faculty workload; academic outcomes and process; student outcomes; new curriculum or current curriculum; articulated coursework required for certificate, degree or transfer; or students’ ability to achieve their educational goals in a reasonable amount of time. A “Substantial Modification” must be proposed and meet the procedural requirements found in Administrative Procedure 4400.
E. Program Discontinuance—is the termination of an existing program, discipline, or department.

Defacto Discontinuance: is the unofficial discontinuance of a program in circumvention of this administrative procedure, intended or unintended, that results from the reduction of course sections within that program or from any other institutional or administrative action; thereby rendering program implementation and completion impossible or improbable.

Committee: When a formal discussion Program Viability Review is initiated, the Academic Senate will form an ad hoc Program Discontinuance Viability Committee that will serve ad hoc whose membership is outlined in Section IV of this procedure.

Intervention: is a recommended action to remedy identified program shortcomings.

Determination Process: refers to the sequential process of Section III through V of this Administrative Procedure.

II. PROPOSING PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE, INITIATION OR MODIFICATION

Program initiation, modification and discontinuance proposals, and defacto discontinuance notifications, can be initiated by the Chief Instructional Officer (CIO), Division Dean, Department Chair, or Academic Program Director. He/she will consult with Division Dean and Chair of the affected department and any other potentially affected department or faculty. He/she will provide and include data and information as specified in Section III of this procedure to demonstrate the need for program discontinuance, initiation or modification. The completed proposal is submitted to the Academic Senate President along with supporting documents.

Pursuant to BP 7215, whereby the Board of Trustees relies primarily on the advice of the Academic Senate in academic and professional matters, the Academic Senate shall have a fundamental and integral role in any discussion of program discontinuance, initiation or modification.

“Nominal Modifications” as defined in Section 4400.3(b) of Board Policy 4400 and Section I(C) of this Administrative Procedure, shall be proposed via the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee may elect to deny a review of proposed modifications it deems “substantial” and refer proposing party to Administrative Procedure 4400 for action.

III. PROPOSAL GUIDELINES

Program initiation, modification and discontinuance proposals shall be submitted to the
Academic Senate President no later than the sixth week of the fall semester. Proposals received after the sixth week of the Fall semester, or during the Spring semester, will be advanced only if there exists necessary and compelling reasons to do so in the judgment of the Academic Senate. Proposals submitted after the sixth week must complete the determination process in the same prescribed manner as timely proposal submissions.

The initial proposal shall include, but is not limited to, the itemized quantitative evidence listed below. Special attention must be given to the impact of program discontinuance upon those students who are currently enrolled in the program. Special attention must also be given to the impact a program initiation or modification has on existing programs, support services, staff, curriculum committee, curriculum cycle and development, and overall college functions. The proposal must include a scheduled implementation timeline that takes into consideration the aforementioned concerns. The emphasis on quantitative data in the initial proposal serves to establish a baseline of substantiation for advancing the proposed discontinuance, initiation, or modification to the next procedural level.

A. Quantitative Evidence

1. The quantitative evidence may include, but is not limited to:
   a. Enrollment trends over the past five years.
   b. The projected demand for the program in the future.
   c. Frequency of course section offerings and rationale as to their reduction, if applicable.
   d. Term to term persistence of students within the program.
   e. Student success and program completion rates.
   f. Student completion rate.
   g. Productivity in terms of WSCH per FTE ratios.
Proposals to discontinue may be initiated only in the Fall semester due to the extended time requirement necessary for completion of the determination process (Sections III through V of AP 4400). The size and diversity of the Ad Hoc Program Viability committee, coupled with the need for sufficient review and discernment of the proposal by the Academic Senate and Administration demands the process extend into the following Spring semester. Furthermore, completion of the determination process by the end of the academic year is mandated by potential changes to Senate membership and Ad Hoc Program Viability Committee composition. Section VI, Implementation, does not need to be completed within the same academic year as the determination process.

Grant funded staffing positions must be presented to the Academic Staffing Committee for long term staffing considerations and planning. The intent of such is to ensure equitable planning. The concern is that commonly funded non-grant positions could be adversely affected by positions initially grant funded but subsequently requiring funding from the traditional College budget.

h. Success rate of students passing state and national licensing exams.
i. Enrollment trends over a sustained period of time
j. Data extracted from Program Review.
k. Data from a CTE Advisory Committee
l. Regional Labor Data
m. Adverse student impact resulting from discontinuance.

2. Incomplete Proposals

Proposals deemed incomplete due to the submission of insufficient benchmark evidence may be returned to the proposing party by the subsequent Academic Senate Discontinuance Ad Hoc Program Viability Committee authorized by Section IV of this procedure.

3. Vocational or Occupational Training Program Proposals

California Education Code Section 78015(a)(1) requires that the local governing board initiate a job market study of the labor market area for a proposed vocational or occupational training program prior to its establishment. Consequently, the initiating party of such a proposal must, prior to the submission of the proposal to the President of the Academic Senate and in accord with Section III(A)(1)(i) of this procedure, have requested and obtained the results of a relevant job market study of the labor market area to be included in their program proposal. If a relevant study has already been completed within 6 months of the program proposal, that study may be used to satisfy the Education Code requirement as well as the criteria of this procedure and thus no new labor market study is necessary.
B. Notifications of Possible Defacto Discontinuances

Any party listed in Section II of this procedure may notify the Academic Senate President of a possible defacto discontinuance. Upon receipt of such notification the Senate President will inform the full Senate of the notification at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate. The Senate President will request the CIO and any other relevant college administrators or personnel to report, within 60 days of said notification, to the full Senate on the status of the program in question. The Senate President will request those same individuals provide the full Senate annual program status updates should a defacto discontinuance remain in effect 12 months after their initial report to the Academic Senate. Future annual reports will be requested by the Senate President if the program status remains unchanged. Notification of a possible defacto discontinuance does not fall within the remaining proposal and procedural requirements of this administrative procedure.

IV. FORMATION OF AD-HOC PROGRAM VIABILITY COMMITTEE

Upon receipt of the proposal by the Academic Senate President, the Academic Senate shall approve the creation of an ad hoc Program Viability Committee at its next regularly scheduled meeting. The Senate President may request the party initiating the proposal to be present at the Senate meeting when the proposal is on its published agenda.

A. Program Viability Committee Composition

1. A tenured faculty member outside the Division of the program in question appointed by the Academic Senate President; (this person will serve as Chair of the Committee).
2. A tenured or tenure-track faculty member from inside the affected program; (if this is not possible, then a tenured faculty member from inside the affected department or division.)
3. Division Dean of the department that houses the program in question.
4. Academic Senate President, or designee.
5. CIO, or designee.
6. COCFA President, or designee.
7. AFT Part-time faculty union President, or designee.
8. A student representative appointed by the Associated Students Government.
9. A Counselor appointed by the Academic Senate President in consultation with Counseling Chair.
10. Curriculum Committee Faculty Chair, or designee.
11. A member of the Program Review Committee.
B. Program Viability Committee Functions

The Committee will use the quantitative evidence contained within the initial proposal as a foundation to make a qualitative assessment as to determining the merit of discontinuance, initiation or modification. The Committee will be charged with:

1. Determining the initial proposal’s evidentiary sufficiency per Section III (A). (2) of this procedure.
2. Exercising discretion to expand its membership to include program support staff, student services representatives, and adjunct instructors.
3. Gathering all qualitative and quantitative evidence into a written report.
4. Participating in all public meetings and discussions.
5. Recommending to the Academic Senate one of the three potential outcomes of the discontinuance process. (Listed is Section V (A) of this procedure.)

C. Qualitative Evidence

Factors to be considered may include, but are not limited to:

1. Contemporary analysis of the relevance of a discipline.
2. Current college curriculum and offerings as they relate to the academic mission of the college.
3. The effect of program discontinuance on institutional outcomes.
4. The potential for a disproportionate impact on diversity.

5. The quality of the program, which should include input from program review, student evaluations, articulating universities, local businesses and/or industry, advisory committees and the community.
6. The ability of students to complete their degrees or certificates or to transfer. This includes maintaining rights of students as stipulated in the college catalog.
7. Consideration of matters of articulation as they relate to curriculum.
8. The replication of programs in surrounding college districts.
9. The ability of programs to meet standards of outside accrediting agencies, licensing boards and governing bodies.
10. The goals and strategies of the College as outlined in the most recent Strategic Plan.

The Ad-Hoc Program Viability Committee must document any recommendations or requirements from external regulatory, governing or licensing body to which the program is subject.
D. Mandated Discontinuance

A recommendation to discontinue is mandated if so ordered by an external regulatory, governing or licensing body to which the program is subject, as stated in BP 4400. If such a mandate occurs, discontinuance of the program will be said to have been approved upon proper notification to the Academic Senate. Such notification should clearly cite the governing entity and legal or administrative authority requiring discontinuance. Pursuant to the mandate, the Ad Hoc Program Viability Committee will be formed for the sole purposes listed in Section VI of this procedure.

V. REPORT OF AD HOC PROGRAM VIABILITY COMMITTEE TO FULL ACADEMIC SENATE

The Ad Hoc Program Viability Committee shall submit its written report to the full Academic Senate no later than the fifth week of the Spring semester of the academic year in which the proposal was submitted. The report shall include both quantitative and qualitative evidence that support its findings. The report should assess the program’s alignment with the mission, values, and goals of the institution, as well as access and equity for students. The proposal shall, in essence, create a narrative describing the rationale for the recommended approval or denial of the proposed discontinuance, initiation or modification. The recommended rationale shall substantiate the likelihood of achieving necessary and legitimate educational and institutional goals as well as bear equivalence to relevant standards established by the State Chancellor’s Office.

---

The fifth week deadline is intended as a consideration of ongoing instructional planning for the next academic year as well as allowing sufficient time for Academic Senate and Board of Trustees action to conclude before the end of the Spring semester.

A. Possible Recommendations of the Program Discontinuance Viability Committee

There are five possible recommendations the Program Discontinuance Viability Committee can make. A program may be recommended to be initiated, modified continued, re-continued with qualifications, or to discontinued.

1. Recommendation to Initiate

The recommendation to initiate a program shall be based upon the aforementioned qualitative and quantitative criteria and will be documented in writing by the Committee and maintained by the Academic Senate. Any such recommendation must consider and address the appropriateness of the projected time frame for implementation as well as whether such implementation will adversely affect existing college functions, services and staff.
2. Recommendation to Not Initiate

The recommendation to not initiate a program must include a clearly stated rationale for arriving at such a conclusion based upon the aforementioned qualitative and quantitative criteria documented in writing by the Committee and maintained by the Academic Senate.

2.3. Recommendation to Modify

The recommendation to modify a program shall be based upon the aforementioned qualitative and quantitative criteria and will be documented in writing by the Committee and maintained by the Academic Senate. Any such recommendation must consider and address the appropriateness of the projected time frame for implementation as well as whether such implementation will adversely affect existing college functions, services and staff.

2.4. Recommendation to Continue

The recommendation for a program to continue shall be based upon the aforementioned qualitative and quantitative criteria and will be documented in writing by the Committee and maintained by the Academic Senate.

2.5. Recommendation to Continue with Qualifications

Based upon the aforementioned qualitative and quantitative criteria, a program that was proposed for discontinuance by this process, may be recommended to continue with qualifications. These qualifications must include any requirements imposed by an external regulatory, governing or licensing body to which the program is subject. A specific time line will be provided during which these interventions will occur. The expected outcomes will be specified in writing and made available to all concerned parties. All interventions and time lines will be documented in writing by the Committee and maintained by the Academic Senate. In accordance with the established time line the program will again be evaluated based upon the aforementioned qualitative and quantitative criteria by the Program Discontinuance Committee.

2.6. Recommendation to Discontinue

The recommendation for a program to be discontinued shall be based upon the aforementioned qualitative and quantitative evidence and will be documented in writing by the Committee and maintained by the Academic Senate.

a. Mandated Discontinuance

A recommendation to discontinue is mandated if so ordered by an external regulatory, governing or licensing body to which the program is subject, as stated in BP 4400 and substantiated under Section IV (D) of this procedure.
B. Full Academic Senate Action

The Academic Senate will consider and deliberate on the Ad Hoc Program Viability Committee’s recommended action. At the conclusion of deliberations, the Senate will hold a vote to determine which of the three six actions it will formally adopt. Acceptance of any proposal by the Academic Senate must consider and send forward a scheduled implementation timeline. The Academic Senate’s recommendation will then be forwarded to the CEO to be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval. Pursuant to BP 7215, “the recommendation of the Senate will normally be accepted, and only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons will the recommendation not be accepted.” If a recommendation is not accepted, the Board of Trustees shall promptly communicate its reasons in writing to the Academic Senate.

1. Vocational and Occupational Training Programs

California Education Code Section 78016 mandates that every vocational or occupational training program offered by a community college district shall be reviewed every two years by the governing board of the district to ensure that each program meet particular criteria. The District shall ensure compliance by conducting such ongoing reviews for all initiated programs of this type.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF FINAL DETERMINATION SUPPORTING DISCONTINUANCE

If a program is recommended or mandated for discontinuance, or to continue with qualifications, and is subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees, the original Ad Hoc Program Viability Committee will reconvene to propose an implementation plan for the finalized determination. The implementation plan does not require approval of the Academic Senate. The Committee will formally convey their proposed implementation plan to the CIO and Academic Senate President who will work in concert with the CEO to implement the plan in a timely manner, to its completion. The Academic Senate President will report back to the full Senate, from time to time, as to the status of implementation.
A. Discontinuance Implementation Plan

The implementation plan must include, but is not limited to:

1. A plan and timeline for implementing the discontinuance or qualifications to be established.
2. A set of procedures to allow currently enrolled students to complete their programs of study in accordance with the rights of students as stipulated in the college catalog. If program completion is not viable, other equitable consideration must be accorded to students.
3. A plan for the implementation of all affected collective bargaining requirements and matters for faculty and staff.
4. Coordinating program discontinuance to be consistent with the college catalogue.

Approved 04/11/12
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BP 4020 PROGRAM AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Reference: 34 CFR sections 600.2, 602.24, 603.24, and 668.8; Education Code sections 66700, 70901, 70901(b), 70902(b), and 78016, Title 5 sections 51000, 51022, 55002(b)(1)(B), 55100, 55140, and 55150.

4020.1. The programs and curricula of the Santa Clarita Community College District shall be of high quality, relevant to community and student needs, and evaluated regularly to ensure quality and currency. To that end, the Chancellor shall establish procedures for the development and review of all curricular offerings, including their establishment, modification, or discontinuance.

4020.2. These procedures shall include:
   (a) appropriate involvement of the faculty and Academic Senate in all processes;
   (b) regular review and justification of programs and course descriptions;
   (c) opportunities for training for persons involved in aspects of curriculum development; and
   (d) consideration of job market and other related information for vocational and occupational programs.

4020.3. All new programs and program deletions shall be approved by the Board of Trustees.

4020.4. All new programs shall be submitted to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office for approval as required.

4020.5. Individual degree-applicable credit courses offered as part of a permitted educational program shall be approved by the Board of Trustees. Non-degree-applicable credit and degree-applicable courses that are not part of an existing approved program must satisfy the conditions authorized by Title 5 regulations and shall be approved by the Board of Trustees.

4020.6. The Santa Clarita Community College District defines a credit hour at College of the Canyons as the amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

   (a) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for semester-length (e.g., sixteen weeks) courses for one semester hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
   (b) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by College of the Canyons,
including three hours of laboratory work, studio work, and other activities leading to the award of credit hours.

(c) A credit hour is assumed to be a 50-minute period. In courses, such as those offered online, in which seat time does not apply, a credit hour may be measured by an equivalent amount of work, as demonstrated by student achievement.

See Administrative Procedure [AP 4020]

Approved XXX
DRAFT of Proposed Revisions

AP 4020 PROGRAM AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Reference: 34 CFR sections 600.2, 602.24, 603.24, and 668.8; Education Code sections 70901(b), 70902(b), and 70016; Title 5 sections 51000, 51022, 55100, 55130, and 55150

4020.1 Programs and curricula of the Santa Clarita Community College District are academic and professional matters which are initiated by faculty within the departments and submitted through the appropriate approval process established by the Curriculum Committee under the jurisdiction of the Academic Senate. Proposals are completed per the Santa Clarita Community College District selected curriculum management system.

4020.2 The Instruction Office and Office of Academic Affairs provide the administrative oversight for this process in partnership with the Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, and Student Learning Outcome Coordinators. Proposals are then forwarded to the Board of Trustees for review and approval before final submission to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. Career Technical Education programs and courses must also be approved by the regional consortium before being sent to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. The college catalog is a collaborative publication reflecting these approvals.

4020.3 The primary responsibility of the Curriculum Committee is assuring academic excellence in curriculum matters by ensuring that curriculum is academically sound, comprehensive, and responsive to the evolving needs of the institution and the community through review and approval of:

(a) New and modified course proposals for Title 5 compliance
(b) Courses as they relate to programs of study
(c) Appropriate requisites
(d) CSU and UC general education proposals in collaboration with the articulation officer
(e) Policy changes pertaining to curricula issues
(f) Implementation of state regulations and guidelines pertaining to the curriculum development process
(g) Proposed programs of study (e.g., Associate Degrees, Certificates of Achievement)
(h) Student Learning Outcomes

4020.4 An ongoing review of courses and programs is conducted to maintain compliance with internal and external policies. Courses are reviewed on a five-year rotational cycle and updated as needed. CTE curriculum is updated on a two-year cycle.

4020.5 Curriculum proposals shall be accepted according to the annual Curriculum Committee calendar. Proposals and catalog changes meeting Curriculum Office deadlines shall be reflected in the following academic year’s college catalog.

Approved XXX
DRAFT of Proposed Revisions

BP 614 4030 ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Reference: Education Code section 76120; Title 5 section 51023; Accreditation Standard II.A.7

A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

1. Freedom of speech is a right granted to all citizens by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution; it is vital to American standards of fairness and intelligent debate, and therefore it extends to the classroom environment for teachers and students.

2. A mature, democratic society functions best when its citizens are permitted and able to exercise their right to discuss, debate, disagree, challenge and engage in dialogue on all topics relating to the welfare of individuals and the larger community.

3. An institution of higher education in such a society is expected to enable its faculty, students and staff to comprehend and value the freedoms and responsibilities inherent in its national culture.

4. Only an academic environment that promotes an open and free exchange of ideas can properly develop the cognitive skills of critical inquiry which promote individual success and societal progress.

5. The College, as an institution of higher education, has an obligation to the community to promote the thoughtful introduction of a full gamut of ideas for discussion. This is facilitated by:

   a. Establishing a policy promoting the principle of academic freedom and encouraging faculty and students to exercise this practice by developing and accepting opportunities for critical thinking and personal growth.

   b. Ensuring that the policy of academic freedom successfully guarantees mutual respect by all participants in the educational environment, including the protection from the threat of political or personal attack. Such guarantees include the full scope of professional faculty obligations relative to assigning textbooks, presenting student learning activities, evaluating student performance or achievement and participating in the academic life of the community.

b. It should be clear that any positions taken by faculty members speaking as private citizens are not to be considered as official District policy or positions.

c. This provision is not intended to limit the right of a faculty member to disagree publicly or privately with District policy, and to participate in peaceful debate on any subject of interest to academic community or the larger issues of society.

5. As members of a profession that relies on academic freedom, all faculty members have an obligation to exemplify the highest standards of professional conduct in this regard and to promote an understanding of this principle to their colleagues, to students, and the community at large.
C. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND STUDENTS
   1. By accepting an academic course of study within the College system, students accept the principle that they will study in an environment that is designed to present the fullest range of academic insight in the subjects they are enrolled in, including contemporary and historical perspectives, and open, thoughtful examination of differing points of view in pursuit of knowledge within general and specific fields of study.
   2. Academic freedom allows students to take reasoned exception to the concepts and conclusions presented in any course of study. Students are, however, responsible for learning the content of any course in which they are enrolled, and can expect to be tested on their knowledge of such information.

D. DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES AND SUPPORT
   1. The District is committed to the full support of the principle of academic freedom within all its activities.
   2. The District supports the freedom of all faculty to inquire, to teach controversial content, to model and encourage critical thinking, and to present all viewpoints within each discipline.
   3. The District supports the freedom of all students to inquire, to have access to the full range of information available, to explore difficult and controversial material, to develop and practice critical thinking skills, and to operate in a classroom climate free of intimidation and conducive to the free exchange of ideas is fully encouraged and expected.
   4. Under the provisions of the California Education Code, the faculty have the right and the professional responsibility to assign grades. The District recognizes its obligation to ensure that faculty members will be allowed to exercise these responsibilities free from political influence, intimidation, or threat of lawsuit.

E. ROLE OF ACADEMIC SENATE
   1. The Academic Senate shall establish a Committee on Academic Freedom to provide clarification and advice on matters relating to academic freedom.

See Administrative Procedure [AP 4030]
Approved xxx
DRAFT of Proposed Revisions

AP 614 4030  ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Reference:  Education Code section 76120; Title 5 section 51023; Accreditation Standard IIA.7

Any college committee, District official, faculty member, student, or community member may ask the Senate to convene the Academic Freedom Committee to provide an interpretation, clarification, or opinion on an issue of Academic Freedom.

A. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Once the Senate receives a request, it will convene an ad hoc committee on Academic Freedom. If several requests address the same or similar issues, the Senate reserves the right to have the committee combine all similar requests and issues into one unified interpretation or opinion.

B. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

1. The committee shall consist of:
   a. At least three faculty appointed by the Senate, one of whom will be designated as Chair;
   b. A student appointed by the Associated Student Government;
   c. An Educational Administrator appointed by the Chancellor; and
   d. The Senate may also choose to appoint individuals with specialize training or expertise to serve as ex officio (non-voting advisors).

2. As far as is possible, the Senate will strive to ensure that the faculty representatives include full time and adjunct faculty.

   1. When there is a question involving a particular academic discipline, at least one faculty member will be from the same or a closely related discipline, and at least one faculty member will be from a different discipline.

   2. No Committee member shall have an immediate interest in the issue(s) being discussed.

C. COMMITTEE OPERATION

1. As much as possible, the committee shall operate in an open, collegial manner. However, the committee will have the right to establish guidelines to govern committee meetings and operations.

2. The committee will work with Human Resources, and other appropriate departments, to ensure that privacy, FERPA, and other related rights are respected for all parties.

D. COMMITTEE REPORT

1. The committee will provide an initial report with its interpretations, clarifications, opinions, findings, and/or recommendations to the full Senate, as well as the parties requesting the report, subject to any restrictions required by FERPA and other privacy rules and regulations.

2. The report is conditional until it is accepted by the full Senate. The Senate may also ask the committee to review portions of the report to provide for additional clarification.

3. In addition, the Committee will provide a summary of its operating guidelines, with suggestions for future committees.

E. APPLICABILITY OF THE REPORT

Interpretations and opinions of this Committee are non-binding on the parties involved. However, it is to be understood by all parties that the final report is the studied interpretation, opinion, recommendations and findings of the Academic Senate. As such it should be should be given due weight and consideration by the parties requesting the report.
F. WHO MAY REQUEST AN ACADEMIC FREEDOM REPORT
Any individual making a request must specify whether the request is being made as an individual, or as an authorized representative of a committee or other group.

Approved xxx
1. Approval of Minutes from Nov 21, 2012
2. Updates:
   a. Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c: Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes
   b. Share information with CPT committee – 5 minute Student Learning Report
   c. Pilot group for CurricUNET
   d. Faculty Manual
   e. How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient? – see attached list with edits.

3. Unfinished Business:
   a. ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions
   b. Use of Blackboard for document storage

4. Open forum
Nicole - Administration of Justice
Paul - Art
Rebecca - Auto Technology
Anne - Computer Networking
OPEN - Construction Technology
Rebecca - Culinary Arts
Paul - Dance
Rebecca - Engineering
Jia Yi - English as a Second Language
Anne - Electronic Systems Technology
Tammy - Geology
Tammy - Geography
Paul - Graphic and Multimedia Design
Rachael - History
Paul - Interior Design
Rebecca - Math
Paul - Media Entertainment Arts
Ann - Manufacturing Technology
Nicole - Modern Languages
Paul - Music
Paul, Nicole, Rebecca - Non-Credit
Jia Yi - Philosophy
Anne - Photography
Rebecca - Physical Science
Rebecca - Physics
Nicole - Physical Education/Kinesiology
Anne - Political Science
Anne - Psychology
Leslie - Sign Language
OPEN - Surveying
OPEN - Water
SLO Committee Minutes
December 5, 2012
MENH-342, 1:30-2:30 pm


1. Approval of Minutes from November 21, 2012: Rebecca Eikey will make the following changes to the electronic document:
   - Daylene Meuschke requested adding Bob Maxwell’s name to the document
   - Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine requested adding her name as confirmed for Program Review

2. Updates:
   a. Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c: Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes
      - Paul Wickline stated the Accreditation Standard IIIa1c is an issue of discussion with the Academic Senate
      - The committee was reminded that, while many colleges have been addressing this, COC has not yet addressed this point.
      - Nicole Faudree added that Paul, Nicole, Vince, and Adele met regarding passing a resolution in Spring 2013.
      - Paul Wickline pointed out the SLO Guiding Principle for SLO Assessment #10, paragraph 4 (page 24 of handbook), includes a significant passage as an overriding argument against the use of SLOs as a basis for faculty evaluations.
      - The SLO Committee will propose that the Senate come to a joint resolution with COCFA to address Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c.
      - Nicole Faudree added it should be clear that SLOs should not be part of faculty evaluations. SLOs should be there to evaluate faculty learning.
      - Paul Wickline suggested the committee should define what this means for faculty.
      - Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine recommended faculty consider self-evaluation as a process for determining how the SLO process guides teaching and pedagogy.
      - Paul Wickline noted “as a component” of evaluation does not specifically mean it is part of the faculty evaluation.
      - Anne raised a question and concern: Part timers are not involved in how many passed or failed—the process is different for part-timers just doing assessment. Would like to consider how “degree of involvement” is worded or phrased. Nicole thinks most faculty will take this seriously.

   b. Share information with CPT committee – 5 minute Student Learning Report
      - Paul Wickline suggested providing regular 5-minute student learning reports on results at each meeting for any level (course, program, institution) and stated it is important to emphasize and show how to effectively report results to CPT.
      - Rebecca Eikey noted a report will go out to the CPT in spring 2013 providing the reorganization of the committee. Nicole added the committee needs more people to come represent the SLO Committee to CPT. Daylene stated the meetings are held on Mondays, but the meeting times can vary.

   c. Pilot group for CurricUNET
Paul Wickline provided information about recent updates to CurricUNET for the pilot group. One question added is the following: “Please describe the specific involvement of the faculty in the planning of the assessment (full time or part time).” The committee needs to decide if names should be listed or if responses should just include a broad statement.

Paul noted there is no place to upload documents and there is no storage house for documents.

“Means of Assessment” box: This can have specific wording added (e.g., Portfolio).

As part of the pilot test, Paul emphasized the committee needs to put a cap on this and start on Wednesday.

“Criteria for Success”: Examples could be provided, but Paul doesn’t want it to be overwhelming.

Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine requested clarification for reporting the “percentage of students expected to pass”: Does this mean “I was hoping 90%” of students will pass? Rebecca Eikey confirmed, yes, that is correct; this is just the planning phase.

“Means of Assessment: Results” section = no changes.

“Means of Assessment: Analysis of Results” section = the text box was changed and clarified. Paul suggested there should be a text box under “Other.”

Paul noted Analysis section is not planning. Please identify involvement of the faculty.

“Trends” was removed—something needs to be written in.

“Identification of Gaps” causes some confusion—we should be able to pull this out for a report.

“Identification of Trends”: This is program level (not course level). Paul suggested putting “Trends” in program level of the assessment.

“Action Plan” – need to get away from “no changes needed / recommended.” Added statement “outline the timeline for the implementation of the Action Plan” to show there is a plan to address the SLOs.

The next step is a “Reflection on the Action Plan” addressing whether or not there were improvements made, and this will close the loop.

Nicole reminded the group to follow Barry Gribbon’s advice never to tell CurricUNET you are through with SLO process.

Rebecca Eikey suggested the committee needs to mentor the department chairs, there needs to be a department chair elect, an interim department chair, and release time for both.

Paul discussed “Create a New Assessment” at the program level. This is the same as the course level. The question was raised whether or not the phrasing in “Mapping” should be changed, but Paul recommended keeping the wording as it is written. After some discussion, it was agreed to keep the wording and see evaluate what the feedback tells us in the pilot.

Paul stated he can make changes to the “Action Plan” screens, but felt the committee should move forward on this. It was noted this can also be produced in an Excel worksheet. Jia-Yi noted this is helpful information to pass on to future department chairs.

d. Faculty Manual

• No updates or news to report. To be done in Spring 2013.
• Need to add examples (e.g., Pitfalls).

e. How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient? –see attached list with edits.

• Rebecca Eikey provided “Sustaining Proficiency—Don’t Fall into the Pit!” handout to committee members to forward to department faculty.
• Rebecca Eikey sent email to faculty letting them know the SLO committee will be reaching out to departments needing support with their course and/or program SLOs.
• Ann, Rebecca, and Paul found faculty to be receptive and that most people were not aware of the items needing clarification. Leslie waiting to hear back from faculty.
• Rebecca Eikey made the recommendation to focus on listening to faculty to identify department needs in order to facilitate in helping the faculty improve SLOs.

3. Unfinished Business:
   a. ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions
   b. Use of Blackboard for document storage

4. Open forum

Meeting adjourned at 2:30p.m.
Nicole-Administration of Justice  
Paul-Art  
Rebecca-Auto Technology  
Anne-Computer Networking  
OPEN-Construction Technology  
Rebecca-Culinary Arts  
Paul-Dance  
Rebecca-Engineering  
Jia Yi -English as a Second Language  
Anne-Electronic Systems Technology  
Tammy-Geology  
Tammy-Geography  
Paul-Graphic and Multimedia Design  
Rachael-History  
Paul-Interior Design  
Rebecca-Math  
Paul-Media Entertainment Arts  
Ann-Manufacturing Technology  
Nicole-Modern Languages  
Paul-Music  
Paul, Nicole, Rebecca-Non-Credit  
Jia Yi -Philosophy  
Anne-Photography  
Rebecca -Physical Science  
Rebecca - Physics  
Nicole-Physical Education/Kinesiology  
Anne-Political Science  
Anne-Psychology  
Leslie-Sign Language  
OPEN-Surveying  
OPEN-Water
Attendees:
Rebecca Eikey, Nicole Faudree, Barry Gibbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Ann Lowe, Jia-Yi Chang-Levine, Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline

Update on department chair retreat. SLO coordinators provided list of courses and programs missing assessment to chairs as well as “Don’t Fall into the Pit” handout. SLO coordinators reminded department chairs to put information in the SLO tables if they have not been able to offer the course due to new creation date or lack of sections due to budget situation, etc.

Barry raised question about merging of CurricUNET and DATATEL information. Discussion about need to do so because it is a laborious process. Daylene clarified that we did not upload courses for faculty from Datatel to SLO tables. This was an option, but faculty did not request this.

Daylene raised issues with faculty and lack of uniformity in the way courses are entered into the SLO tables. However, this shouldn’t be an issue once CurricUNET Assessment Module is online.

SLO coordinators indicated that SLO tables in Program Review will no longer be used by Fall 2014. Pilot testing is occurring this semester (Fall 2013) and will continue next year with volunteer departments. By Fall 2014, SLO tables should no longer be available.

Question raised about how information will be placed into SLO tables to refer Daylene to CurricUNET Assessment Module. Statement made to include standard language to notify Daylene that information is in module. Pilot testers will be notified of this.

Paul provided brief update on CurricUNET/Governet work. Meeting held earlier on this date and regular meetings will be held every 2 weeks. Bugs encountered which Governet is working on.

Discussion held of accuracy of the list Daylene provided of courses without assessment. Ann noted that new courses that haven’t actually been made ACTIVE were picked up in Daylene’s report. Seems information is coming from either CurricUNET or MIS. Daylene will look into and report. Concerns about accuracy of the report. Issues noted with SOLAR and PLUMBING. Suggestion made that we need “last time offered” available for Daylene to note when pulling information for report. Daylene indicated we will add this.

Barry asked if every active course is currently in CurricUNET. Ann wasn’t certain, noting a Nursing course that wasn’t showing up. Need to check with Patrick on this problem to see if other issues exist. Barry suggested reconciliation of this. Need to make certain every course in Datatel is in Curricunet with the same mnemonic.

Rebecca noted that this process of looking through list has been very useful to identify and resolve issues.
Jennifer noted that some faculty are using an Administrative Program Review and aren’t certain where to indicate COURSE SLO data. Daylene suggested they place them in the AUO box and then add a NOTE indicating these are SLO results.

Barry asked if they shouldn’t be doing an ACADEMIC P.R. instead.

Rebecca asked about the lack of a program review or assessment of the Liberal Studies degree. This is an ongoing issue. She mentioned that she discussed this with Omar at the division meeting. Divisions might take ownership of these programs in their division Administrative Program Review? Jennifer noted that Humanities courses have also not been completed.

Barry noted that if there is a course it should be in the ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW. If NOT, complete an ADMINISTRATIVE program review. If there is a course, should be noted in the ACADEMIC program review due to success/retention rates, etc. It was noted that this should be a discussion at future PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE meetings. Paul will place on agenda for the March 22nd meeting.

Question raised about degrees without assessment occurring.

DSPS, GEN STU, LEARNING RESOURCES, LIBRARY, TLC are all areas with courses but might be completing the administrative program review. Need to follow up and look into this.

Rhonda noted that Health 100 is another question. Homeless. Does it live in Health Science program review of PE? Health won’t take it. Needs to live in PE/Kinesiology.

Ann raised question about new courses coming from programs that have not assessed current courses. This is a cause for concern since these programs aren’t meeting needs of current courses and programs through proper assessment of SLOs and demonstration of needs based on SLO results. Should restrictions be placed on these departments requiring them to reach proficiency before adding new courses? Curriculum committee is impacted by this. Issues should be addressed.

Question asked, does Curriculum Committee need to include this on the form for requesting new courses: Proof that current courses have been assessed? Note made to include this as a discussion item on agenda for next SLO meeting and to include it as a discussion item at future Curriculum committee meeting.

Question raised about concern of developing new programs without consideration of the consequences and impact on available resources, budget, etc.

Daylene asked about “ongoing assessment.” Paul reminded that ACCJC does not CURRENTLY indicate a requirement for how often assessment must occur. SLO coordinators recommend at least every 2 years. Curriculum would likely need to monitor this during the 5 year revision process.

Rebecca reminded the SLO committee that they should receive FLEX credit for giving SLO training.

Update on the list of departments SLO committee members are working with. Everyone has reached out to all those on the list, often through repeated contacts or individualized training.
Rebecca will be meeting with Culinary arts next week.

Recommendation made to NOT mark anyone off the list and to wait and see what the results are after Daylene pulls information.

Jennifer suggested that the SLO committee members looking at SLO results provide email feedback to deans with the guidance provided to departments.

Note made that the committee should look at PROGRAM REVIEWS after April 15th to see updates made/problems encountered, etc.

Barry would like to reopen Program Review quickly, but early May. Contingent on what Program Review Committee provides in terms of changes.

Proposal made to expand CurricUNET Assessment Module testing fall 2013.

Reminder made that we need to pursue MY CANYONS SLO collection. Reminder made to check ACADEMIC SENATE meeting minutes and Survey results to identify interest.

Review of additional items on workplan. Faculty manual needs updating. Table for next meeting. Note made that we still have 2 faculty who have not received SLO manual.

Need to add appendices to SLO MANUAL with ISLO and SLO resources. Rubric examples from COMS, THEATRE, ENGLISH, etc. should be placed in the manual. Add the PITFALLS document. Add TRAINING SESSIONS PPT’s into the document in appendices.

Suggestion made that someone might take the SLO MANUAL as an independent flex activity.

Note made that we need to identify who is and isn’t on the committee. May need outreach. Do we have reps from every division? (NOTE – we DO NOT have representation from LEARNING RESOURCES)

How do we get additional faculty involved in SLO COMMITTEE? Reaching out individually seems to be consensus.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.
SLO COMMITTEE MINUTES
4-10-13

Attendees: Necia Gelker, Daylene Meuschke, Nicole Faudree, Anne Marenco, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Jennifer Brezina, Rebecca Eikey, Tammy Bathke

Minutes of 3-27-13 meeting: reviewed and amended for accuracy. They were approved as amended.

Updates
1st agenda item:
A. How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient?
   i. See attached list with edits
   ii. Time to update status of each – April 15 Program Review opens up to edits

Rebecca asked Daylene for update on report she just sent out to ACCJC. Daylene reported approximately 95% of courses have evidence of ongoing assessment. Program SLOs have shown increase as well. Significant growth over past 1-2 years in both course and program assessment. Nicole recalls it is 83%. Marked improvement indicates hard work of SLO Committee.

List update: Question raised by Anne Marenco about receiving an updated list of departments needing assistance/improvement on program review data. There is an edited list of depts. needing assistance. Daylene reported that there are programs from the Year 2 update that still need evidence of ongoing assessment. Goal to gauge which programs still need help. Two lists exist. One developed by Paul and Nicole last year indicating need for improvement on SLO tables. Other list developed by Daylene’s office. Discussion ensued about the overlap between these 2 lists and the need for updated lists.

Action: Rebecca requested that the people who have been working with their assigned departments who were deficient, per list on Agenda, could look at the departments again to see if the suggested improvements were made. If improvements made, department names could be removed from list. At next meeting individuals are to report back on their findings. Example of classes that need help: Physical Ed, LM Tech, MEA, noncredit-Diane Stewart completes this.

Discussion about “orphan” programs/courses without ongoing assessments. Decision needed about which Division these to be housed in. Concern about who will follow up on these courses. J. Brezina suggested going to Academic Senate and suggesting that eliminating the system of orphaned classes and always assigning courses /programs to a given dept.
Action: Rebecca to ask Edel to put Orphan Courses/Program on Senate agenda as a Discussion Item.

Action: List needed of “orphan” courses and programs. Daylene to obtain this list for us. Ex: plumbing, General studies currently in DSP&S, Humanities 101. Anne brought up an example of a class she will teach soon, Interdisc 1A, which is only to be taught once. Another dilemma brought up about depts. without a FT employee.

Action: Daylene to provide a list of depts. without a FT employee.

Question raised about stand-alone courses and interdisciplinary degrees: who does their program review? Action: Nicole to put this topic on the Program Review committee agenda. Ex: Patty Robinson does the one for SHARP.

2nd agenda item:

B. Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c: Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes

   i) Resolution to be presented at Academic Senate for discussion – reference to attached updated draft

Discussion about rewording the resolution. Concern about use of SLOs as part of faculty evaluation. This committee prefers to use it as a self-reflective process and not to be used in a punitive manner, more as a positive.

Action: Edits made and noted, attached at end of minutes.

3rd agenda item:

C. New Business

   i. Options to assess Program level SLOs besides mapping and capstone methods. What other way is there to do assessment?

How can we help faculty on the problem list to do program level assessment? We have offered 2 methods: mapping and capstone. What other ways are there to do program level assessment?

Nicole stated she would have to double check but believes History does direct assessments. They identify certain questions in certain courses that map only to their program and they assess these. Barry stated there are no mechanisms we are using now but went on to describe some things other depts. do. Ex: powerful data provided by some
programs such as Nursing using NCLEX as capstone and surveys from employers rating graduates skills. Employment and wage data is also useful outcome data for occupational areas, which we don’t use very much now but plan to do more soon.

Problem is that some students who qualify for a degree or certificate are not applying for it. Barry stated we will begin notifying them to apply for this more systematically.

Jennifer Brezina stated what the English department has done in the past is to ask A&R for a list of students who are graduating in the upcoming semester and this list would go to the literature courses with those students in their classes. A list of 100’s of students gets boiled down to about 20 students and SLOs assessed on these students. Ex: Math and English do not have a capstone. Difficulty: how is program SLO measured?

Anne Marenco described their method of getting 2 lists from MIS. One lists everyone who has declared sociology as a major. Then instructors are asked if these students can pass the given SLOs, second list is the graduating students and then the faculty are asked if these students can meet a given SLO.

Transfer success: CSU has resistance to this process, Cal pass Plus. Hope to reopen this.

Problem: many students take a few classes and never graduate.

ii. Do students have to file for their certificates? Yes
DRAFT

COC Academic Senate Resolution on Student Learning Outcomes

WHEREAS, College of the Canyons has focused its instruction and assessment on course SLOs, course objectives and criteria for measurement of learning,

WHEREAS, our goal is to work in partnership with our students as they develop the skills necessary for success first in our courses, and then, for honing these skills as they transfer to other colleges, programs, and/or the workplace as successful lifelong learners,

WHEREAS, at College of the Canyons, assessment of SLOs shall be used to analyze, and thereby improve, student learning through informed decision making and planning,

WHEREAS, assessment results should be used for and limited to the following roles in the institution:

1. To improve services, feedback, guidance, and mentoring to students in order to help them better plan and execute their educational programs

2. To help design and improve programs and courses to better promote student learning and success

3. To identify shared definitions and measurable benchmarks for evaluating student abilities to more coherently and effectively promote student learning.

RESOLVED, that the College of the Canyons Academic Senate and COCFA assert that student learning outcomes and data related thereto should be used in a non-punitive manner in individual faculty evaluations to ensure the integrity of the SLO process;

RESOLVED, that the College of the Canyons Academic Senate and COCFA discourage the use of student learning outcomes in any manner that would undermine either local bargaining authority or the academic freedom or privacy of students or individual faculty members.

4-10-2013
Attendees: Tammy Bathke, Jennifer Brezina, Rebecca Eikey, Nicole Faudree, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Rebecca Kroll, Ann Lowe, Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline

I. Minutes of the 4-10-13 meeting reviewed, amended, and approved for accuracy. One correction made to first paragraph: “Significant growth over past 1-2 years in both course and program assessment is 83%.”

II. Updates and reports of findings for each committee member’s assigned departments:

A. Anne Marenco forwarded message that her departments made improvements and are able to be removed from the list.
B. Rebecca Eikey reported Culinary Arts and Auto Tech are good. Geology, Math, and Engineering are in process.
C. Nicole Faudree reported all of her departments can be removed from the list except Administration of Justice and P.E. Nicole will also reach out to Administration of Justice and make suggestions for making data visible.
D. Jennifer Brezina reported Claudia fixed tables, Philosophy is making progress, and none are copying and pasting anymore. Jennifer deferred to the committee to decide if her departments should be removed from the list.
E. Paul Wickline suggested keeping the following departments on the list: Dance, Art, and M.E.A. Paul reported the following departments can be removed from the list: Graphic & Multimedia, Music, and Interior Design.
F. Tammy Bathke reported Physics can be removed from the list.

Action: Rebecca Eikey recommended postponing Non-Credit for discussion at a later date.

Discussion: During the review of the department list, Nicole Faudree raised the question regarding how much help the SLO committee should offer to a department when it is functioning and it will move onto CurricUNET (completed cycle). We can give recommendations, but how much should we give?

III. Orphan Lists: Rebecca Eikey reported going to the Senate tomorrow and needs to see if a procedure can be put into place to categorize orphan courses. Jennifer Brezina stated we do have a program discontinuance process put in place by Academic Senate. The committee brought up several issues needing clarification:

A. Is there a misclassification of classifying Landscape as Horticulture? (Ann Lowe, Nicole)
B. Are there adequate labor market data to see if there a need for the Horticulture program? (Barry)
C. Who should perform review? Faculty, Dean? (Barry, Jennifer, Ann Lowe)
D. Can you assess SLO content without being a subject matter expert and are we including part-time faculty? How do we address content expertise and management analysis? (Ann Lowe, Jennifer)
E. Should we consider a policy when a program is under 18 units? (Ann Lowe)
F. If a course or program hasn’t been assessed and revised in a number of years, and the loop closed, should we implement a policy that the course or program will be archived? (Barry, Ann Lowe)

**Action:** Rebecca Eikey stated this will be an ongoing discussion. Ann Lowe stated she will move this forward and will talk about procedures at the upcoming retreat.

**IV:** SLO Newsletter needs updates. **Action:** Suggestions for updates include the following:

A. Data and statistics updates (e.g., ACCJC report from March and CurricUNET assessment module update) (Daylene)
B. Best Practices statement (Paul)
C. Proficiency Rubric – SQCI (Paul)

**V.** Updates needed for SLO Faculty Manual.
Add to the Appendix
Addendums to “Don’t Fall into the Pit” handout (Paul)

**Action:** Paul suggested pulling pieces together for next meeting of what we can offer to each section of the manual. Faculty signed up for the following sections:

Introduction .................................................................(Nicole)
Developing Student Learning Outcomes .............................2 (Nicole/Ann)
Assessing Student Learning Outcomes ...............................3 (Tammy)
Developing Assessment Plans for Courses .........................4 (Barry)
Developing Assessment Plans for Department-Level Programs ...6 (Barry)
Developing and Assessing SLOs for Institutional-Level Programs........8 (tbd)
Scheduling Assessments ..................................................9 (Ann)
Collecting/Analyzing Data and Fostering Dialogue ................10 (Paul)
Documenting Progress ...................................................12 (Barry)
Glossary (from ASCCC) ..................................................13

**Appendices:**
Appendix A: *Map: Interactions of Courses and Programs* ..............19 (no updates)
Appendix B: *SLO Rubric from ACCJC* ................................21 (Nicole)
Appendix C: *Choosing an Assessment Tool* ..........................22 (Barry)
Appendix D: *Assessment Plan form* ....................................23 (Paul/Rebecca)
*Sample Assessment Plan* ..............................................23 (Paul/Rebecca)
Appendix E: *Developing a Rubric* ......................................24 (Paul/Nicole)
Appendix F: *Non-instructional Program Assessment* .................26 (Barry/Daylene)
Appendix G: *Bloom’s Taxonomy/Critical Thinking Verbs* ............35 (Barry)
Appendix H: *Program Assessment* ......................................37 (Rebecca)
Appendix I: *Associate Degree Requirements (2009-2010)* ..........40 (Rhonda)
Appendix J: *Assessment Schedule Form* ............................42 (Paul)
*Sample Assessment Schedule* .........................................43

**Action:** For Appendix E, if anyone has sample rubrics, Paul requested sending samples electronically.
I. Review and Approve Minutes from February 12th
Minutes were passed out and reviewed by those in attendance. Revisions were made, motion to approve minutes to be posted to the S4S website; Jose Martin, second Jennifer Brezina, approved.

II. Research
Daylene Meuschke and Catherine Parker gave a presentation on 4 different research reports that have been completed. The reports will be available on the intranet and S4S website and the PowerPoint presentation will also be available on the S4S website.

-Non Credit ESL Profile. This report profiles enrollment patterns starting in summer 2005 to fall 2008. Data includes: How many times do students take a noncredit ESL level before progressing to a higher level, what is the average number of hours students spend in a level before progressing to a higher level, what is the progression rate from noncredit to credit ESL, How many students attend fewer than ten hours and stop out, how many students start at a higher level then enroll in a lower level, how many students take noncredit ESL classes in the level in which they placed, what are the demographics for the noncredit ESL population (age, gender, ethnicity, and zip code).

-English 071 and 071L Success Comparison. This report addresses the success rate in English-071 for students who enrolled in and passed English-071L compared to students who did not pass English-071L and those who did not enroll in English-071L in Fall 2008. This report also shows data on English overall success rates and by ethnicity for English 071, 081, 091, 094, and 101.

-English Success Rates by Faculty Type. This report shows the data for success rates of students enrolled in English courses with adjunct instructors and full time instructors. The courses sampled were English 071, 081, 091, and 101.

-English Progression Analysis. This report shows data for the progression rates for students who enrolled in English-071 in fall 2004, 2005 and 2006. The courses sampled were English 071, 081, and 091/094. This reports also shows the progression rates for students who started in English-071, 081 and 091/094 in fall 2006 by ethnicity.
Other reports coming soon include: Action Implications for the reports that were presented above, the effectiveness of The Zone, math placement for high school graduates from outside the district, and Identifying courses which may benefit from a supplemental course by analyzing retention/success rates.

III. Group Reports
   **Curriculum**- Collette Gibson reported that ESL has made progress coordinating ESL with non credit ESL. Applied math is trying to create problem sets from other disciplines. Math is focusing on offering applied sections of math 60 in fall 2009. Kathy Kubo, George Ryhs and Collette are working on the applied math side.
   **Supplemental Instruction**- Collette Gibson is offering some workshops for Math 70 as of right now that are tied to sections in the book prior to exams. Jose Martin and Mary Petersen will co-chair the supplemental instruction work group.
   **Technology/Open Computer Lab**- Jennifer Brezina reported that their group has met a couple times since last meeting and are close to submitting a funding proposal. The computer lab will be called the Skills4Success Center. This will not be piloted this semester but rather in fall 2009. They are also coming up with a marketing campaign for students.
   **Budget Deadlines**- Denee Pescarmona and Audrey Green held a workshop on March 20th on how to apply for Basic Skills funding. End of spring and summer 2009 proposals will be accepted March 20 - April 15. The proposals will be reviewed by the funding committee; proposals will be blinded when reviewed by the committee. The committee will use the rubric to score the proposals and will let those who submitted proposals know by May 1st if accepted or not. Proposals for fall 2009 projects will be accepted May 1 – 20 and will notify those who submit proposals by the end of school year if proposals have been funded.

IV. Hewlett Leaders Update/Reminder
   Two members from the Hewlett Leaders in Student Success Program will be visiting us on April 2nd. Audrey Green will be putting together criteria on what they are looking for and how they will score us.

V. CalADE/NADE membership for campus
   Mary Petersen passed out information on CalADE. They have a website that links to meetings. Mary also spoke about the membership and the potential for the national conference being in California.

VI. Conference Report
   Denee Pescarmona attended the CCCC conference in San Francisco and the Innovations conference in Reno and gave a quick report on both of them.

VII. Summer Bridge
   Denee Pescarmona reported on the Summer Bridge program. This program will be piloted this summer and is limited 25 students.

VII. Next Meeting: April 23rd 1:30 – 3:00 in R-206
   There will not be a meeting on April 9th due to Spring Break.
I. Review and Approve Minutes from March 26th
Minutes were passed out and reviewed by those in attendance. Revisions were made, motion to approve minutes to be posted to the S4S website; Jose Martin, second Collette Gibson, approved.

II. Research
Daylene Meuschke and Catherine Parker spoke about what the research sub-committee has been working on. A handout was passed out for a report on the top 20 courses that have shown historically low success rates and that would benefit from supplemental instruction. The 20 courses that were identified with low success rates were from the Fall 2006, 2007 and 2008 semesters. Courses included in the analysis offered four or more sections, with the exception of ESL courses. ESL courses were included in the analysis at the request of the Skills4Success Supplemental Instructions sub-committee. This report included only on-ground courses and excluded courses in which only one semester of data was available. Two of the recommendations made in the report included inviting instructors who teach courses identified in the top 20 list of courses with historically low success rates to incorporate supplemental instruction into their course and also consider expanding supplemental instruction invitations to instructors teaching courses that are not identified in the top 20 list. A copy of the handout will be posted on the S4S website. The effectiveness of The Zone will be the next report the research sub-committee will be working on.

III. Hewlett Leaders Announcement
Denee Pescarmona let the group know that College of the Canyons was selected as one of the Hewlett Leaders in Student Success award winners. Denee thanked everyone that helped with the gathering of data and with the April 2nd site visit from the Hewlett Leaders visiting team. The official announcement will be made on May 8th in Sacramento; College of the Canyons will be one of three California Community Colleges to receive this recognition. Denee also let the group know that the Hewlett visiting team mentioned the positive attitude and enthusiasm of the faculty was a key factor for College of the Canyons being selected.

IV. Group Reports
Curriculum – The Curriculum group has not recently met. Collette Gibson let the group know that the Math department will be meeting with math faculty from the Hart District directly after this meeting. The English department will also be meeting with English faculty from the Hart District on May 13th. Jennifer Brezina also reported that ESL has a new course sequence in line for curriculum and that they are turning their focus to conversation and computers for ESL.

Supplemental Instruction – Jose Martin updated the group on the supplemental instruction sub-committee. A website is being built to inform faculty about the nuts and bolts of supplemental instruction. They are also in the process of collecting surveys from division meetings and getting in touch with departments to see if they want to do anything regarding supplemental instruction.
Technology – Jennifer Brezina let the group know they have officially submitted a Skills4Success Center computer lab proposal and are waiting to get official word if it has been accepted.

Budget Committee – Denee Pescarmona let the group know the budget/funding sub-committee received 17 funding proposals, and they are currently being reviewed by the members of the sub-committee. Once the sub-committee has completed reviewing the proposals, the approved proposals will be forwarded to Dr. Capet for final approval. The next deadline for submitting funding proposals will be May 20th. Denee also let the group know that the 2009-2010 BSI Action Plan will be due earlier this year, most likely in mid September. Susan Crowther also added that the rubric used for scoring the proposals should be updated now that we have gone through the process once.

Professional Development – The Professional Development sub-committee will be meeting this upcoming Monday. Russell Richardson and Denee are currently working on a mission statement and learning outcomes for the certificate program. Currently there are 2 Skills4Success FLEX workshops, if there are any additional ideas for a FLEX workshop please email Denee and let her know.

V. CMC^3 Conference Report
Collette Gibson attended the CMC^3 (California Mathematics Council Community Colleges) conference which was paid for with Basic Skills funds. Collette updated the group on what was discussed at the conference and how the Math Department at College of the Canyons can use what was learned at the conference.

VI. Upcoming Conferences
- SBCC Colloquium, April 24th. A team of 6 from College of the Canyons will be attending the SBCC Building Student Success Colloquium. SBCC was a 2008 recipient of the Hewlett Leaders in Student Success award.
- Basic Skills Regional Meeting, May 7th - 8th L.A. Mission College. Currently this Regional Meeting is full but Denee is trying to secure some extra spots for College of the Canyons representatives. Denee should know within a couple of days if we can get anyone in and then a team will be put together to attend.
- Basic Skills Boot Camp, May 29th - 31st Chaffey College. A team of three from College of the Canyons will be attending the Basic Skills Boot Camp at the end of May.
- Reading Institute, August 3rd - 5th Santa Ana College. We have received approval to send two faculty members from College of the Canyons to the Reading Institute put on by WestEd. The two faculty members that attend the reading institute can pass on the information to the Skills4Success committee as well as other college faculty and staff.

VII. Upcoming Presentations
- Dr. Lynn Wright - Creating a Culture of Inquiry: How to Start Faculty Inquiry Groups on Campus. This presentation is part of the S4S Wednesday Workshop series and will take place in Hasley Hall 232 on April 29th from 2:30 – 4:00.
- PLATO & SkillsTutor Software Demonstrations. Representatives from PLATO and SkillsTutor will be on campus Thursday April 30th giving demonstrations of their products. The demonstrations will take place in PDR #2 from 2:00 – 3:30.
- Dr. Kathleen Gabriel - Teaching Unprepared Students. This will also be a part of the S4S Wednesday Workshops. Dr. Gabriel will be discussing her book on teaching unprepared students and how to improve student success. Copies of her book will be made available to those who wish to attend.

VIII. Next Meeting: May 14th, 2009 1:30 – 3:00 in R-206
Attendees: Myriam Altounji (Non-Credit), Leslie Bretall (Library), Jennifer Brezina (English), Michael Dermody (Field Studies), Vincent Devlahovich (Geography/Geology), Ron Dreiling (English), Collette Gibson (Math), Audrey Green (Academic Affairs), Lee Hilliard (Computer Networking), Garrett Hooper (Counseling), Adam Kempler (English), Susan Ling (DSP&S), John Makevich (Dist. Learning), Daylene Meuschke (Institutional Research), Catherine Parker (Research), Denee Pescarmona (English), Mary Petersen (English), Tracey Sherard (English)

I. Approval of February Minutes and Budget Review
- Minutes were passed out and reviewed by those in attendance. Motion to approve minutes to be posted to the S4S website made by Daylene Meuschke and second by Catherine Parker, approved.
- Denee Pescarmona passed out a tentative budget for the 2011/2012 Academic Year, PLATO costs may be covered by Non-Credit, an augmentation for this has been submitted.

II. Field Studies, Michael Dermody
Michael spoke about the Field Studies program and how they could possibly help out with the Skills4Success initiative. The Field Studies program started about 4 years ago, students spend a weekend in the San Bernardino Mountains, live together, eat together, and attend classes. The cost to the student is about $48 for meals and the cost of transportation is also covered by the student. The Field Studies program has seemed to have a big impact on the students attitude toward college and to their fellow students.

III. Subcommittee Reports
-FYE: Denee reported that the FYE subcommittee has met twice and will be going to high schools starting on April 18th for information sessions. Cougar Days will be held immediately after graduation this year during the week of June 6th. Orientation sessions will be held in the middle of July will which include a campus tour, new student advisement, and registering for 12 units as opposed to 6 from last year. Call for volunteers coming out shortly. Jeff Baker and the Animation club will be producing a 30 second marketing video. We will also be promoting the Honors program this year for students who don’t qualify for the FYE program workshops. Math SI attendance has been increasing and are starting to run out of room.
-SCV Learning Consortium: Catherine gave a presentation on the Math and English Learning Consortium.
-Professional Development: Denee reported that Brandy has sent out an update to the Professional Development group, big things include planning the next Symposium and On-Course type training. Teaching Skills certificate coming through as well, very excited about this. Audrey mentioned the April 15th CORD workshop on contextual teaching.
-Non Credit to Credit Transition: Myriam Altounji reported that the subcommittee had a meeting last week with the GED instructors, went over PLATO. Audrey commended the group for the great job they have doing on helping students in the high level of ESL to transition into credit curriculum.

IV. Research Update
Daylene updated the group on the following project the Research Subcommittee is working on.

-FYE: Track success and persistence compared to other first-time freshmen who placed into at least one basic skills course. Track contact hours with faculty mentor, TLC, S.I., and GLAs.

-Supplemental Learning: Analysis of success and persistence rates compared to other students in the same courses who do not attend S.L. or complete GLAs. We’ll be using the database to identify S.L. and GLA participants.

-Applied Math: Examine final exam scores from Math-060 sections in Spring 2010 (Applied vs. Traditional), still waiting on 4 sections. Administered pre & post surveys to assess math self-efficacy for students in Math-60 Applied and Traditional, semester-length sections in Fall 2010. This study is using a Solomon four and three-group quasi-experimental design with experimental and comparison groups. This design allows us to control for the effect of the pre-survey, prior differences and maturation.

IA4Stat Class: Evaluation plan has been identified and will include rerunning the progression analyses done by Cal-PASS this year to include showing all students who attempted a course and those who passed and tracking their progression; Success for IA4Stats students will be disaggregated by their placement levels and tracked to see how many complete Math-140 within 1 year and 2 years; Tracking will be done through Spring 2013.


V. ARCC Update
Denee and Daylene gave an update regarding the ARCC data. Due to an error in the TOP codes for these courses the improvement rates showed zero for English as well as a significant drop in the Math cohort size. The TOP codes have been corrected and have been submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office. Prior to the change in the TOP codes, only MATH-059 and ESL data was being captured.

VI. Update on Acceleration
Denee introduced John Makevich, Director of Distance and Accelerated Learning. John will be joining the Skills4Success committee and helping out with acceleration and the Pal program.

VII. Web Committee Sign Ups
Denee will be sending out an email for Web Committee volunteers.

VIII. Upcoming Conferences
-Acceleration and Context: April 1st, Chaffey College.
-3CSN Foothills Inland Empire Regional Acceleration Workshop: April 29th, Citrus College

IX. New Business/Other Discussion
A Screening of “Race to Nowhere” will be held on April 28th in Hasley Hall 101.

X. Next Meeting
Thursday May 26th, 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm. R-206
Attendees: Patrick Backes (Academic Affairs), Ebony Coburn (Distance Learning), Cynthia Dorroh (Allied Health & Public Safety), Collette Gibson (Math), Audrey Green (Academic Affairs), Angela Grigoryan (Math), Lee Hilliard (Computer Networking/Electronic Systems), Garrett Hooper (Counseling), Ana Palmer (Math), Catherine Parker (Institutional Development), Dustin Silva (Math), Matt Teachout (Math)

I. Welcome, Approval of March and April 2013 Minutes
   -Garrett Hooper and Angela Grigoryan welcome everyone in attendance.
   -Motion to approve March and April 2013 minutes made by Collette Gibson, second by Ana Palmer, approved.

II. Overview of Skills4Success Website
   The Skills4Success website has been updated, some of the changes include:
   -Subcommittee Report Page. Subcommittee meeting minutes can now be input onto the webpage which will free up more time at the Skills4Success Committee meetings for activities and discussion. May 2013 subcommittee reports are attached.
   -The Supplemental Learning page has been improved to include a schedule at a glance, full calendar, and descriptions of workshop topics making it easier for students to navigate the page. Faculty will be able to access full curriculum for Supplemental Learning, this area will be password protected.
   -First Year Experience page has also been revised to break down the program and explain to students and parents exactly what the program is and the necessary steps needed to participate in the program. Also included on the FYE page is an important dates section, orientation information, and an Frequently Asked Questions page.
   -A Research page has been added and is currently under construction.

III. AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities) Roadmap Project
   -Audrey Green let the committee know that College of the Canyons has been selected to participate in the AAC&U Roadmap Project based on the proposal that was submitted regarding the redesign of the First Year Experience Program. College of the Canyons is the only California Community College that was selected to participate. A group from College of the Canyons will be attending the AAC&U High Impact Practices Institute in June.
   The Committee broke up into groups of three and was asked to discuss the following two questions to help the group prepare for the High Impact Practices Institute:

   1) what programs exist to help all students succeed academically and socially? To what extent are group differences addressed in the approaches of these programs.
   Answers to question #1 included The Learning Center (TLC), Associated Student Government (ASG), Supplemental Learning (SL), Personalized Accelerated Learning (PAL), Learning Communities, Body Mind Wellness (BMW), Health Center, Honors Program, Skills4Success Committee, and Career Center Workshops
2) What internal and external factors might enhance or impede the implementation, evolution, and sustainability of new programs and high-impact practices at College of the Canyons? How might Skills4Success leverage or address these factors to increase the likelihood of success and sustainability?

Answers to questions #2 included: Financial resources, human resources, resistance to change from faculty, student motivation, communication, decision making from students, lack of connection to adjunct faculty.

IV. New Business/Other Discussion
- Reminder that the Reading Apprenticeship program will be held on June 14th in University Center Room 258.

V. Next Meeting
Fall 2013 - date, time and location to be determined.
# Skills4success Subcommittee reports for May, 2013

## S4S Research Update – 5/23/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S4S Project</th>
<th>Research Plans for 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FYE | Upcoming:  
  - Fall 2012 semester survey: Report being edited  
  - 2010-11 cohort: How many degree/applicable/transfer level applicable units have been earned to date?  
    - All cohorts:  
      - Who persisted?  
      - How many have completed 30 and 48 units?  
      - How many have completed a degree and/or transcriptable certificate?  
      - How many have progressed to degree applicable/transfer level math and English?  
  - Drafting Orientation Days survey for 2013-14 cohort |
| S.L. | Success and retention analysis  
  - Editing Spring and Fall 2012 research briefs  
  - Need to discuss how frequently success and retention analyses should be conducted in the future. |
| Math-075 | The Research Office is coordinating research activities with the Community College Research Center and conducting success and progression analyses. |
| English-096 | The evaluation of the proposed accelerated English course will collect quantitative data related to needs being met through the pilot project. Specifically, the analyses planned will examine the degree to which the pilot course results in improved success in basic skills English and progression to and success in transfer level English compared to students who follow the traditional path of one course per semester. Information is intended to both assess the progress and outcomes of the pilot project as well as inform decisions to improve pedagogy for basic skills English curriculum and student learning. |
| Learning Consortiums | None |
| Other | Over the summer the Research Office will be conducting additional analyses using the Scorecard data to try to understand more about the cohorts. Specifically, one thing we’re trying to understand is why the persistence rate is lower for “prepared” students compared to students in the “unprepared” category. |
| Non-Credit to Credit Transition | Need to develop research plan.  
  - Need to analyze placement test data from locally developed test.  
    - Working with Debbie Rio on this analysis |
| Reminders | Fill in OneNote. Contact Catherine anytime for help with this.  
  - Capture documentation of anything that provides evidence of changes and student success as a result of your work (i.e. video documentation). |
During the summer and in 2013-2014 the Math Consortium hopes to create a math course(s) for the junior/senior year that is contextualized to CTE fields. This course(s) would then be offered at the high schools in the 2014-2015 school year. Currently some juniors are asking their math professors what type of non-AP math class they can take their senior year.

Pilot testing for the Smarter Balanced exams took place at Canyon High. Computerized testing was a challenge for the students. Some problems allowed students to use a pop-up scientific calculator or graphing calculator. The graphing calculator was used for a regression question. Some questions did not allow calculators. There were two portions to the math exam with the second portion requiring a lot of reading and having the students answer six questions based upon one table. Students needed to type paragraphs for answers on the second portion of the math test and type explanations for their answer in the first portion of the test. The students were tired as they took English tests one day and math tests the next day. Next academic year the piloting of Smart Balanced exams will expand throughout the high schools in the district. Eleventh graders will be tested on everything up through Algebra II/Trig. Tenth graders will be tested on Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry. In the future the Smarter Balanced exams will be given to 7th, 8th, and 11th grade students.

Possible sequencing changes due to Common Core are still in discussion at the high schools. Here is what they are currently discussing: (1) What algebra is called now in high school → algebra in junior high, (2) Geometry → geometry and trigonometry, and (3) Algebra II in high school → Pre-Calculus material.

The Consortium may be requesting additional research to look at students from the Hart district with a GPA below “x” and no math during their senior year to find out what they do at COC whether it is completing a certificate, completing an AA, transferring, or dropping out.

Two four-hour Saturday Math Preparation Workshops were held at Hart High in April. Twenty-four students from Hart and Bowman attended the first Saturday, and eleven completed both sessions from beginning to end. Students were introduced to a narrated version of the math video “How To Be A Successful Math Student”, completed a pre/post test, reviewed arithmetic and elementary algebra problems with COC math faculty, and had various other questions answered such as where to take the placement exam (shown via google maps.) Solutions to the math problem packets were given to students at the end of the second day. The Consortium discussed changes for future workshop offerings.

Meeting Dates for Fall 2013 will be the third Tuesday of the month (September, October, November) from 4:00-5:30. The Math Consortium has held their meetings in the University Center.

**SCV English Learning Consortium**

The SCV English is having its final meeting next Tuesday. We will be norming a set of English 096 (Acceleration) essays. Instructors felt that this would be more valuable than the classroom observations that we had preliminarily scheduled, so the observations have been tabled until next semester.

**FYE Update May 2013**
The 2012-13 FYE program is coming to a close. In addition to guaranteed units in English, math, and general education classes, students have completed Counseling 010 – Career Exploration during spring 2013. Students were also required to complete four Supplemental Learning workshops or Guided Learning Activities, and attend four office hour visits with their professors.

Jose Martin has been hard at work modifying and adding to the redesigned FYE website. Two new pages were created: the FYE Application page and the FYE Orientation page. Both pages are designed to assist students in the application process for the 2013-14 FYE program. Chad Estrella built the actual FYE Application, which links to a Microsoft Access database that collects all relevant applicant information for review.

The 2013-14 FYE application period began May 1 and concluded May 20. In order to qualify for the program, students must have completed their COC Application, COC Online Orientation, math and English assessment, and place below transfer-level in both math and English.

Application review has begun for the 2013-14 program. All admitted students will be notified by Friday, May 24. Program participants will be directed to sign-up for the FYE Orientation on June 3rd.

The FYE Orientation webpage provides a description of the key objectives of the orientation, and also includes an agenda for the day. The program will include a panel presentation from former FYE students, as well as workshops conducted by Instructional and Counseling Faculty. Students will also receive guidance on using MyCanyons from A&R staff, and will register for fall 2013 classes. FYE Orientation will be held July 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Chad Estrella and Linda Maricle have constructed the FYE Orientation online registration form and SARS database.

Participating students will be required to sign a contract confirming their understanding and compliance with all FYE requirements in order to qualify for spring 2014 registration.

We intend to require a Service Learning component to the fall 2013 FYE requirements.

Catherine Parker from Institutional Research has completed the 2013 FYE Orientation Survey.

Planning has begun for the 2014-15 FYE program.

Supplemental Learning Update

Supplemental Learning continued to offer workshop, GLAs, and practice jams to meet student needs in The Learning Center this semester.

Jose Martin has been working hard to make Supplemental Learning Curriculum page for faculty. The goal for the page is for faculty to access all components of the
supplemental learning curriculum, including workshops and guided learning activities. We hope to have the password protected page available to faculty for Fall 2013.

- SL committee worked together before the start of this semester to create a sample SL sheet which was implemented by some faculty. The sample SL sheet had a suggested due dates for the SL assignments. This new strategy for due dates helped students not to wait for the last few weeks to complete the SL requirements and it also helped TLC. During the last semester at this time there was a big group of students in TLC waiting to complete GLAs which created lines in front of GLA room and there was a wait time. This semester it is dramatically better compared to last.

- The table below shows some data comparison Fall 12 vs. Spring 13. As indicated, the number of students completing GLAs within the first 8 weeks of this semester doubled compared to last.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012 (week 8)</th>
<th>Spring 2013 (week 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English GLAs</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Soft-Skills Workshops</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math GLAs</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Workshops</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Jams</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Next SL meeting is scheduled this Thursday, May 23rd from 1-2. The goal of the meeting is to talk about and plan the GLAs and workshops for next academic year.

**Acceleration Subcommittee**

The Acceleration subcommittee began this semester. The subcommittee has been looking for new members and working on a mission statement and goals for next semester.
Non-Credit to Credit Transition Meeting Update

From April 22, 2013 2:00 PM MENH-246

Attendees: Jasmine Ruys, Susan Prier, Bernadine Smalley, Michele Wegter, Ann Lowe, Garrett Hooper, Kari Soffa, Diane Stewart, Debbie Sall, Denise Grzesiak.

1. Approval of last meeting’s minutes: The minutes were approved from the last meeting.

2. Summer Bridge Course Content:
   a. Instructors – There was a discussion about who would teach the math and English courses. The minimum qualifications for Non-Credit instructors is a Bachelor’s degree in the major being taught. But for counseling, because there is no undergrad major, the requirement would be a Master’s degree.
   b. How the classes will run:
      i. Counseling – 8:00 am to 9:15 am Monday through Thursday
      ii. Math – 9:30 am to 12:00 pm Monday through Thursday
         1. Requires completion of Math-025, or eligibility for Math-058.
         2. (Ann says that it was actually incorrect of us to use a credit class as a prerequisite for a non-credit class per the President of the Academic Senate).
      iii. English – 1:00 to 3:30 pm Monday through Thursday
         1. Requires eligibility for Eng-081.
   c. Prerequisite Challenge at the end? – Instead of allowing a student to prereq challenge after taking the Summer Bridge classes, a student will be allowed to retest to see if they assess at a higher level.

3. Flyer/Advertisements:
   a. Do we market to FYE students? (Because the FYE program this year is targeting those who assess at below college level English and math). No, this program is geared more towards ESL students for now. We wouldn’t want to market the Counseling class anyways to FYE, because Couns-111 is so similar to the content of the Summer Bridge Counseling class, and Couns-111 is required of FYE students.
   b. What about books? They are not required, but suggested. This may create questions though, because the flyer says that the classes are free. (Parking also would have to be paid for). The flyer will be redone so that this is a little more clear.

4. Survey of Non-Credit Students – Diane and Jasmine want to do a survey of the Non-Credit students to determine if they are interested in becoming credit students.
   a. We currently have no baseline to this question, so this information would be helpful. Anecdotally, it seems to vary from term to term, per Diane.
   b. Should we build our programs for those that do want to make that transition or for just a few (say 30 students or so?).
   c. Some at the meeting mentioned that this type of survey may already have been completed before. Jasmine will check with Daylene Meuschke.
   d. Questions might include:
      i. Why are you attending COC?
ii. What is your goal while at COC?
iii. Do you want to obtain a certificate?
iv. Do you want to obtain an AA/AS degree?

5. Other Ideas?
   a. When will the flyers go out? Jasmine says they’ll go out by tomorrow.
   b. Do we have specific information as to why the Summer Bridge program
did or did not work the last time it was offered? [Question not addressed in
meeting.]
   c. Do we have a minimum number of students that need to be enrolled for
the program to fly? No, we don’t have that information. We are okay
with teaching to just a few students, but ultimately it will be up to Audrey
Green.
   d. Kari suggested that it would be helpful for us to collect information
regarding how the student heard about the program.