Academic Senate for College of the Canyons
February 12, 2015 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. BONH 330

A. **Routine Matters**
1. Call to order
2. Approval of the Agenda
   a) Approval of the Consent Calendar: December 11, 2014 (pg. 2)
3. Academic Senate President's Report – Paul Wickline
4. Academic Senate VP Report – Rebecca Eikey

B. **Committee Reports**

C. **Unfinished Business**
1. Policies on Counseling Services – in Policy Review committee
2. Alignment of LEAP Principles with Institutional SLO (ISLO) – in Division Discussions
3. Formation of Ongoing Accreditation Committee – for Senate Discussion in Fall 2014
4. Local Graduation Requirements – for Senate discussion in Fall 2014

D. **Discussion Items**
1. BP 4260 Prerequisites and AP 4260 Prerequisites – David Andrus (pg. 10 & pg. 12)
2. http://www.canyons.edu/Offices/AcademicSenate/Documents/Academic%20Senate%20Program%20Review%202014-15_Draft_2-9-15.pdf

E. **Action Items**
1. Discipline assignment for Morgan Cole, Mathematics and Kelly Aceves, Mathematics(pg. 24 & 25)
2. Approval of Emeriti Status for Lori Brown, Allied Health

F. **Reports**
• Division Reports

G. **Announcements**
1. Accreditation Institute, February 20-22, 2015, San Mateo Marriott Hotel, San Francisco
2. Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation and a Strong Economy, Saturday, February 28th 10:00 am to 3:00 pm Palomar College
3. Academic Academy, March 13-14, 2015, Westin South Coast Plaza, Costa Mesa
4. Spring Area C Meeting, March 28, 2015, Location TBD
5. 2015 Noncredit Regional Meeting, Friday, March 20, 2015 9:30 am to 2:00 pm, Cerritos College, 11190 Alondra Blvd., Norwalk, CA 90650
6. Spring Plenary Session, April 9-11, 2015, Westin San Francisco Airport
7. Vocation Leadership Institute, May 7-9, 2015, San Jose Marriott
8. Faculty Leadership Institute, June 11-13, 2015, San Jose Marriott
9. Curriculum Institute, July 9-11, 2015, Anaheim-Orange County, Doubletree

H. **Open Forum**

I. **Adjournmen**t

The next Senate meeting will take place **February 26, 2015**
As always everyone is welcomed

Summary of Academic Senate Meeting December 11, 2014

Attendance: Paul Wickline, Rebecca Eikey, David Andrus, Thea Alvarado, Chelley Maple, Lee Hilliard, Heidi McMahon, Miriam Golbert, Bob Maxwell, Ruth Rassool, Ron Karlin, Amy Shennum, Philip Marcellin, Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, Shan Ramey, Edel Alonso, Garrett Hooper, Regina Blasberg, Deanna Riviera, Ann Lowe, Peter Hepburn, Mike Sherry, Andy McCutcheon and Dr. Buckley

A. Routine Matters
1. Call to order: 3:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the Agenda: Paul went over some of the errors that were found on the summary. Paul made new changes and a new summary will be put on the agenda and website. Motion to update the minutes David Andrus, seconded Ann Lowe. Unanimous. **Approved**. Paul asked that we move the Action items to top. We need a quorum to approve and some individuals need to leave early. Motion to move up was Rebecca Eikey, seconded by Chelley Maple. Unanimous**. Approved**
3. Approval of the Consent Calendar: Motion to approve the calendar, Ann Lowe, seconded David Andrus. Unanimous. **Approved**
4. **President's Report, Paul Wickline**
   - ✓ Paul sent out an email to chairs and faculty today about the movement of the deadline for Program Review to Wednesday morning, December 17th. In the Chancellors all college session, she recommended the deadline extension. Paul received an email from the Chancellor with the budget details and then emailed and received the dean's feedback. He then sent out the memo notifying chairs of the extension to the following Monday, December 22nd. The impetus was for the improvement of the budget forecast for this year for both 14/15 and 15/16. Those who attended the all college meetings heard that there is pretty positive outlook based on Prop 98 revenues. We wanted to give faculty a bit more time with to consider their budget requests for 2015-16.
   - ✓ Paul said that we met goals with the five year curriculum revision list. It looks like all courses scheduled for spring will make the deadline. Paul thanked Ann and the faculty for working so hard and thank you to our curriculum committee.
   - ✓ Wendy gave a report on Academic Staffing. They did two full days of presentations for new and replacement position proposals. Following these meetings, they received dean feedback and then the committee met to deliberate. From this deliberation, they created a prioritized list. This was sent to the chancellor, Dr. Buckley and to Academic Senate president and the division reps. Wendy asked the division reps to distribute it. Those interested can go to the intranet and look at the Academic Staffing committee website and see the list of recommendations. Wendy noted one significant change. The committee

now has an ongoing, ranked list of faculty requests. After a three year period, those still interested in hiring new or replacement faculty were required to represent. Previously, the committee had one list with the year faculty requests were added. The committee decided to come up with an actual prioritized list. The committee has always had a group for Urgent, a group for strongly recommended and a group for recommended. Now there is a ranked order within each area. Wendy made it as visually easy to read as possible so there is a three page list for Urgent in bright red and then there are three groups for strongly recommended and then recommended. She tried to articulate in the memo to Dr. Van Hook and Paul what they were doing. Dr. Buckley and Wendy meet with the chancellor on Monday morning. The Chancellor has also expressed a desire for this prioritized list. By next fall it should be a nice clean list. Wendy sent out a link to the division reps. Paul asked if the Senate President send out this link not a document and Wendy said she didn't mind.

✓ On Friday, those involved in the Equity Plan initiatives and proposals met with Ryan Theule and they walked through the schedule for the implementation and expense of funds. This will be an ongoing project for anyone who wrote an Equity proposal and was approved a couple months ago. This will continue into the winter and into the spring. Paul also stated not to be surprised to learn that we have extra equity funding available to expend if other colleges are unable to expend their funds in the fiscal year. Chelley stated that a three month carry over has been approved for 3SP and Equity. They do not have to be expended by July 1. If you did not have a chance to submit a proposal the first round you are welcomed to do that again. Paul is sure Ryan will roll out another round of submissions, requests. Please share this with your faculty. Also, see the email department chairs about program review from Paul because he reminded you to be sure you labeled anything that has equity implication, AB850 Baccalaureate Degree and AB86. Please see his email if you have questions.

✓ Paul met with Dr. Buckley on Wednesday and they talked about modernization monies coming from the state in the near future. Each of the deans hopefully worked with faculty on that process last fall, looking at the buildings and needs, etc. As Paul understands it, the college is expecting monies from the state and will begin to work on prioritizing and planning to expend those monies for facility improvements. Along the same lines is a request from Dr. Buckley to begin to exam a maintenance equipment replacement punch list/ bullet list/prioritize list. The process will begin in the program review first and then move to identifying the additional things that might not be captured in the program review. Equipment replacement is a new area in program review. Paul said at Enrollment Management non-credit was discussed. Paul said he could probably summarize some of things and put them in an email to everyone and give you an update as well.

5. **Vice President's Report, Rebecca Eikey**: N/A

B. **Committee Reports**

    1. PAC-B, Edel Alonso. Edel stated she had just sent out an email to all full time faculty explaining what she would sharing with Senate. The committee members started the year being told that there was an 11% ending balance end of last year. Even though the faculty thought was a bit high. Fiscal services office aims to have a 15% ending balance. They arrived at that figure because they believe it leaves operational costs for three months in case of an emergency. That was the rational given by VP Sharlene Coleal and the department. The faculty were also surprised to find out over the summer all requests for new equipment that were part of the program review that submitted last spring were also granted. So, any new equipment that you requested in program review, you should have received. In her email she asked that you go back and check your budget to be sure that you did get what they said you did. Also, there were $91,000 dollars unallocated. The faculty was very insistent that no decision should be made on that money until we went back to the program reviews, take a look at the prioritization at each level (faculty/staff, administrator, executive cabinet. After some back and forth, the committee agreed to fund the next four or five things that were there if they had not already been funded by 3SP or student equity or some other fund. They allocated $10,000 of the $91, 000 for a new position having to do with sexual harassment and assault. It is a position that is now mandated by legislative. The committee is also looking at the list of budge transfers every month and they have lots of questions to better understand the rationale behind the transfers. At CPT and in PAC-B there was this discussion about all the monies that has come in this year related to student success initiatives and Ryan Theule did a very nice job of passing out a flyer that was important because they talked about it in PAC-B too. Edel passed that flyer around to the Senators that outlines for you exactly what has come from Student Equity Plan, from 3SP, basic skills and title V. From Student Equity almost $700,000, from 3SP $2.2 million, basic skills $150,000 and title V $2.5 million. We had a big infusion of money this year. We expect more next year. Sharlene prepared a handout on the budget forecast for 15-16. Edel was particularly interested in the budget proposal to hire more full-time faculty. Edel is assuming there will be some kind of formula or matrix so they will be told exactly how many full-time faculty they will need. Edel felt this was very promising. The entire proposed budget from the state looks very promising for 15-16.

C. **Unfinished Business**

    1. Policies on Counseling Services, Prerequisite – in Policy Review Committee
    2. Alignment of LEAP Principles with Institutional SLO (ISLO) – in Division discussions
    3. Formation of Ongoing Accreditation Committee – for Senate Discussion in Fall 2014
    4. Local Graduation Requirements – for Senate Discussion in Fall 2014

D. **Action Items**

    1. COC Honors Operating Procedures: Miriam Golbert went over the changes the Senate had asked For. No questions by the Senate. Motion Edel Alonso, seconded Shane Ramey. Unanimous. **Approved**
    2. Discipline Assignment for Lauren Yeh, Counseling. Minor revisions made. No questions from the Senate. Motion Rebecca Eikey, seconded Garrett Hooper. Unanimous. **Approved**
    3. BP 4250 Probation, Disqualification and Readmission change. David Andrus spoke on the change and there were no questions regarding the change. Motion Wendy Brill, seconded Ann Lowe. Unanimous. **Approved**

4. New Adjuncts with MQs. This item was **Tabled**. After a discussion it was determined that the MQ's was not complete. There were duplicate names and the list didn't seem to be current. Paul will be asking HR about this before it comes back to Senate.

E. **Discussion Items**
   1. Civic Engagement Proposal
      Paul stated that he and Dr. Buckley had a brief discussion on this Wednesday. Dr. Buckley knows Paul's concerns about having a one page perspective and where the ongoing funding will come from. Paul spoke about the concerns the Senate had in their discussion at the November 20th meeting and addressed that it was a lengthy discussion that the Senate had at the last meeting and some of the concerns the Senate had. Paul stated this was moving forward and currently would be housed in the new building. He also said that we are taking currently existing programs that don't required additional funding and moving them under this umbrella like Service Learning, Career Services, Volunteer Bureau and Internships. David stated he appreciated Paul putting this item back on the agenda. He understands the concerns people have regarding prioritization, sustainability, outcomes and so forth. David stated that if you were not here at the last meeting that you read the summary from the last meeting if gives you an idea of the concerns that people have.
      David stated that something like this that is not officially a program raises questions:
      "how do we deal with a new program that clearly impacts education but not necessarily the classroom directly?"
      "How do we prioritize the energy, the money, the resources, the time, for anything even if it is really a good idea."
      Many support the concept and we want to be collegial with each other. There are many competing good ideas on campus. Paul had asked that we take this back to our divisions and many divisions have not met yet so David feels this will be an ongoing discussion; however, David feels it has been well stated that this is something Chancellor wants to move forward with and is moving forward with it. The exploratory committee suggested taking a slower approach to make sure how the program is implemented effectively with sufficient feedback from various constituencies.

      In bringing this proposal to the Senate, David believes this is a 10+1 issue because it impacts faculty, students, academics and so forth. David believes the Civic Engagement Center is an example of a proposal that has merit, but things move quickly around here and he thinks it is important for people to bring their concerns to the Senate. The two primary entities on campus are the COCFA (union) and Academic Senate. Bringing concerns to the Senate and having discussions so that we can have a record of our view of these and other initiatives is essential to providing a voice for faculty in such matters. This was largely David's interest bringing this to the Senate.

      This Civic Engagement initiative doesn't yet involve curriculum, and doesn't yet trigger program viability processes, etc. It was really made clear at CPT earlier this year that the Chancellor believes that this lives in Student Services. Other people believe it lives in Instruction. We know that it has a foot in both worlds. If you look at the proposal from the exploratory committee,

everything is about teaching students about civic engagement. The focus is clearly instructional, with student support services also involved.

David and Paul encouraged faculty to consider the impact dedicating time, money, energy, personnel, office space, oversight, etc. has on our institution and the, primarily, full-time faculty who are already dedicated to teaching, serving on committees, advising students, etc. There are so many projects and initiatives occurring on the campus. The Academic Senate is the best place to discuss these and other projects that impact teaching and learning before the institution selects those projects it feels are the most appropriate use of our institutional resources. Faculty must be involved and that involvement needs to include the academic senate.

The Civic Engagement Exploratory Committee will meet again in the spring. By then, the project may be implemented. Maybe, in the end, the faculty would have approved the initiative or gone done that road in agreement, but we really have not had the time to address those things. It is something we believe in, but it is more about the process than the issue.

Paul expressed concerns that this conversation might be ameliorated somewhat by the upturn in the budget. So, if all of a sudden we start to get things that we put in the budget requests for program review because now there is a pot of money, this frustration about not going through proper channels becomes less of a concern because now there is money for everything. Still there is this basic concern that we need to be involved and there needs to be a process to better consider these kinds of programs. Paul stated that this initiative is going to be called a "program" because it will have a program review. In a sense it is a non-instructional program if that is the way we go about doing it.

The Senate expressed concerns with the institution's approach at times to allocate space and funds by circumventing the program review or by submitting "requests" to the Chancellor directly as opposed to going through either CPT and/or PAC-B. Space and budget allocation request, whether included in the program reviews or not, should be vetted through a clear, collegial process with administrative, staff and faculty involvement. Allocations should not be bestowed on those who "get there first" or have the best or most frequent contact with decision makers. We need to find a way to put these processes in place or give voice to the need for a process like that. That comes from the Senate.

David said he really appreciated Paul's comments because of this flush money everywhere and what it causes everywhere, he thinks that when you have an enormous amount of money it is easy to trigger more and more things that then end up being depleting all of our time and resources. The Senate expressed that there are many people who are exhausted and struggling with their ability to juggle multiple responsibilities (instruction, committee work, advisory groups, outreach/recruitment, project management, etc.) that only increase with the addition of new programs and grant awards. Increased compensation is not necessarily the answer, because the issue is often the time needed to participate in projects without the release time needed to succeed and complete quality work.

Dr. Buckley has tried to deal with that with the chairs and they do appreciate that, but it is a difficult challenge. Every time the institution receives more money, it creates programs that often have merit and positively impact our students. The question is how we can make them meaningful and sustainable if we don't have enough time to put the needed effort behind it. David feels that is the concern.

Ann stated that the report actually bulleted "maintained transparency of decisions and actions to creating a civic engagement center" which does not seem to be happening. It was highlighted and that seems like that is what we are asking for. From her own experience with these non-instructional, non-faculty driven initiatives is that people often get ideas and they are usually have a strong curriculum need or component. However, they don't have anyone to write that curriculum, which is a faculty member's role and responsibility. David and Paul echoed this concern. Who is then going to write that curriculum, who is going to own that curriculum, and assess the course and program SLOs? Who will manage it and make sure of the 5 year revision cycle? Where does the curriculum then live? Is it a standalone course? If so, that creates additional problems and questions that fall to the Academic Senate and faculty to solve. There are a lot of complications that come out of this. That is where the processes come in because this is how we end up having orphan programs.

Dr. Buckley was invited to speak. First, he thanked the Senate for everything they do. He explained that this is one of things the college does with the Senate's leadership — have these difficult discussions. We don't always agree but that is part of the fun of it. He wanted to clarify that there is some pressure to move this Center for Civic Engagement along and at the same time he wanted to be clear that he is not in his capacity recommending creation of any excess office space beyond that which that which the existing programs currently occupy. He is trying to co-locate them so they can explore synergy. Synergy will not happen unless you do the other half of the equation. These are going to be programs that augment specific instructional programs that already exist. It is an opportunity to utilize these services for the students in such a way that they can then benefit from them. It is the faculty's decision.

Dr. Buckley noted that the Buck McKeon papers are now coming, which Head Librarian Peter Hepburn verified. He said he never agreed to when the arrival date was so that was a surprise to him. Edel spoke that these things have a way of growing and we will need someone to oversee this and clerical help will be needed. They do have merit but when do we prioritize? What body is helping with this process?

David felt our Senate should reach out and ask our faculty representatives. Maybe we should have more regular communications with academic senators and faculty to improve awareness so that the Senate is aware of what is going on at CPT, PAC-B and so forth.
Questions raised: Do these college-wide committees have by-laws? How do they make decisions? Vote? Consensus? How do they make sure that the faculty and Senate are included in things?

David thinks this is an opportunity. Can we take this proposal and use it to find out where we can improve on our prioritization because none of this lived in his program review before this semester. For the year 1, 2014-15 program review, he will include this initiative. Again — how do we prioritize these good ideas?

One of the missions for the spring is for the Senate to connect and try to bring some order to this in some way, if we can. Wendy stated that we should probably expand the Program Viability policy. She thought the policy could be revised and include a process for initiatives that are not immediately instructional programs, but will likely affect instruction and faculty directly.

David said that he and Dr. Buckley discussed this briefly and he thinks there are two paths we take. We can do that or we can at the same time consider a parallel policy that is separate from that if we feel that is the better approach. The policy committee is more than willing to take that up in the spring.

Paul stated this would be an important conversation. He noted the Chancellor's response to the faculty hiring process and procedures proposed early this year. One concern expressed is that there are things that come up institutionally that need immediate response and reaction — they might be state mandates or other initiatives that if you don't take advantage of the opportunity, the opportunity will pass. The conversation will likely make its way through executive cabinet, whatever form it takes. Paul noted that this is certainly warranted, he just wants everyone to be aware. As Dr. Buckley pointed out having a discussion is a good think even if you disagree. David stated it would be good for everyone to take this back to their divisions in the spring just to see what people think.

In closing this discussion, Paul asked for a document that clarifies some of these details and David said the exploratory committee is working on it. Chelley brought up staffing regarding categorical funding. We will have quite a bit of money for hiring people both classified and faculty. Paul asked, what is the cost of ownership? What is the total impact of this program whether it is categorical or otherwise on facilities, on maintenance, etc.? The list goes on and on. And he does not think we do a very good job as an institution considering that. We have limited control over that, but we can voice concern and request that process be examined.

Dr. Buckley stated that the total cost of ownership concept has taken root and is being pursued institutionally. Cost of ownership came about because the accreditation site visit team raised it with this college.

Paul noted that there will be a meeting in January for AB86 and there will be a stipend. You will be getting a message for this.

2. Strategic Goals
   Paul stated we are going to do the same thing we have done in the pass. Barry is going to send the extraction that takes place from the program review to all department chairs to get feedback and editing of that information before he puts the strategic plan accomplishments and

objectives together. He assumes this will be completed in early spring. We will have time to look at them and give suggestions. Some faculty could not attend the all college meeting because they are in class so they are asking for a schedule so they put it on their calendar for spring semester.

Jerry spoke about prioritizing the bullet list of maintenance and equipment replacement. Some of that can be pulled from the program review. Dr. Buckley stated he would like everything to go into program review. He agreed with everything Edel had said. We are not the only college with this problem. We have been underfunded for maintenance and operations for several years. Also, if you had budget cuts in the past, go back and put them back in your program review because there could be money coming.

F. **Reports**: N/A
G. **Announcements**: see the agenda
H. **Open Forum**: N/A
I. **Adjournment**: 4:35 p.m.

~~620.~~ **4260** GENERAL POLICY ON PREREQUISITES/COREQUISITES/**ADVISORIES and LIMITATIONS on ENROLLMENT**

The CEO is authorized to establish pre-requisites, co-requisites, advisories on recommended preparation for courses, and allowable limitations in the curriculum. All such pre-requisites, co-requisites, and advisories shall be established in accordance with the standards set out in Title 5. Any pre-requisites, co-requisites or advisories shall be necessary and appropriate for achieving the purpose for which they are established. The procedures shall include a way in which a pre-requisite or co-requisite may be challenged by a student on grounds permitted by law. Pre-requisites, co-requisites, and advisories shall be identified in District publications available to students.

~~**620.1 Philosophy**~~
~~The SCCCD Board adopts this policy in order to provide for the establishing, reviewing, and challenging of prerequisites, corequisites, advisories on recommended preparation, and certain limitations on enrollment in a manner consistent with law and good practice.~~
~~The District recognizes that prerequisites, corequisites, advisories and limitations, if established unnecessarily or inappropriately, constitute unjustifiable obstacles to student access and success. It is the policy of the Board that caution and careful scrutiny are used when establishing these. Nonetheless, the Board also recognizes that it is as important to have prerequisites in place where they are a vital factor in maintaining academic standards as it is to avoid establishing prerequisites where they are not needed. For these reasons, the Board requires that any procedure adopted to implement this foster the appropriate balance between these two concerns.~~
~~**620.2 Dissemination of Definitions and Procedures**~~
~~The College shall provide the following explanations both in the College Catalog and in the Schedule of Classes:~~
~~a. Definitions of prerequisites, corequisites, and limitation son enrollment including the specific differences among them and the specific prerequisites, corequisties, and limitations on enrollment which have been established pursuant to Section55200 (a-f) of Title 5.~~
~~b. Procedures for a student to challenge prerequisites,~~
~~corequisites, and limitations on enrollment and circumstances under which a student is encouraged to make such a challenge.~~
~~c. Definitions of advisories on recommended preparation, the right of the student to choose to take a course without meeting the advisory, and circumstances under which a student is encouraged to examine that right.~~
~~**620.3 Challenge Process**~~
~~The College shall establish procedures by which any student who does not meet a prerequisite or corequisite or who is not permitted to enroll due to a limitation on enrollment, but who provides satisfactory evidence, may seek entry into the class according to a challenge process as required in and according to provisions of Section 55201(f) of Title 5 and Section I.B. 1-3 of the Model District Policy.~~
~~**620.4 Curriculum Review Process**~~
~~The College certifies that the Curriculum Committee has been established by mutual agreement of the administration and the Academic Senate as required in Section 55002(a)(1) of Title 5. The Curriculum Committee shall:~~

a. Establish prerequisites, corequisites, advisories on recommended preparation, and limitation on enrollment pursuant to Sections 55002, 55201, 55202, and 58106 of Title 5 and Section I. C.3, 1-4 and II.C of the Model District Policy.

b. Verify and provide documentation that prerequisites orcorequisites meet the scrutiny specified in one of the measures of readiness specified in Section 55201(b)(1)
of Title 5 and Sections II.A.1.a-g of the Model Distric tPolicy.

c. Provide for review of each prerequisite, corequisite, oradvisory at least every six weeks pursuant to Section55201(b)(3) of Title 5 and Section I.D. of the Model District Policy. Any prerequisite or corequisite which is successfully challenged under subsections (1), (2),
or (3) of Section 55201(f) shall be reviewed promptly thereafter to assure that it is in compliance with all other provisions of the law.

d. Provide for a review of any prerequisite, corequisite,
or advisory upon the request of any faculty member or educational administrator.

e. Provide for a review of each limitation on enrollment at
least every six years pursuant to Section II.C of the Model District Policy.

620.5 Implementing Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Limitations on Enrollment
The College shall establish procedures wherein every attempt shall be made to enforce all conditions a student must meet to be
enrolled through the registration process so that a student is not permitted to enroll unless he or she has met all the conditions or has met all except those for which he or she has a pending challenge or for which further information is needed before final determination is possible of whether the student has met the condition pursuant to Section 55202(g) of Title 5 and Section I.E.
of the Model District Policy.
Every attempt shall be made to make certain that changes in prerequisites or corequisites do not adversely affect currently enrolled students.

620.6 Instructor's Formal Agreement to Teach the Course As Described
The College shall establish a procedure whereby courses for which prerequisites, corequisites, or advisories on recommended preparation, are established will be taught in accordance with the course outline pursuant to Section 55201(b)(2) of Title 5.

ADOPTED: OCTOBER 12, 1994

PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

AP 4260 PROCEDURES ON PREREQUISITES/COREQUISITES/ADVISORIES

Reference: *California Code of Regulations(CCR) Section 55000 et seq; 55003 et seq*

4260.1 Purpose

These procedures are to provide for the establishing, reviewing, and challenging of prerequisites, corequisites and advisories on recommended preparation, by faculty, in a manner consistent with Board Policy 4260, law and good practice.

The District permits the use of content review (alone), or in the alternative, content review accompanied by statistical validation as means to substantiate the appropriateness and need of prerequisites, corequisites and advisories.

4260.2 Definitions (CCR Section 55000; 55502)

The District shall adopt the following definitions and explanations and provide them in the College Catalog and in the Schedule of Classes:

A. Advisories (a.k.a. Advisory On Recommended Preparation) - means a condition of enrollment that a student is advised, but not required, to meet before or in conjunction with enrollment in a course or educational program.

B. Prerequisites - means a condition of enrollment that a student is required to meet in order to demonstrate current readiness for enrollment in a course or educational program.

C. Corequisites - means a condition of enrollment consisting of a course that a student is required to simultaneously take in order to enroll in another course.

D. Content Review - is a *rigorous* systematic process that is conducted by faculty to identify the necessary and appropriate body of knowledge or skills students need to possess prior to enrolling in a course, or which students need to acquire through simultaneous enrollment in a corequisite course. Content Review, at the minimum, has the following elements:
   1. Careful review of the course outline of record to identify the skills and knowledge necessary for student success.
   2. Determination of how the preparation can be obtained in order to advise or require students to acquire the necessary preparation prior to enrolling in a prerequisite or corequisite.
   3. Review of all departmental faculty syllabi for the target course, sample exams, assignments, instructional materials, grading criteria for the target course, SLOs,

course objectives, required and recommended reading and essay requirements to determine a sufficient correlation/association of required skills/knowledge students must have prior to enrolling in the target course and matching those skills/knowledge to the proposed prerequisite or corequisite course(s).

4. Direct involvement of the discipline faculty to collaborate on identifying course content, skills and requirements and determine how the course outline is being implemented departmentally.

5. Specification of the body of knowledge and/or skills which are deemed necessary at entry and/or concurrent with enrollment.

6. Identification and review of the prerequisite or corequisite which develops the body of knowledge and/or measures skills necessary for enrollment in the target course.

7. Documentation of the review undertaken.

8. The prerequisite or corequisite meets the appropriate level of scrutiny specified in Section 4260.3(B) of this AP.

E. "Necessary and Appropriate" (as it relates to Content Review) - means that a strong rational basis exists for concluding that a prerequisite or corequisite is reasonably needed to achieve the purpose that it purports to serve. This standard does not require absolute necessity.

F. Content Review with Statistical Validation - is defined as conducting a content review (as defined in subdivision (c) of section 55000) and the compilation and analysis of data according to sound research practices which shows that a student is highly unlikely to succeed in the course unless the student has met the proposed prerequisite or co-requisite.

G. Statistical Review – differs from statistical validation. It is a process in which to compare historical data to justify a prerequisite or to determine recommended action on review and revisions of prerequisites, corequisites and advisories.

H. Health and Safety Prerequisites – is a prerequisite or corequisite necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or the health or safety of others.

I. Educational Program - an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education.

J. Sequence of Courses – content and thematically related courses in a discipline showing a progression of complexity.

K. Disproportionate Impact – Disproportionate impact occurs when the percentage of persons from a particular racial, ethnic, gender, age or disability group who are directed to a particular service or placement based on an assessment instrument, method, or

procedure is significantly different from the representation of that group in the population of persons being assessed, and that discrepancy is not justified by empirical evidence demonstrating that the assessment instrument, method or procedure is a valid and reliable predictor of performance in the relevant educational setting. CCR Section 55502(d).

L. Target Course – the course that a proposed prerequisite, corequisite or advisory shall be applied to.

4260.3 Permitted Prerequisites and Corequisites

A. Purpose - No prerequisite or corequisite may be established or renewed unless it is determined to be necessary and appropriate to achieve the purpose for which it has been established and supported by substantiated evidence.
    1. Prerequisites or corequisites may be established only for any of the following purposes:
        a. The prerequisite or corequisite is expressly required or expressly authorized by statute or regulation; or

        b. The prerequisite will ensure that a student has the skills, concepts, and/or information that is presupposed in terms of the course or program for which it is being established, such that a student who has not met the prerequisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course (or at least one course within the program) for which the prerequisite is being established *[CCR, Section 55003(d)(2)*)]; or

        c. The corequisite course will ensure that a student acquires the necessary skills, concepts, and/or information, such that a student who has not enrolled in the corequisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course or program for which the corequisite is being established; or

        d. The prerequisite or corequisite is necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or the health or safety of others.

B. Levels of Required Scrutiny - All adopted prerequisites, corequisites or advisories must meet the appropriate level of scrutiny required per CCR 55003 *et seq*. The scrutiny levels are:

    1. Advisories – content review required. For advisories only, the minimum standard of content review will require only of a comparison of the course level Student Learning Outcomes for both the target course and the intended advisory course. All other content review must follow the standard set forth in Section 4260(D) of this administrative procedure.

2. Prerequisites/Corequisites Requiring Content Review Alone:

      a. Course in a sequence in a discipline – content review required

      b. Course for a sequence in vocational disciplines – content review required

3. Content Review and additional substantiating requirements:

      a. Course out of discipline but not an English or Math course – content review plus evidence that an equivalent requirement exists at three CSU/UC's

      b. Course or eligibility for a course out of discipline in English or Math – content review, plus one of the following:

            i. evidence that an equivalent requirement exists at three CSU/UC's, or

            ii. a letter from a CSU/UC requiring that prerequisite/corequisite, or

            iii. data collection and analysis, or

            iv. research with statistical validation.

      c. Health and Safety Requirement

            i. Content review may be used to establish a health and safety prerequisite.

            ii. Mandated Health and Safety Prerequisites:

                (1) Mandated by Statute or Outside Agency Regulation – no content review required, but documentation is required, to include legal or regulatory citation.

                (2) Mandated by the Outside Agency- if a prerequisite or corequisite is mandated by industry or outside agency, a minimal content review shall be required to align the required skill set determined necessary. Documentation is required to cite the source of mandate.

4. Limitations on Enrollment - Requiring Criteria Other Than Content Review

      a. Auditions for performance courses– documentation of the audition process plus disproportionate impact study at least every six years related to the audition. Additionally, other courses must be available to meet degree/certificate requirements.

      b. Honors courses restricted to an honors cohort– other sections/courses must be available to meet degree/certificate requirements

      c. Blocks of courses or sections (cohorts) – other sections/courses are available to meet degree/certificate requirements.

5. Assessment Test Prerequisites

a. Cut score for use within the same discipline sequence – content review, plus a test approved by the Chancellor's Office in accordance with established standards, plus validated cut-off scores, plus multiple measures, plus disproportionate impact study

b. Cut score for use outside assessment area – same as 6(a) above plus data collection and analysis.

C. Proposing faculty may elect to include statistical validation with their content review.

4260.4 Exemptions

A prerequisite or corequisite need not be scrutinized using content review or content review with statistical validation if:

A. It is required by statute or regulation; or

B. It is part of a closely-related lecture-laboratory course pairing within a discipline; or

C. It is required by four-year institutions; or

D. Baccalaureate institutions will not grant credit for a course unless it has the particular communication or computation skill prerequisite.

4260.5 Criteria and Processes for Establishing Cross Disciplinary Prerequisites/Corequisites/Advisories

All District personnel involved in the proposal, analysis, substantiation, and approval of a prerequisite, corequisite, or advisory shall adhere to the following sequential and substantive process:

A. Faculty may establish an advisory, prerequisite, or corequisite if it:
1. Is expressly required or expressly authorized by statute or regulation
2. Will assure that the student has the skills, concepts, and/or information needed to succeed for the target course it is established
Title 5 Language: Will assure that a student has the skills, concepts, and/or information that is presupposed in terms of the course or program for which it is being established, such that a student who has not met the prerequisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course (or at least one course within the program) for which the prerequisite is being established; or

3. Is necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or the health or safety of others.

B. Cross Disciplinary Prerequisite Sub-Committee

The Curriculum Committee will establish a standing "Prerequisites Sub-Committee" to address out of sequence prerequisites (cross disciplinary) in the areas of reading, written expression or mathematics. Committee membership will be reported to the Academic Senate at the beginning of each academic year and approved via the Academic Senate's consent calendar. All participating members of this sub-committee shall be trained in the prerequisite process each academic year prior to any official meetings. This training will be documented in the Curriculum Committee Summary submitted to the Academic Senate.

1. Subcommittee Membership
   a. Standing Members:
      i. Faculty Curriculum Committee Chair, or designee,
      ii. Four members of the Curriculum Committee other than the Faculty Chair,
      iii. Chair, Department of Math, or designee,
      iv. Chair, Department of English, or designee,
      v. Member of the Academic Senate other than any other listed member to this committee,
      vi. CIO, or designee.
   b. Ad Hoc/Temporary Members
      i. Chair of the proposing faculty member's department, or designee,
      ii. Course Author

2. Voting – only standing faculty committee members shall have voting `rights.

3. Subcommittee Duties
   a. Review proposals and ensure that the proper method of scrutiny is applied to the out of sequence prerequisite in reading, written expression or mathematics.
   b. Consultation with Enrollment Management to ensure equitable and practical implementation of prerequisite or corequisite.
   c. Consultation with the Articulation Officer to safeguard unintended consequences to articulation agreements, *inter alia*.
   d. Assessment of impact on District resources.
   e. Ensure that any academic department, and the College as a whole, will not be harmed, pedagogically or otherwise, by the establishment of a prerequisite or corequisite and will not impact the viability of any existing program.
   f. Initial determination as to the appropriateness of the proposal.
      i. Data pertinent to determining the appropriateness of the proposal:
         (1) Evidence of appropriate scrutiny applied to support the prerequisite.

(2) Patterns of student success in the target course.

(3) Placement assessment data correlating with required skill level for success.

ii. Decisions will be based on a majority vote of a quorum of voting members of the sub-committee. A quorum is said to exist if a simple majority of voting members are in attendance at the time of the vote.

iii. The Curriculum Committee decision will be recorded in the Curriculum Committee Summary and submitted to the Academic Senate for approval on the consent calendar.

g. Formally communicate the recommendations for the sub-committee to the Curriculum Committee chair. The chair will put the recommendations of the sub-committee on the next Curriculum Committee agenda for a vote of the Curriculum Committee.

C. Proposals

1. Faculty members initiating a proposed prerequisite or corequisite in reading, written expression, or mathematics for a course not in sequence in those areas must:

i. Undertake a Needs Assessment that serves as an initial determination as to the appropriateness of the proposal. Data pertinent to the proposal is:

(1) Evidence of appropriate scrutiny applied to support the prerequisite.

(2) Patterns of student success in the target course.

(3) Placement assessment data correlating with required skill level for success.

ii. Create the proposal in CurricUNET, satisfying all required scrutiny standards applicable under Section 4260.3(B) of this Administrative Procedure.

iii. Submit a proposal to the Curriculum Committee chair and the chair of his/her department notifying them of the prerequisite request.

iv. Submit the proposal by the deadline established each academic year by the Curriculum Committee and published in the Curriculum Committee Calendar.

2. The chair of the Curriculum Committee will initiate a meeting of the sub-committee to evaluate the proposal.

3. The Subcommittee will either recommend approval or denial of the proposed prerequisite, corequisite or advisory to the Curriculum Committee.

a. Standard of Review

The completed written proposal must contain conclusions supported by documented substantiating evidence and data. The data may be qualitative or quantitative in nature. The written proposal must be explicit in validating the prerequisite by defining the need and level of need.

b. Sub-Committee Review Form – the sub-committee shall adopt a standardized form for use to document its findings and recommendations. The form, coupled with the final written proposal, will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee.

c. If the sub-committee rejects the proposal for further   consideration it shall communicate, upon request, written   rationale for the denial to the proposing faculty and Chair of the   proposing department. The proposal may be submitted for   reconsideration if additional supporting data is included in the   revised proposal.

5. The Curriculum Committee will review the complete proposal and accompanying recommendation forwarded from the Subcommittee. The Curriculum Committee will either accept or deny the proposed prerequisite or corequisite based on a finding of its necessity and appropriateness. The Curriculum Committee shall institute a standardized form to serve as its written documentation its findings and determination. Any determination by the Curriculum Committee must be by majority vote of a quorum of the Curriculum Committee for the date on which the proposal is to be reviewed.

6. Approval by the Board of Trustees will result in the prerequisite, corequisite or advisory being enforced at the earliest possible date that will not result in inequitable application.

4260.6 Prerequisites Requiring Precollegiate Skills

If a prerequisite requires precollegiate skills in reading, written expression, or mathematics, the District shall:

A. Ensure that courses designed to teach the required skills are offered with reasonable frequency and that the number of sections available is reasonable given the number of students who are required to meet the associated skills prerequisites and who diligently seek enrollment in the prerequisite course.

B. Monitor progress on student equity in accordance with CCR Section 54220. Monitoring shall include:

1. Conducting an evaluation to determine the impact on student success including whether the prerequisite or corequisite has a disproportionate impact on particular groups of students described in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, age or disability, as defined by the State Chancellor

2. Where there is a disproportionate impact on any such group of students, the district shall, in consultation within the State Chancellor, develop and implement a plan setting forth the steps the district will take to correct the disproportionate

impact. Implementation shall take effect no later than two years from the end of the semester in which disproportionate impact was identified. Upon subsequent review, if the disproportionate impact continues to exist, the prerequisite or corequisite will be suspended until a revised implementation plan is established and in force.

4260.7 Implementation of Content Review with Statistical Validation

If the Curriculum Committee, using content review with statistical validation, initially determines that a new course needs to have a communication or computation skill prerequisite or corequisite, then, despite Section 4260.4 of this policy, the prerequisite or corequisite may be established for a single period of not more than two years while the research is being conducted and the final determination is being made, provided that all other requirements for establishing the prerequisite or corequisite have been met.

A. Finding of Disproportionate Impact
1. New Courses – where disproportionate impact is proven to exist outside the parameters of Section 4260.7(B), the prerequisite or corequisite shall be suspended until an implementation plan is established to correct the disproportionate impact. Review of the implementation plan shall be undertaken at least once every six years. Upon subsequent review, if the disproportionate impact continues to exist, the prerequisite or corequisite will be suspended until a revised implementation plan is established and in force.

2. Existing Courses – where content review with statistical validation is utilized, no prerequisite or corequisite shall be established until the completion of the substantiating statistical research and no disproportionate impact is proven to exist. Review of the prerequisite for the existence of disproportionate impact shall be undertaken at least once every six years. Upon subsequent review, if a disproportionate impact is found to exist, the prerequisite or corequisite will be suspended until an implementation plan is established and in force.

B. The requirements of Section 4260.7 of this policy related to collection of data shall not apply when the prerequisite or corequisite is required for enrollment in a program, that program is subject to approval by a state agency other than the Chancellor's Office and both of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. Colleges in at least six different districts have previously satisfied the data collection requirements of this subdivision with respect to the same prerequisite or corequisite for the same program; and

2. The district establishing the prerequisite or corequisite conducts an evaluation to determine whether the prerequisite or corequisite has a disproportionate impact on particular groups of students described in terms of race, ethnicity,

gender, age or disability, as defined by the Chancellor. When there is a disproportionate impact on any such group of students, the district shall, in consultation with the Chancellor, develop and implement a plan setting forth the steps the district will take to correct the disproportionate impact.

a. Review of Disproportionate Impact – where disproportionate impact is found to exist under Section 4260.7(B) and upon subsequent review to be undertaken at least once every six years, if the disproportionate impact continues to exist the prerequisite or corequisite will be suspended until a revised implementation plan is established and in force.

C. Prerequisites establishing communication or computational skill requirements may not be established across the entire curriculum unless established on a course-by-course basis.

4260.8 Mandated Review Process

All prerequisites, corequisites and advisories must be reviewed to assure they remain necessary and appropriate. This process shall occur at least once each six years, except that prerequisites and corequisites for vocational courses or programs shall be reviewed every two years. Every attempt shall be made to make certain that changes in prerequisites or corequisites do not adversely affect currently enrolled students.

4260.9 Student Challenge Process

Prerequisite challenge petitions are available in the Admissions and Records office.

A. A prerequisite may be challenged for the following reasons:
1. The prerequisite has not been made reasonably available;
2. The prerequisite was established in violation of regulation, or in violation of District approved processes;
3. The prerequisite is discriminatory or applied in a discriminatory manner; and/or
4. The student has knowledge or ability to succeed in the course despite not meeting the prerequisite.

B. In each case the student must provide documentation to support the challenge. Examples of documentation are transcripts, copies of certificates, proof of knowledge of the required material, etc.

C. The procedure for prerequisite challenge petitions will be adequately published for students:

4260.10 Implementation and Enrollment Management

Whenever a prerequisite or corequisite course is established, sufficient sections shall be offered to reasonably accommodate all students who are required to take the corequisite.

A. Other Degree Applicable Courses – the College shall ensure other degree applicable courses are available to students impacted by implementation of prerequisites or corequisites as to prevent enrollment barriers to students.

B. Implementation – the Office of Instruction, in consultation with the Curriculum Committee, shall develop a plan to determine when adopted prerequisites and corequisites shall be made operational.

4260.11 Satisfaction of Prerequisite

The determination of whether a student meets a prerequisite shall be based on successful completion of an appropriate course or on an assessment using multiple measures, as required by section 55521(a)(3). No exit test may be required to satisfy a prerequisite or corequisite unless it is incorporated into the grading for the prerequisite or corequisite course.

4260.12 Enforcement of Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Limitations on Enrollment

The District shall make every attempt to enforce all conditions a student must meet to be enrolled through the registration process so that a student is not permitted to enroll unless he or she has met all the conditions or has met all except those for which he or she has a pending challenge or for which further information is needed before final determination is possible of whether the student has met the condition pursuant to CCR Section 55003, *et.seq.* Enforcement standards shall be established by or within District Administrative Procedure(s).

A. Faculty
1. Courses for which prerequisites and corequisites are established will be taught in accordance with the course outline of record, particularly those aspects of the course outline that are the basis for justifying the establishment of the prerequisite or corequisite.

2. Each section of the prerequisite or corequisite is to be taught by a qualified instructor and in accordance with a set of objectives and with other specifications defined in the course outline of record as required per CCR Section 55002.

4260.13 Publication

Prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation must be identified in college publications available to students, to include the College Catalogue and Schedule of Classes, as well as the course outline of any course for which they are established.

4260.14 Annual Report to Chancellor's Office

By August 1 of each year the District, should it have chosen to established enrollment limitations, shall submit to the Chancellor's Office in the manner specified by the Chancellor the prerequisites and corequisites that were established during the prior academic year. The District shall also specify the level of scrutiny, i.e., content review or content review with statistical validation, used to determine whether the prerequisite or corequisite was necessary and appropriate for achieving the purpose for which it was established.

4260.15 Instructor's Formal Agreement to Teach the Course As Described

The District shall establish a procedure whereby courses for which prerequisites, corequisites, or advisories on recommended preparation, are established will be taught in accordance with the course outline pursuant to Section CCR Section 55003 *et seq.*

4260.16 Annual Training

The Curriculum Committee and all appropriate sub committees will be trained annually on the appropriate criteria, scrutiny, and documentation required to establish advisories, prerequisites, and corequisites based on CCR Section 55003 *et seq* and District procedures. Training may consist of any local workshops developed by the District but shall include attendance of the annual Curriculum Institute of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.

HUMAN RESOURCEES OFFICE

Date: December 23, 2014

To: Paul Wickline
                President, Academic Senate

From: Rian Medlin
                Senior Human Resources Generalist (Faculty)

CC: Christina Chung
                Director, Human Resources

Subject: Discipline Assignment – Morgan Cole

The following information is provided for discipline assignment:

Morgan Cole

Ms. Cole has been hired as a Mathematics Generalist with an effective start date of February 2, 2015.

The following is provided for discipline assignment:

- MS in Mathematics, University of South Carolina, Emphasis in Number Theory

It would appear that Ms. Cole qualifies for the discipline(s) of:

- Mathematics

HUMAN RESOURCEES OFFICE

Date: December 23, 2014

To: Paul Wickline
            President, Academic Senate

From: Rian Medlin
            Senior Human Resources Generalist (Faculty)

CC: Christina Chung
            Director, Human Resources

Subject: Discipline Assignment – Kelly Aceves

The following information is provided for discipline assignment:

Kelly Aceves

Ms. Aceves has been hired as a Mathematics Generalist with an effective start date of February 2, 2015.

The following is provided for discipline assignment:

- PhD in Mathematics, Baylor University

It would appear that Ms. Aceves qualifies for the discipline(s) of:

- Mathematics