

We are 10+1

Academic Senate for College of the Canyons
October 22, 2015 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. BONH 330

A. Routine Matters

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of the Consent Calendar:
 - a) Academic Senate Summary: October 8, 2015 (pg. 3)
 - b) Curriculum Summary: October 15, 2015 (pg. 8)
4. Academic Senate President's Report – Rebecca Eikey
<http://www.asccc.org/events/2015-11-05-153000-2015-11-08-000000/2015-fall-plenary-session>
5. Academic Senate Vice President's Report – Teresa Ciardi

B. Committee Report

1. Honors Program Update – Miriam Golbert (pg. 10)

C. New Business

1. FIT Faculty Interns
2. Revisions of online Teaching Requirements

D. Unfinished Business

1. Local Graduation Requirements
2. Adjunct Minimum Qualification Memo Sheets
3. Resolution on Nepotism
4. Policy changes for sexual Harassment/Assault
5. High Impact Practices – Principles of Excellence

A. Discussion Items

1. Accreditation Taskforce Recommendations – Wendy Brill (pg. 11)
2. Equity Plan – Ryan Theule [2015-16 Student Equity Plan](#)
3. Learning Management Systems Canvas Training – James Glapa-Grossklag (pg. 16)
4. 3SP – Chelley Maple (pg. 17)
 **2015-16 Credit SSSP Program Plan Template ORIGINAL 10.02.2015 for Academic Senate.pdf**

B. Action Items

1. Endorsement of Scholarly Presentation for November 19, 2015, Miriam Golbert – Galapagos, A personal Journey on Darwin's Footsteps
2. http://www.canyons.edu/Offices/AcademicSenate/Documents/Miriam_Golbert_ScholarlyPresentationPoster.pdf
3. Endorsement of Oktober Fest October 30, 2015 (pg. 21)
4. 3SP Noncredit – Jasmine Ruys  **Noncredit SSSP plan - Final.pdf**
5. Academic Senate Logo (pg. 22)
6. Access to BONH 330

C. Reports from Schools

D. Announcements

- Area C Meeting, October 24th Valley Glen, CA
- Oktober Fest, October 30, 2015, 4:40 pm to 7:00 pm UCEN Lobby

- Fall Plenary Session November 5-7, Irvine Marriott Hotel
- Scholarly Presentation November 19th PAC 6:00 p.m., Miriam Golbert, Galapagos
- Innovation and Instruction Design Institute January 21-26, 2016 Riverside Convention Center
- Accreditation Institute February 19-20, San Diego
- Academic Academy March 11-12th ,North, TBD
- Spring Plenary Session April 20-23, Sacramento Convention Center
- Career Technical Education Institute May 6-7, TBD

E. Adjournment

The next Senate meeting will take place on **November 5, 2015**

As Always Everyone is welcomed

Comments from the public are encouraged for any item on the Agenda, but there may be a time limit for such comment

Summary of the Academic Senate Meeting October 8, 2015

Attendance

Voting Members					
Senate President	Rebecca Eikey	✓	SBS Senator	Victoria Leonard	✓
Vice President	Teresa Ciardi	✓	Business Senator	Bob Maxwell	
Immediate Past President	VACANT		Learning Resources Senator	Ron Karlin	✓
Curriculum Chair	Ann Lowe	✓	At Large Senator	Diane Baker	✓
Policy Review Chair	David Andrus	✓	At Large Senator	Lee Hilliard	✓
AT Senator	Regina Blasberg	✓	At Large Senator	Deanna Riviera	✓
MSHP Senators	Amy Shennum, Mary Corbett		At Large Senator	Michael Sherry	✓
VAPA Senator	Wendy Brill-Wynkoop	✓	At Large Senator	Valerie Malinoski	
Student Services Senator	Garrett Hooper (Proxy – Graciela Martinez)	✓ ✓	Adjunct Senator	Kimberly Bonfiglio	✓
Humanities Senator	Tracey Sherard	✓	Adjunct Senator	Jason Burgdofer	✓
Kinesiology/Athletics Senator	Philip Marcellin		Adjunct Senator	VACANT	

Non-voting Members	
Dr. Jerry Buckley	✓
Lita Wangen	✓
Amy Foote	
Dr. Michael Wilding	
ASG Representative	

Guests
Christina Chung, Aivee Ortega, Jasmine Ruys, Lisa Pavik

A. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 3:05 p.m.
2. Approval of the agenda: Rebecca asked that we add Polices for Sexual Harassment/Assault under Unfinished Business. Motion David Andrus, seconded was Ann Lowe. Unanimous. Approved.
3. Motion to approved the Agenda, motion Victoria Leonard, seconded Wendy Brill Wynkoop. Unanimous. Approved
4. Approval of the Consent Calendar: Motion Ann Lowe, seconded David Andrus. Unanimous. Approved
5. **Academic Senate President's Report, Rebecca Eikey.**
 - ✓ Rebecca spoke about the committee representation. What do we do about the lack of representation of faculty? What do we do about the large schools and then how do we balance out our small schools? What do we do next with our committee structure? David asked if there had been any discussion in their schools about the revisions regarding the constitution and by-laws for the Academic Senate. David will be asking soon ideas regarding changes for the constitution and by-laws, as they will be revised at once. Any ideas should be directed toward David. The

Academic Senate meetings are scheduled for 1 ½ hours. Should we go 2 hours instead? There are meetings when we do not have time to discuss all our items and we table for the next meeting. Our volume of work has gone up. A suggestion was asked about changing the time to 2:30 instead, but that would not work since some faculty are teaching until 2:35. David also stated that the Chancellor just gave him a list of several policies that will be coming our way. We may need to utilize electronic dissemination of documents more effectively.

- ✓ On October 22nd Distance Learning will be coming. They are saying there will be six hours of training required for any faculty who want to use Canvas, the new Learning Management System. Faculty are concerned that six hours is a lot of time to spend in training. Faculty should have a voice as to how many hours are needed. Regina says this came from the online training requirement for online instructor – to qualify to teach online faculty needed six hours for Blackboard training in addition to other training requirements. Regina suggested that this is where the six hours is coming from for the training requirement for Canvas. The faculty need a say in this matter of training, as the six hours for online training was voted on by Academic Senate.
- ✓ There is a small group working on our resolution regarding Nepotism.
- ✓ At the state level, there is discussion regarding aligning CTE curriculum in C-ID system, similar to what happened with transfer curriculum. Ann Lowe stated that participation and opinions from faculty is important part of this statewide process. When there is a conference related to this, faculty need to be mindful that we need a voice there.

B. Committee Report

1. Faculty Intern Program-Ron Karlin

Ron gave a report Intern Program used at LACCD as an example. LACCD has had this program for over two decades. He said it was pretty well established and is called Project Match. He said new faculty were matched up with existing faculty that have been at the college for a while. They offer a small compensation. Regina Blasberg spoke and said she had gone through the Program Match and the COC Mentor Program were not the same. They are two different programs. In Project Match, there are courses the interns take related to course development. As the “intern” you get assigned your mentor faculty member. Regina did her course work over a summer and then in the fall she was paired with a faculty member. She co-taught with this faculty mentor a class for that semester. During the summer course work, one learns how to do a lesson plan, how to make a syllabus, about acronyms, and the way that a college functions. Faculty interns also learn about different teaching methodologies and how to prepare for a teaching job (such as resume develop and differences with

being a full time faculty member vs an adjunct. This was useful for those directly out of industry. The Mentor Program at COC works with faculty who are already hired and in the classroom, where Project Match helps to get new faculty trained. Regina felt her experience was very positive. Aivee Ortega stated she had also gone through the program and she was paired up with an EOP counselor. When Aivee participated, at end of the program the interns did a teaching demo for full time faculty who provided feedback on the teaching.

C. Unfinished Business

1. Local Graduation Requirements
2. Adjunct Minimum Qualification Memo Sheets – in HR
3. Resolution on Nepotism
4. Policies for Sexual Harassment – in Schools

D. Discussion Items

1. Credit 3SP - Aivee Ortega

Aivee Ortega reported the Credit 3SP in place of Chelley Maple who is currently at a conference. Aivee stated that the plan has been approved by Fiscal Services. Aivee stated that everything that is required by the state was in the plan. When developing the plan there was representations from all parties. Rebecca stated that she had a really hard time comparing the allocated budget to the plan because it is not the same language that is being used. There is a lot about SS specialist position, program advisors, and academic advisors. Rebecca stated she really didn't know how to read it in the adoption budget or allocated budget. It talks about full-time faculty coordinators, academic counselors, classified managers, it didn't map well. When looking at it budget code 2000 and then looking somewhere else it is object code. Why is one document saying budget code and the other saying object code? She couldn't figure how things were connected. And she also was not sure how the money was connected. Looking at last year's budget, it seems they were looking at additional funds in places that hadn't been there the previous year. There were issues last year with the 3SP Plan in regards to clarifying the role of Academic Advisors. There was no resolution when it was at last year's Senate and the Senate President did not sign off on it. Jasmine spoke and stated from what she understands this issue has been resolved over the past year. Since that time, there has been an MOU regarding the Academic Advisors. A lot of positions in the current plan are divided up over the six required sections (assessment, planning, orientation, etc). Aivee said she would bring this up with Chelley. Rebecca did feel it added up. On one page it stated budget codes for contracts \$1500 and on another page it is listed as \$45,000. One is \$8,000 and one is \$25,000. Rebecca did not see it matching. The test amount was the only one she saw that matched. It was decided that there were too many unanswered questions and that Chelley needed to be there to help the Senate understand. This item is coming back as a

discussion/or an action item for the next meeting which is October 22nd depending if Chelley can be here. Too many people were lost and didn't understand the plan.

2. 3SP Noncredit – Jasmine Ruys

This is a smaller plan with less state funding (\$34,000 where the credit 3SP credit has millions). The plan is much shorter. There are about 700 students that they work with. They do orientation, placement, student ed planning and follow-up services. These four areas are the same in both credit and non-credit 3SP plans. However in non-credit it is much smaller scale. Orientation is done in the classroom with every student. Only do placement testing for ESL we don't for general GE classes or citizenship classes. Our student ed planning is pretty straight forward. They talk about their services when they are with the students. They do transition workshops going from non-credit to credit, we are in the classrooms to ensure that if the students need to talk about anything they are there for them. They come in because they are not sure if they are in the right level in non-credit ESL. You will see in the plan there is a lot more activities that they are planning for, but don't have the funds from the state to do. The Credit 3SP plan has been generous and moved monies over to non-credit so that they can get that program up and going. This is the first year that the state has requested this non-credit plan. It is also the first year that they have provided them with this template, with the provided services specified. Non-credit have been providing these services for years, but this is the first year 2015/16 that it is required for the college to submit a non-credit 3SP plan. They hope to receive 50% more funding and will be notified in the next couple of weeks what that will be. The budget must be separated out based on the 4 service areas, per the template of the plan. This item will be coming back as an Action Item on October 22nd.

3. Academic Senate Logo – Rebecca Eikey

Rebecca spoke on our logo that Wendy Brill has drawn up with the help from a former student. She asked what we thought of it. People liked it seems everyone was pleased with it. Rebecca mentioned ordering pins for Senators to wear that show our logo. This item will be coming back an Action Item on October 22nd.

4. BONH 330 key access – Rebecca Eikey

We have had faculty asking for access to BONH 330 and in the past we have issued keys for individuals who have meetings in BONH 330 on a regular basis. There was a discussion that this is the faculty center why do we have to have permission to get access. So it was decided that if someone asked for access we would give it to them. Faculty will need to check with Lita to be sure no one is using the room if faculty want to gather in there. Also we need to remind

everyone that has a key to lock things up for security. This will come back as an Action Item on October 22nd.

5. AAC&U HIPS & Principles of Excellence – Rebecca Eikey

Rebecca stated that there has been some movement at the CSU level to define locally what they believe their high impact practices are. Which practices are likely to have a significant benefit to the student's success in obtaining their degree? She was thinking it would be good for us here at COC, since we already do a lot of these things that would be classified as high impact practices, to decide locally what do we consider to be higher impact practices, what purpose do these serve, how do the students benefit and make an endorsement. Rebecca wants to see if we also want to adopt these Principles of Excellence from AAC&U. There were questions from the senators regarding what are the implications if we do if we adopt these? What is the follow-up? Some felt this was similar to Civic Engagement. Questions were asked what excellence instruction means. Some were not interested in defining excellence. Some were concerned that if we start this then when accreditation comes we will always have to do it. We don't have it in a document, but we are already doing these here at COC. Others thought that by defining excellence that we can help with identifying appropriate resources for academic programs. We had a lengthy discussion on this item.

E. Action Items

1. Academic Hiring Procedures for Adjunct Positions. Motion Wendy Brill, seconded Ron Karlin. Unanimous. Approved.
2. Approval of Discipline assignments for, Galeen Roe, George Lee, Erin Barnthouse, Erika, Torgeson, Consuelo Beecher, Jason Oliver and Mary Manuel. Motion Wendy Brill, seconded Teresa Ciardi. Unanimous. Approved.
3. Faculty appointments to the Accreditation Taskforce. Motion Wendy Brill, seconded Teresa Ciardi. Unanimous. Approved.
4. Phil Gussin, co-chair Faculty Professional Development. Motion Wendy Brill, seconded Teresa Ciardi. Unanimous. Approved.
5. Approval VP for Senate Teresa Ciardi. Motion Wendy Brill, seconded Teresa Ciardi. Unanimous. Approved.

F. Reports: N/A

G. Announcements: see the agenda

H. Adjournment: 4:35 p.m.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE SUMMARY

October 15th, 2015

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 October 9th, 2015.

Members present: Backes, Patrick – Curriculum & Articulation Coordinator; Barnthouse, Erin – Learning Resources; Brill, David – Visual & Performing Arts; Cicchelli, Giana – Adjunct Representative; George, Tricia – Humanities; Hilliard, Lee – Applied Technologies; Hyatt, Rhonda – Kinesiology & Athletics; Jacobson, Julie – Member at Large; Marengo, Anne – Social & Behavioral Sciences (Substitute Co-Chair Faculty); Matsumoto, Saburo – Member at Large; Pescarmona, Denée (Substitute for Audrey Green, Co-Chair Administrator); Solomon, Diane – Student Services; Stephens, Cindy – Member at Large

Members absent: Bates, Mary – Math, Sciences & Health Professions; Green, Audrey – Co-Chair, Administrator; Lowe, Ann – Co-Chair, Faculty; Ruys, Jasmine – Director Admissions and Records

TECHNICAL CHANGE MEMOS on consent:

Subject	#	Title	Description of action	Author	Effective
MATH	111	Finite Math	Removing MATH-075 prerequisite option.	S. Matsumoto	Fall 2016

MODIFIED COURSES on consent:

Subject	#	Title	Description of action	Author	Effective
CAWT	101	Introduction to Computers	Revised SLO's (2), revised objectives and content, and assignment examples as requested by C-ID reviewer.	H. Lipman	Fall 2016
MATH	215	Differential Equations	Revised description, objectives and content. Updated textbooks. Changed prerequisite to MATH-212 (formerly MATH-213).	S. Matsumoto	Fall 2016
MEA	155	Basic Audio Production	Revised description, revised SLO's (2), revised objectives and content. Updated textbooks.	J. Amador	Fall 2016
MUSIC	131	Keyboard Instruction I	Revised description, revised SLO's (2), revised objectives and content.	J. Lawson	Fall 2016
MUSIC	132	Keyboard Instruction II	Revised description, revised SLO's (2), revised objectives and content.	J. Lawson	Fall 2016

Motion to approve all Consent Calendar Items on the October 15th, 2015 Curriculum Committee Agenda; Motion by Cindy Stephens, second by Julie Jacobson. All in favor: Unanimous.

NEW COURSES:

Subject	#	Title	Description of action	Author	Effective
HUMAN	115	Cultural Eras in Humanities I: Antiquity to the Late 15 th Century	3 units, 54 hours lecture, new SLO, new recommended preparation of ENGL-091, added DLA	A. Kalesman	Fall 2016
HUMAN	116	Cultural Eras in Humanities II: Late 15 th Century to the Present	3 units, 54 hours lecture, new SLO, new recommended preparation of ENGL-091, added DLA.	A. Kalesman	Fall 2016

Motion to approve HUMAN-115 & HUMAN-116: Motion by David Brill, second by Julie Cindy Stephens. All in favor: Unanimous.

NEW COURSES-DISCUSSION OF NEED:

Subject	#	Title	Description of action	Author	Effective
COUNS	095	UPGRADE: Building Academic Strengths	1 unit, 18 hours lecture, new SLO, added DLA.	A. Gesege	Fall 2016

Motion to approve and adopt the need for the COUNS-095 new course proposal: Motion by Julie Jacobson, second by Diane Solomon. All in favor: 2, Opposed: 8, Abstained: 1. Not Approved.

NEW/MODIFIED PREREQUISITES:

Title	#	Title	Suggested Enrollment Limitation	Author
HUMAN	105	Cultural Eras in Humanities I: Antiquity to Medieval	New recommended preparation of ENGL-091. – Approved	A. Kalesman
HUMAN	106	Cultural Eras in Humanities II	New recommended preparation of ENGL-091. – Approved	A. Kalesman
MATH	111	Finite Math	Removing MATH-075 prerequisite option. – Approved	S. Matsumoto
MATH	215	Differential Equations	Changed prerequisite to MATH-212 (formerly MATH-213). – Approved	S. Matsumoto

NEW DISTANCE LEARNING ADDENDUMS:

Title	#	Title	TYPE OF DELIVERY	Author
HUMAN	115	Cultural Eras in Humanities I: Antiquity to the Late 15 th Century	100% online, Online Hybrid. – Approved	A. Kalesman
HUMAN	116	Cultural Eras in Humanities II: Late 15 th Century to the Present	100% online, Online Hybrid. – Approved	A. Kalesman

Discussion Items:

1. 2015 Five Year Revision List Update. The updated five year revision list was reviewed by the committee members. Departments with courses on the list that have not yet been submitted will be contacted by their curriculum committee School representative.

2. Diversity Requirement:

New Courses Includes ISA's	2	Modified Non Credit Courses	-0-	Modified Prerequisites	2
New Programs	-0-	New DLA's	2	Deleted Courses	-0-
Modified Courses	5	New SLO's	2	Deleted Programs	-0-
Modified Programs	-0-	Modified SLO's	8	Proposals Reviewed in Technical Review Session	11
New Non Credit Courses	-0-	New Prerequisites	2	Proposals Returned from Technical Review Session	6

PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
For consideration Fall 2015

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has recognized the value of honors programs, encouraged their creation, and been concerned that they equitably serve California's diverse population (Spring 1998 20.01, Fall 1998 20.04, Fall 1999 20.04, Spring 2007 03.01, Fall 2011 13.12);

Whereas, Many presidents at California community colleges with honors programs have been contacted by American Honors, Inc. (AHI), a for-profit company, seeking to bring those existing programs under their corporate control, bypassing the local Academic Senate, its curriculum committees, and existing honors program faculty;

Whereas, Students enrolled in AHI programs pay an average of \$2,800 per year to the company in supplemental tuition and fees for participation in their honors programs,¹ and the company is reported to be seeking establishment of differential fees in California community colleges,²

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has confirmed its "opposition to any bill that attempts to establish a two-tiered system" (2012 06.04); and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has resolved to "support legislation and policy directives that limit need-based financial aid packages to public and private nonprofit colleges only" (Spring 2012 06.01);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office and other system partners to oppose the intrusion of for-profit honors programs into California community colleges; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to oppose the involvement of for-profit companies in provision of honors program opportunities and the insinuation of supplemental fees for honors program participation.

1. Moritz, B. (2014). Mission-Driven and For-Profit: Not Mutually Exclusive. Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council, 15(1), 29-34. (The author is Vice President for Academic Affairs for American Honors, Inc.)

2. <http://www.scpr.org/blogs/education/2013/12/14/15403/two-california-colleges-part-of-new-for-profit-col/>

Alannah Rosenberg

Saddleback College

September 9, 2015



President
David Morse
Long Beach City College

October 9, 2015

Vice President
Julie Bruno
Sierra College

Secretary
John Stankas
San Bernardino Valley College

Treasurer
Wheeler North
San Diego Miramar College

Interim Area A Representative
Grant Gould, American River College

Area B Representative
Dolores Davison
Foothill College

Area C Representative
John Freitas
Los Angeles City College

Area D Representative
Craig Rutan
Santiago Canyon College

Interim North Representative
Cleavon Smith
Berkeley City College

North Representative
Ginni May
Sacramento City College

South Representative
Adrienne Foster
West Los Angeles College

South Representative
Cynthia Rico
San Diego Mesa College

Representative at Large
Cheryl Aschenbach
Lassen College

Representative at Large
Randy Beach
Southwestern College

Julie Adams, Ph. D.
Executive Director

Chancellor Brice Harris
California Community Colleges
1102 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

Dear Chancellor Harris,

I am writing to inform you that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges unanimously supports the report of the Chancellor's Office 2015 Task Force on Accreditation and the recommendations contained within that report.

At its regular meeting on September 11, 2015, the Executive Committee of the ASCCC engaged in an extensive and thoughtful discussion of the task force report. Various issues were raised regarding the potential impact of the report, but the tenor of the discussion was clearly supportive of the report's conclusions.

At its following meeting on October 2, 2015, the Executive Committee took a formal vote regarding support for the task force report. The motion passed with one abstention and with no votes against.

At the 2015 ASCCC Fall Plenary Session on November 7, delegates from local academic senates around the state will vote on a resolution of support for the task force report. We will report the result of this vote to you once it is taken. However, in the interim between bi-annual plenary sessions, the Executive Committee is authorized to take formal positions for the ASCCC, and thus the Executive Committee conveys its clear and undivided support for the task force report and its recommendations at this time.

Sincerely,

David Morse
President

Summary of Accreditation Task Force Aspirational Vision for Accrediting Agencies

Characteristics of a Successful Accrediting Agency

- A. *"The accreditor emphasizes improvement rather than compliance."*
Accreditation should ensure the integrity of the community college system, not punish or weaken institutions.
- B. *"The accreditor demonstrates collegiality and consistency in all of its actions with member institutions and constituent groups."*
Accreditation should be equitable and avoid conflict of interest.
- C. *"Accreditation reports that indicate deficiencies include clear expectations for correction and allow reasonable opportunities for improvement."*
The level of significance of deficiencies is identified and sanctions are never a first response.
- D. *"The accrediting process and accreditor actions and decisions are transparent."*
The accreditor does not take actions in response to public input which appear to be retaliatory. Accreditation team members are selected in a transparent way using a process which involves system stakeholders.
- E. *"The regional accreditor demonstrates and maintains consistency with federal accreditation mandates and regional accreditor peers."*
Best practices for accreditation used by all regional bodies are followed.
- F. *"The accreditor provides quality training to commissioners, visiting team members and member institutions that is inclusive of all groups involved in the accreditation process."*
System constituent groups are involved in developing training. Visiting teams represent these groups equitably.
- G. *"The accreditor is responsive to and collaborates with California Community College constituent groups."*
Trustees, faculty, staff and students should be included, along with all levels of administration.
- H. *"The accreditor respects the roles and responsibilities of college and system constituent groups."*
This item specifically references bargaining units, along with Boards of Trustees, administration and faculty in other capacities. It captures our concerns with incursions into the scope of bargaining.
- I. *"Member institutions have a formal process for periodic evaluation of the accreditor."*
The formal evaluation is not an internal review but asks for feedback from member institutions.

SAMPLE LETTER ON THE ACCREDITATION TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Community College Chancellor Brice Harris

Office of the Chancellor

1102 Q Street

Sacramento, California

Dear Chancellor Harris,

We have read the Report of the 2015 Accreditation Task Force and we wholeheartedly endorse the Recommendations of the Task Force, specifically to either join with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Division or to explore affiliation with another regional accrediting agency.

Sincerely,

[NAMES AND ORGANIZATION]

Resolution in Support of the Recommendations of the Chancellor's Accreditation Task Force 2015

Whereas: The U.S. system of regional accreditation continues a long tradition of providing essential guarantees of quality in America's post-secondary institutions; a spirit of collaboration and mutual respect between the regional commissions and their member institutions is essential to the success of the system of accreditation; and a shared focus on the needs and interests of students is primary and vital to preserve, and

Whereas: Over the last decade, the relationship in the Western Region between the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) and California's 112 community colleges has changed from one of constructive collegiality to one in which the member colleges increasingly report antagonism, intimidation and fear, and

Whereas: The ACCJC levels sanctions against California community colleges at a rate that is 400% of the sanction levels seen in other regions and in four-year California institutions,

Whereas: Concerns about the changed nature of the relationship between the ACCJC and many of its member institutions have been documented by resolutions, articles and complaints prepared and approved by leading statewide organizations of professional educators, including the Community College Council of the California Federation of Teachers (CCC-CFT), the Community College Association of the California Teachers Association (CCA-CTA), the California Community College Independents (CCCI), the Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges (FACCC) and the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges (ASCCC),

Whereas: Many Administrative, Trustee, Support Staff and Student Groups have joined faculty in expressing concern about the actions of the ACCJC,

Whereas: The growing concerns regarding the ACCJC have led to a review of the ACCJC's financial impact on community colleges by the CA Legislature's Joint Legislative Audit Committee, creation of three separate Task Forces by the California State Chancellor's office, filing of three lawsuits against the ACCJC, and multiple public statements of concern from members of California's Congressional delegation as well as state legislators, and

Whereas: The ACCJC's frequent sanctions based on the legitimate activities of trustees of Community College District Boards have raised serious concerns regarding the free speech rights of elected officials and the rights of voters to representation by duly elected officials, and

Whereas: Areas of non-compliance found during the ACCJC's regular review by the U.S. Department of Education prompted the DOE to continue its recognition of the ACCJC as an accrediting body for only a one-year period -- in which it must demonstrate compliance -- instead of the standard five-year period for renewal of recognition, and

Whereas: The 2015 Chancellor's Accreditation Task Force Report has researched and reported on the actions of the ACCJC and has recommended unanimously that the Chancellor either pursue joining the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission or affiliating with another regional accreditor,

**Resolution in Support of the Recommendations of the Chancellor's
Accreditation Task Force 2015**

Therefore Be it Resolved: That [Our Organization] hereby joins with our colleagues throughout the state to express deep concern over the adversarial relationships fostered by the ACCJC, which pose a threat to fair accreditation and access to public higher education in California, and

Be it Further Resolved: That this body stands in strong support of the recommendations made by the Chancellor's 2015 Accreditation Task Force Report and endorses a new model for accreditation, including options such as forming a combined single accrediting commission with community colleges joining WASC Senior College and University Commission, in keeping with the prevalent model for regional accreditation, or identifying other regional accreditors that could serve the California Community Colleges.

Date _____

Title

Title

Title

Discussion Item 3: Canvas (Learning Management System) Training

Distance Learning is proposing that all faculty who want to use Canvas (for online/hybrid or web-enhanced classes) must complete 6 hours of Canvas Training at COC.

Distance Learning is also proposing that faculty who will be piloting Canvas in the Spring must complete 4 hours of Canvas Training at COC prior to Jan 1, 2016.

Questions to consider:

- Should training be mandatory?
- Can faculty learn on their own? For example, why can't faculty just watch the Canvas training videos online?
- If training is mandatory, how many hours is needed?
- Can we allow faculty to place out of the required training, similar to our students taking a placement test?
- Can faculty be trained anywhere (as we did for Blackboard)?
- How do we recognize that some faculty may already know how to use Canvas?

Example email:

"One of the business adjuncts has asked about the required Canvas training. I know that this is likely to be a topic for discussion in the senate, so i wanted to share her story as evidence we need some flexibility on the rule of required COC training for canvas.

Bianca Phillippi is a Harvard educated faculty member who has been using Canvas at least at one other institution. She has created these courses from scratch. She believes she has so much experience that she could TEACH the Canvas class that she would be required to take. It would be a colossal waste of her time."

2015-16
Santa Clarita Community College District
College of the Canyons
Credit

Part II: Planned Credit SSSP Expenditures

Report planned expenditures of the Credit SSSP allocation by object code as defined by the California Community Colleges Budget and Accounting Manual. Although they appear in the Manual, not all expenditures listed are appropriate for Credit SSSP purposes. Refer to instructions below. Please refer to the SSSP Funding Guidelines for more information.

	Classification		Orientation	Assessment	Counseling/ Advising/Other Ed Planning	Follow-up	SSSP Research/ Coordination * (see below)	Total
1000	Academic Salaries: List by Position Title(s)	# of FTE Positions						
	SSSP Director	1.00	\$ 35,102	\$ 35,101	\$ 35,101	\$ 35,101	\$ -	\$ 140,405
	Adjunct Counselors	3.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 80,100	\$ 34,328	\$ -	\$ 114,428
	Full time Counselors	7.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 367,730	\$ 134,876	\$ -	\$ 502,606
	Transfer Center Director *	0.10	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,837
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Subtotal		\$ 35,102	\$ 35,101	\$ 482,931	\$ 204,305	\$ -	\$ 769,276
2000	Classified and Other Nonacademic Salaries: List by Position Title(s)	# of FTE Positions						
	Dean, Enrollment Services	0.05	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,225	\$ 7,225
	Academic Advisors	3.00	\$ 17,314	\$ 7,201	\$ 121,203	\$ 34,631	\$ -	\$ 180,349
	eLearning Specialist	0.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000
	Noncredit Academic Advisor	1.00	\$ 28,805	\$ -	\$ 28,805	\$ 7,201	\$ -	\$ 64,811
	Part time Proctors	3.00	\$ -	\$ 83,700	\$ 9,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 93,000
	Part time Program Advisors	3.00	\$ 22,000	\$ 11,000	\$ 77,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 110,000
	Part time Temporary Staff	0.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,600
	Part time Temporary Staff - Noncredit	1.00	\$ 6,000	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,000
	Peer Advisors	3.50	\$ 7,380	\$ -	\$ 66,420	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 73,800
	Program Advisors	2.00	\$ 11,678	\$ 11,000	\$ 77,000	\$ 2,400	\$ -	\$ 102,078
	Researcher	0.30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,954	\$ -	\$ 23,954
	Senior Researcher	0.30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,037	\$ 33,037
	SS Program Specialist - Assessment	1.00	\$ -	\$ 46,320	\$ 5,790	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52,110
	SS Specialist II - SSSP	1.00	\$ -	\$ 53,628	\$ 5,959	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,587
	SSSP Database/MIS/Web	1.00	\$ 5,100	\$ 5,100	\$ 20,400	\$ 25,500	\$ -	\$ 56,100
	SSSP Noncredit Coordinator	1.00	\$ 7,800	\$ 46,800	\$ 15,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 70,200
	SSSP SS Coord II - Computer Support	0.50	\$ 12,071	\$ -	\$ 12,036	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,107
	Transcript Evaluator	1.50	\$ -	\$ 21,587	\$ 43,296	\$ 7,216	\$ -	\$ 72,099
	Transfer Center Coordinator	1.00	\$ 6,293	\$ -	\$ 44,054	\$ 25,174	\$ -	\$ 75,521

	Adult Reentry Coordinator*	0.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,532
	Financial Aid Director*	0.12	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,250
	Assistant Director, Admissions & Records*	0.05	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,206
	Outreach Director*	0.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 65,064
	Student Support Manager*	0.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,600
	Subtotal		\$ 124,441	\$ 298,336	\$ 530,463	\$ 156,076	\$ 40,262	\$ 1,286,230
	Classification		Orientation	Assessment	Counseling/ Advising/Other Ed Planning	Follow-up	SSSP Research/ Coordination * (see below)	Total
3000	Employee Benefits: List by Position Title(s)							
	Fringe Benefits		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 776,024
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Subtotal		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 776,024
4000	Supplies & Materials							
	Non-Instructional Supplies		\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 16,707	\$ -	\$ 46,707
	Tests		\$ 55,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ 74,000
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Subtotal		\$ 60,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 20,707	\$ -	\$ 120,707
5000	Other Operating Expenses and Services							
	Conferences		\$ -	\$ 8,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 7,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000
	Contracts		\$ 7,470	\$ 1,500	\$ 22,970	\$ 21,530	\$ -	\$ 53,470
	Other Expenses		\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ 18,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 600	\$ 30,600
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Subtotal		\$ 9,470	\$ 9,500	\$ 50,970	\$ 38,530	\$ 600	\$ 109,070
6000	Capital Outlay							
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Subtotal		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7000	Other Outgo							
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Subtotal		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grand Total			\$ 229,013	\$ 347,937	\$ 1,099,364	\$ 419,618	\$ 40,862	
Total Planned Expenditures cannot exceed the 2015-16 Credit SSSP Allocation								

Summary- Noncredit 3SP plan

The Academic Senate has asked that I provide a summary to the noncredit SSSP plan regarding the budget and positions dedicated to the program. Below are the allocations from the state for noncredit and the use of Credit SSSP money funding positions in Noncredit SSSP.

There are currently 2 full time positions and 2 part time positions funded through SSSP. We are expecting to hire another 3-4 part time positions with the new money received.

Noncredit SSSP

The noncredit SSSP allocation is \$32,419. The funding is broken up into the following locations:

Object Code (budget #)	Name of Budget line Item	Amount
51490	Adjunct Supplementary Services	\$500
52310/52320/53000	College Assistant/Short term employee/Fringe Benefits for Short Term Employee	\$32,234
64550	Supplies	\$185

- The Adjunct Supplementary Services are used to pay adjunct faculty for help in development of cut scores and multiple measures for the noncredit ESL assessment tests.
- The College Assistant/Short Term Employee funds are used to pay for 2 currently employed part time employees. One has been paid on the noncredit SSSP budget for years, one is a new hire that we hired in August.
- The small supply budget is for the few supplies we need for the core services.

Credit SSSP

The credit SSSP contribution towards noncredit is \$237,270. The funding is broken up into the following locations:

Object Code (budget #)	Name of Budget line Item	Amount
52110	FT Classified Administrator	\$78,000
52120	FT Classified Clerical	\$72,012
53000	Fringe – Classified Administrator and Classified Clerical	\$57,758
64360	Tests	\$3,500
52310	College Assistants	\$24,000
64550	Supplies	\$2,000

- The FT Classified Administrator is a new hire, Lisa Pavik. She started in the newly created position in July 2015.
- The FT Classified Clerical is also a new hire, Anthony Morris. He is an academic advisor hired in July to split time between credit and noncredit needs. His focus will be on noncredit.

- The College Assistants are new hires. They are due to start in October.

Other notes

- We have received word we will be receiving an additional \$31,845 for a total of \$64,264 for the 2015-2016 year. This was sent to us on October 12, 2015 and we will need to decide what to do with the additional funds. I believe, with this new amount, we will return \$31,845 to the credit SSSP. We will be meeting with fiscal to determine the best course of action for this.
- There is no supplanting occurring in noncredit SSSP. The people who were funded through SSSP in the past are funded again this year. All new money is going towards new hires.

Click to add header

2015-16 Noncredit Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Budget Plan for fiscal reporting period July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016

					District:	Santa Clarita CCD
					College:	College of the Canyons
					select your college	

Submit the Budget Plan with signature page by email no later than **Friday, October 30, 2015**.

Email to: noncreditSSSP@cccco.edu

and

Mail signature page with original signatures (postmarked by October 30, 2015) to:

Patty Falero, Student Services and Special Programs Division
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
1102 Q Street, Suite 4554
Sacramento, CA 95811-6539

For assistance in completing this report, you may contact:
Chris Graillat - cgraillat@cccco.edu - (916) 322-7988.

This workbook contains 6 protected spreadsheets in the following order:

1 Cover Page	3 Part I: Funding	5 Part III: Planned District Match
2 Select District/College	4 Part II: Planned Noncredit SSSP Expenc	6 Summary

Basic instructions:

Show expenditures from your Noncredit SSSP allocation as well as district contribution in accordance with the [SSSP Program Guidelines](#). In addition, these expenditures must be clearly identified in your program plan. At the bottom of some of the spreadsheets (or the back of the page if printed) are instructions for certain cells. You will be able to enter whole numbers only (no cents).

If you need additional rows to complete your data entry in Part II or Part III, use the password to unlock sheet (budget1516). Be sure to lock the sheet when finished.

-  Yellow colored cells allow you to enter a value, either by selecting from a drop down list or typing in the cell.
-  Blue colored cells indicate a pre-populated cell and cannot be modified.
-  Gray colored cells indicate a formula and cannot be modified.



Friday October 30th 4:30-7:00pm, UCEN Lobby

***This Event is a Fundraiser for the Emeriti Scholarship,
which benefits Students of COC Employees***

Eat German Food!



Grilled German sausage sandwiches
German potato salad, Bavarian pretzels
Watermelon mint salad, plus German
Beer/wine or ice tea.

Play Fun Games!



Win raffle tickets
playing FREE outdoor
games and group trivia

Win Great Prizes!



Buy raffle tickets (\$10/arm length)
to win one of our more than 20
fantastic raffle items

Purchase Tickets through the COC Foundation Webpage*

(*indicate donation is for Oktoberfest 2015)

- **\$20/ticket:** purchased by Oct 19th (get 5 raffle tickets with pre-order)
- **\$25/ticket:** at the door

Each ticket buys an assortment of German food & 2 drinks (beer/wine/non-alcoholic). Net proceeds support the COC Emeriti Scholarship.

