College of the Canyons Academic Senate
February 22, 2018
3:00 p.m. to 4:50 p.m. BONH 330
AGENDA

Notification: *The meetings are audio recorded for note taking purposes. These recordings are deleted once the meeting summary is approved by the Academic Senate.*

A. Routine Matters
1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
   This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Academic Senate on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Committee Appointments:
   - Dustin Silva, Senate Elections Committee appointment.
   - Updated Tenure Committee List
5. Approval of the Consent Calendar
   - Academic Senate Summary, February 8, 2018 (pg. 3-23)

B. Reports (time limit 7 minutes each)
1. President's Report, Rebecca Eikey
2. Vice President's Report, Jason Burgdorfer
3. Campus Culture and Safety- Barry Gribbons

C. Action Items
1. Peer Review Process for Program Review, Jason Burgdorfer (pg. 24-29)
2. BP 4020 - Program and Curriculum Development-David Andrus (pg. 30-32)
3. Environmental Science-Biology Merge Rubric- Lisa Hooper (pg. 33-35)
4. Election Results – Academic Senate President, Vice President, Adjunct

D. Discussion (time limit 10 minutes each)
1. CCCCO Guided Pathways Workplan, Denee Pescarmona
2. Standard Components for Academic Senate Committee Charters (pg. 36)
3. Mission Statement Proposed by CPT November 20, 2017- Jason Burgdorfer (pg. 37)

E. Unfinished Business
1. Faculty Professional Development Committee Procedures
2. Ad Hoc Committee Update – OEI Rubrics, Anne Marenco
3. Curriculum Committee Procedures, Lisa Hooper
4. Resolution in Support of Resources for the Academic Senate
5. Emeriti Scholarship Requirements-Jason Burgdorfer
6. Fall 2017*/Spring 2018 Adjunct Discipline Lists
7. Discipline Memos for New Fulltime Faculty

F. New Future Business

Request to place an item for a future agenda is welcomed. Below is a list of topics that will be discussed at a future business date.

1. TOP Code Alignment Project Update
2. CWEE Courses & Work Based Learning
3. BP/AP 4021 Program Viability

G. In Committee

Here is a list of policies that the Policy Review Committee is working on in the event someone would like to attend. Please contact David Andrus if you would like to be informed when one of the specific items below will be discussed in committee. Policy Review meets every Thursday from 2:00 – 3:00 pm in BONH 330.

Student Discipline (BP 5529, 5530, 5531)
AP 7120 Recruitment and Selection
Academic Freedom AP 4030
Matriculation Policies BP 5050
AP 5909 International Students
BP 5053 Assessment

H. Announcements

- o Next Academic Senate Meeting – March 8, 2018
- o Upcoming elections for School Senators, Department Chairs and Curriculum Committee members.
  These are for Fall 2018-2020
- o 2018 Accreditation Institute February 23-24, Anaheim
- o 2018 Spring Plenary Session, April 12-14, San Mateo
- o 2018 Career and Noncredit Education Institute, May 4-5, Costa Mesa
- o 2018 Faculty Leadership Institute, June 14-16, San Diego
- o 2018 Curriculum Institute, July 11-14, Riverside

I. Adjournment

If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in the public meeting, or if you need an agenda in an alternate form, please contact the Academic Affairs Office at College of the Canyons at least 48-hours before the scheduled meeting.

Academic Senate Summary for February 8, 2018

Voting Members					
Senate President	Rebecca Eikey	A	SBS Senator	Rebecca Shepherd	X
Vice President	Jason Burgdorfer	X	Business Senator	Gary Collis	X
Immediate Past President	VACANT		Learning Resources Senator	Erin Barnthouse	X
Curriculum Chair	Lisa Hooper	X	At Large Senator	Erika Torgeson	X
Policy Review Chair	David Andrus	A	At Large Senator	Jennifer Paris	A
AT Senator	*Lee Hilliard for Regina Blasberg*	X	At Large Senator	Deanna Riveira	X
MSHP Senators	Mary Bates	X	At Large Senator	David Brill	X
VAPA Senator	*Michael McCaffrey for Wendy Brill-Wynkoop*	X	At Large Senator	Saburo Matsumoto	X
Student Services Senator	Garrett Hooper	X	At Large Senator	Benjamin Riveira	X
Humanities Senator	Marco Llaguno	X	Adjunct Senator	Noemi Beck-Wegner	X
Kinesiology/Athletics Senator	Phillip Marcellin	X	Adjunct Senator	Carly Perl	X
			Adjunct Senator	Aaron Silverman	X

Non-voting Members	
Dr. Buckley	A
Marilyn Jimenez	X
Dan Portello	A
Dr. Wilding	A
Devon Miller, ASG	A

Guests	
Aivee Ortega	
Heaven Warner	
Omar Torres	
Dr. Dianne Fierro	

A. Routine Matters
1. Call to order: 3:00pm
2. Public Comment: None
3. Approval of the Agenda: Motion to approve Deanna Riviera, seconded by Mary Bates, none abstained. Approved.
4. Committee Appointments:

These are appointment set forth by our constitution and listed here for informational purposes. We will clarify if these items are to set as an Action for the next Senate Agenda meeting.
- [Tenure Committees 2017-2018](#)
- Gary Quire, CASL
- Sarah Etheridge, Scholarly Presentation Committee Chair
- Regina Blasberg & Nicole Faudree, Taskforce AB-288/Dual Enrollment
- Marco Llaguno, Tammy Bathke and Majid Mosleh, Equity-Minded Practitioner Work Group.

5. Approval of the Consent Calendar: Motion to approve Mary Bates, seconded by Garrett Hooper, none abstained. Approved.

1. Academic Senate Summary, December 7, 2017 (pg. 3-23)	
2. Full-Time Senator 2018-19: Marco Llaguno Senator for Humanities Department.	3. Erika Torgeson, Guided Pathways Liaison Student Services (pg. 29-30)

B. Reports (time limit 7 minutes each)

4. President's Report, Rebecca Eikey
   - President will share the report at the next Senate Agenda meeting on February 22, 2018.

5. Vice President's Report, Jason Burgdorfer
   - There were a couple absences here but those individuals will be here for next meeting to continue discussion.
   - Vice President asks that during the public comment period that everyone bring any ideas or concerns you have. We have the COCFA as a representative for working conditions but if you have any Academic conditions you want to address. If you bring it up in the beginning then we can put it out on the next agenda.

6. Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies update, Aivee Ortega
   - Rebecca has asked that I share with you an update and an idea of what we have been working on. A copy of the "Discipline Assignments (Minimum Qualifications)" handout was distrusted to the senators and guests. There are three entities on the sheet, Disciplines, Faculty and Courses that make up how courses and how faculty are hired. We hire faculty according to discipline, then we assign courses according to discipline and this is who can then teach these courses. The dilemma is that Academic Senate receives these discipline assignments and for example it will read, Garret is being hired for those listed discipline assignments. Then we have Curriculum separate, here are the counseling courses and their assigned Disciplines and if you refer to the venn diagram the connection between human resources and curriculum is the disciplines. We have two different lists that don't connect at all, and we have a disconnect. Who can teach? We don't know. How is this discipline connected to this course? We don't know. We wanted to bridge the connect connection between faculty and curriculum. This has been a project in the making for over a year. We are hoping that this new database can bridge the three entities together. I will use myself as an example, I am in counseling, but let's say for example Jane Doe is also listed as Counseling in Psychology. Marilyn currently has this information listed in an excel spreadsheet discipline, faculty memo (and we will connect about that) and Lisa has a list of the course. I have actually an older list that Lisa and Patrick gave me to test out, eLumen does not have this challenge. For example this will list all of the Physical Science courses assigned to that disciplines. How do we connect the two pieces? You can look at it according to faculty, discipline and course or course, discipline and faculty. For example, I am assigned to counseling and these are all the courses assigned to counseling. If I have a second discipline I can go in here and see all the courses in psychology and courses I can teach. This is more for Senate to have a big picture and how all these different entities connect to this.
       - Senator comments a primary objective of this project is to make sure Chairs have a current list of available instructors. So when they are searching for people to each, at times someone may need MQ's not in the department but in

another department. Knowing that you have a qualified instructor in an emergency situation can really take the stress away from the chairs.

- I am working with Marilyn on how to get the different entities. For example, I don't have someone that can teach Anthropology 101 and lab but this system will pull up all the names. Let me pull up Counseling (Aivee clarifies the system is not pulling up individual qualified to each Counseling because she hasn't update this information into the database) there are only two people on this list, myself and Jane Doe. For example who can teach this Counseling 101? The database will pull up a list of people who can and what they were hired under. The three entities, Curriculum information, Human Resources information, the pre-loaded 2017 State Chancellors office handbook (which are approximately 243 positions) where all uploaded by a click of a button. All I need to do is get these different list from these different entities and then load that information into the database. We are thinking of doing this once a year.
  - ➢ Omar Torres (Academic Affairs) asks: We have an engineering course, Solid Works 114 where the minimum qualification aren't engineering courses but drafting.
  - ➢ Senator comments and suggest that all chairs check and see what disciplines are assigned to which courses in their areas
  - ➢ Omar Torres adds, all of the other courses require for example a Master's in Engineering, this is the exception.
  - ➢ Senator comments, we have disciplinary courses where you have to have primary training in one filed and supplementary training in another field to be eligible to teach that course. We don't have many of these but interdisciplinary can become more complicated.
- Aivee adds, if you see in the actual discipline in the MQ handbook should be interdisciplinary studies but notes will say here are the different disciplines. We are hoping to have this database running by fall. We will put all the different discipline memos that come through in this database eventually.
  - ➢ Senator asks, once this is all together who is going to maintain it? Senator answers, I believe that is Marilyn and it should be a click of a button.
- The key here to remember is that the assignments need to match the discipline and the courses need to match the discipline. For example, I will see in a discipline assignment memo that we hired Jane Doe for "Counseling" but it will read "Counselor." This will not load because it has to be a perfect match.
  - ➢ Senator comments, on occasion (and we have been catching it at the Senate) but sometimes people are being assigned to disciplines that exist under that same name but they change.
- Thank you for point that out, we have recently discovered in Animation that someone was hired for Animation but that discipline assignment did exists a while back but in the MQ handbook there is no Animation. It is listed under Graphic and Multimedia Design. We had to go back and fix that. This system will eliminate any discrepancies.
  - ➢ Senator asks, when a person changes their name, they get married or divorced will Human Resources send that information? Will it get updated? I'm thinking of Julie Hovden, formerly known as Julie Jacobson, so with those types of things that can happen will they get changed?
- I don't know how Senate handles that?

- ➢ Senator asks, where are you pulling the list? Or are you hand inputting the list of faculty, Marilyn? Or is this populating from Datatel? Marilyn confirm it is a manual input in excel.
- I recall when I meet with Lita and Rebecca last spring they confirmed every time they receive a discipline assignment they were adding that in excel.
  - ➢ Senator states, you will then just load that information from an excel spreadsheet?
- Whatever information they entered from their discipline memo that is what they are loading. They are not getting a Datatel report from Human Resources, they are just getting the memos? They are coming from Human Resources and not Academic Senate.
  - ➢ Senators states, I can see Rebecca's point, that you can almost be incumbent on faculty members to follow their name change with the college. They will to forward that change to through senate.
- How is it happening now? For example when they get assigned to a committee?
  - ➢ Senator comments, I happen to know that when she is on curriculum for a time while she (Julie) as Hovden and Jacobson didn't work, so she couldn't get anything at the college for a short window of time. Something does happen on the Datatel level, did that happen to you?
  - ➢ Senator answers, some places have my maiden name and sometimes I have to use a blend. For example I can log in through one but once I am in it will address me by another name.
- What is interesting with Julie is that her email is still Jacobson. I don't think that has been changed.
  - ➢ Senator comments, I think the large question is there a master database for this information (there is supposed to be) such as Datatel and Datatel and Human Resource should be able to produce that.
- What they could do is rather than give you a discipline assignment (they could still give you a discipline assignment) but we can talk to Human Resources and say, ok once a semester produce this query of full-time faculty. We are not going to add Adjunct faculty as that is more complicated. We could ask Rian Medlin in Human Resources to once a semester, pull out a Datatel spreadsheet and we can then load into the database. Then we can match this information to your list to make sure your memos are correct.
  - ➢ Senator asks, are there any Computer Science people here, and is it possible to run a report based on any changes since the last time you ran a report?
  - ➢ Senator answers, it is a computer and you can program it to do anything.
  - ➢ Senator comments, or have Datatel generate a list of only new or modified names. If there is a last update button in Datatel for example that could run a report on anything last modified since this date.
  - ➢ Senator, this could help Marilyn.
  - ➢ Senator states, we are excited about your program but we want to make sure we do not lose any people in the process.
- Thank you yes that is a good point, it is nice to hear others concerns. When you have been working on a database it is easy to miss some things and it good to have someone else's view point on items that we may have forgotten. When we met in December about this, there were suggestions for different fields and I wrote those down. This is a draft we still haven't added those fields that we talked about. There is another handout

that I will wait to share until I have more information or clarity about what to share and I will wait until the next Senate Agenda meeting. Every semester we get a list of new faculty hires? I am sure you all get this list. Is this list in the agenda?

- Vice President confirms the list was added in the agenda summary for the fall. There are always some small discrepancies that we see.
- Aivee states, I will share the handout even though I am not clear as to what she (President) wanted me to share. The handout was shared and passed around with the senators. Just so you are aware of what we are looking for, when the faculty adjunct list is put together, there are somethings that I see that do not match with the qualifications and they may not be on the final list on the agenda. For example, the first one for adjunct in Child Development, the Minimum Qualifications say a Master's in Business in Math or Family Consumer Science with a specialization. Then in the right hand side it doesn't say what the specialization is. It just reads master's In Family and Consumer science at California State University Northridge. I know for a fact Masters in Family and Consumer science at California State University Northridge does not have an emphasis in Child Development it is its own masters. This is concerning, when I see this list, or when this person has already taught and I now I am trying to find this information. In writing, English is very specific, Master's in English literature or Comparative literature or composition. Creative writing in only good when you have a Masters in any of the above. But this person majored in Creative Writing, these are some examples of what we are looking for when we get the adjunct list.
    - ➤ Senator comments, not to worry anyone but if you offer a course with a unqualified instructor the student don't doesn't earn a grade and institution has to pay back all of the financial aid dollars (or a portion of that money) that they used on that course. We hear this a lot at the curriculum institute, "get this right." It's great to have someone like Aivee Ortega, in the role of a Minimum Qualifications chair, to help with this. The database is hopefully going to help chairs not get into those emergencies situations as often.
- When you get the full-faculty or adjunct faculty list these are some things you can look and understand the connection or the disconnection in the Minimum Qualifications and what their qualifications are. We are waiting on human resources to clarify the names on this list.
    - ➤ Senator adds, this has come up with other colleagues. We have a hiring committee, we have 80 different people applying, and we are reading all of these applications. There are a lot of people who get through the screening process and have interesting backgrounds but they meet the minimum qualifications for the job. I feel that these issues should have been addressed at the hiring committee before you are ever tasked with asking those questions. On a hiring committee we have 3-5 discipline experts who would be able to speak to that preparation.
    - ➤ Senator adds, even before that HR is supposed to be screening them before they move from consideration to the level one committee, this surprises me.
- Aivee states, we do get some that we screen but there are others that are missing information.
    - ➤ Senators adds, they send it to a chair sometimes.

- ➤ Senator states, when I served on the Hiring committee as a chair I would receive questions from Human Resources asking does this person meet the minimum qualifications?
- ➤ Senators adds, you know 90% is the 10%, the reading between the lines, that Aivee and her team have to determine. It is just not that simple.
  - Aivee comments, yes some of them are simple, some are straight forward black and white, and others I have questions and I bring it to the Equivalency Committee. I do the research before I present to the equivalency committee, for example here are the courses at CSUN and it is brought together and we all vote. The year that I've been chair there is one person who we have denied. Overall the process is not great.
    - ➤ Senator adds, and the state has decided to review the discipline assignment annually now, which didn't used to happen this often, but we are seeing more sub disciplines emerge and become their own disciplines and we are getting refinement. It is a lot of moving parts and speaking from the Curriculum chair perspective having a counselor sharing in the MQ's committee is so helpful because they are used to looking at transcripts, courses and they know to find course descriptions, they know how to look at articulation they can compare a graduate program and tell if they are comparable and it is something that all of us could do.
  - Another issue that I am looking into is, there is an individual trying to get hired in through Culinary Arts but we can't tell if it's an accredited institution. Rian will attest to this that the applicants, a part of it is, it is their due diligence to get us that information but they don't give us that information then I am trying to get all of the pieces together. The one that came electronically doesn't say if it's an accredited institution, there is nothing in the back to say if this is an accredited institution and here is the information of this institution. I am having to go to the website and now I might call because there is nothing on the document to say it is accredited. The diligence part on the applicant is not always there.

C. Action Items
1. Part-Time Faculty Discipline Assignment for Fall 2017 (pg. 52-53)
   - Vice President has stated there are some modifications we need to make to this list and we will need to vote to approve this list. We will need to remove some individuals from the Part-Time Faculty Discipline Assignment list (which was passed out with Aivee's notes.)
     - o Striking out April Alvarez, Rebecca Laff, Kyle J. Keller, Ryan Seymore, and David Tripoli, it is page 31,
     - o Senator, has asked why we are removing them?
   - Vice President has confirmed the degree is not specified what the emphasis is for April Alvarez and Rebecca Laff in the degree title at the moment. This is on page 41 Kyle Keller and Rebecca Laff pg. 42. Ryan Seymour is listed on pg. 47 and the last one David Tripoli is listed on pg. 48. For Tina White there is no equivalency listed, but it is a Master's degree in Geography in the discipline.
     - o Senator stated, Tina White is listed twice on this list.
   - Vice President confirms to strike the second one and only keep the first one.
   - Vice President comments there is also one for Math.

- Vice President stated on pg. 44., we do not accept equivalency #1 anymore and shared Aivee Ortega's notes and clarifications for Tina White and Linda Newland, "There is a concern that referencing equivalency #1 as the equivalency to a masters has no options. It may be confusing to still have the reference numbers that do not exist." Let's just list what the equivalency is in general. How should we approach this? Since we do not know what they are.
    - Senator adds, given that these people have already taught if we post pone it, it won't make much of a difference.
- Vice President asks the senators is there is a consensus on this action?
- Is there a motion to post pone to the next Senate Agenda meeting? Vice President agrees to post pone this item to the next meeting.

2. Proposed calendar for Curriculum and Senate 2018/2019 (pg. 50)
    - Has anyone had a chance to review it or see any possible conflicts with dates? With holidays or with spring break?
        - Senator states there should be Thanksgiving in there.
    - Vice President confirms, yes it is the Nov. 22nd the second senate meeting and it is blocked out as a holiday on the calendar.
    - Vice President asks, are there no objections? Motion to approve by Mary Bates, seconded by Carly Perl. Unanimous. Approved.
3. Administrative Retreat Rights updated (pg. 51)
    - This is an update list to reflect recent hires and recent retirements or resignations.
        - Senator asks, do we know who was taken off or added?
    - Vice President confirms Renee Marshall was removed.
    - Motion to approve by Deanna Riviera, seconded by April. Unanimous. Approved.
4. Approval of Nicole Faudree, Department Chair of Business & Department Chair of Paralegal Studies for spring 2018.
    - Is there a motion to make her chair? Motion by Deanna Rivera, seconded by Gary Collis. Unanimous. Approved.
5. Discipline Assignments:
    - We need to approve the new hire, Gary Quire, Business. There remaining names will come forth on the next agenda meeting.
    - Motion to approve for Gary Quire for the discipline of Business? Motion by Gary Collis, seconded by Mary Bates. Unanimous. Approved.

D. Discussion (time limit 10 minutes each)
1. Emeriti Scholarship Requirements-Jason Burgdorfer (pg. 53)
- There are some notes provided from the President:
    - "The Academic Senate in honor of the founding faculty member retirees and provides a scholarship to a student who is related to a College of the Canyons faculty or staff."
- Currently in the requirement to receive this degree we have a criteria of being a US citizen so for today the discussion is should we remove this requirement or should we leave it?
    - Senator asks, do we know if there was a history as to why that was there?
- Vice President responds, I do not have this history, does anyone else have the history or origins of this?
    - Senator adds, I think from what I understanding in regards to financial aid there is

certain documentation you have to have, not necessarily a US citizen but you have to have some documentation. Maybe they were trying to narrow it down so it was the same sort of criteria.

- ➢ Senator asks, is it possible for us to see, since it looks like it might potential go through financial aid, now so they can get the money up front. As opposed to them purchasing things and getting receipts to get the money. I personally do not think that is should say "US Citizen" even though this is an emeritus scholarship and the person is in some way shape or form related to a faculty member. We do have people who teach who may have a niece or nephew from somewhere else coming over for a semester but I think we have to make sure that they met financial aid requirements and that it would be consistent with that so they could get the money.
- ➢ Senator comments, I think that is should mirror what the financial aid rules are. It does state that they must be a US Citizen or eligible non-citizen.
- ➢ Senator comments, use that language and let financial aid figure it out.
- Vice President asks for clarification, keep "US Citizen or eligible non-citizen" and that makes things easier.
    - ➢ Senator comments, or meets the "eligibility requirements for student financial aid."
    - ➢ Senator add, I like that because then it can change and those requirements change.
- Vice President makes a note on suggested wording: "meets the requirements for student financial aid."
    - ➢ Senator asks a question regarding the "background", it says "the Emeriti's scholarship is established by its founding faculty members retirees" and then it reads "for a student who is related to College of the Canyons faculty or staff" why or "staff?" Is it related to someone who was a faculty retiree? But then it reads staff, it is confusing.
- Vice President responds, I don't know if this was set up jointly or if there are multiple pots of donations that may need us to broaden it.
    - ➢ Senator comments, it just sounds inconsistent. The retiree is the faculty or staff or faculty and staff?
- Vice President will discuss wording with President. For the purpose of eligibility meets the requirements of financial aid and leave it at that.

2. Peer Review Process for Program Review, Jason Burgdorfer (pg. 54)
    - We had started the discussion in the last meeting of the fall semester but we ran out of time. Just a brief review, if your chair, program review or committee chair, you have probably experience program review. It's going through some changes this year and the new changes will be available for roll out for the next academic cycle. One of those changes is to implement a peer review process and a chair can get together with another chair to compare their respective program reviews for the sake of personal growth, I don't want to say ensuring a common standard but it's your program review. It is mostly for collaboration and sharing and personal growth. The committee on student learning and with the program committee we have been jointly meeting this past year and we have come up with a set up procedures for the peer review process. There are 70-80 academic programs and we will take volunteers. We are hoping that all the academic programs can split this with a third going one year, a third going another year and the third last year just because there are so many programs and it is a three year review cycle. The comments in the peer review process are supposed to stay between the two faculties involved and shouldn't be forwarded to the next level, to a Dean or to Vice President. This should all take place before the program review is submitted to the level two. Ideally this would take place in the middle of the semester. Are there any questions?
        - ○ Senator asks, is this physically feasible to have it go to the peer reviewer then have the

peer reviewers complete the peer review, debrief with the person before it goes to stage 2. Chairs aren't getting program review information quickly enough to do that.

- Vice President clarifies, before it goes to stage 2. Vice President asks for clarification, is this coming from the perspective of two faculty members from different department being able to see their review or people submitting their peer review the day before.
  - o Senator adds, no, from the time the department chairs are receiving the information in the computer system that will allow them to complete their peer review. The timeline or deadline is for stage 2 is very narrow.
  - o Senator adds, this last time we had just two weeks. I kept asking when we are getting the data.
  - o Senator Rebecca Shepherd adds, if you only have two weeks plus your teaching, committee work and all other responsibilities, how do you make time for this process. I think it's a great idea don't get me wrong I just don't think it is physically possible. So I think we may need to advocate for shift in how the process is handled and if this is going to be supported by administration. If we could get the chairs the data in three or four weeks before we it has to go to stage two then we have time to draft and time to have someone look at it and talk about it, make the changes and go to stage two, otherwise it's not going to happen.
- Vice President adds, the data we are looking for is the budget, enrollment, completion and table data. This is going to be embedded in the new version.
  - o Senator adds, this is all uploaded but I think what the problem is, and I absolutely agree with Rebecca, is if that information is not available at the time then how are we going to add in this extra layer. It is a noble idea, and a lot of other schools are doing it, but if we don't have the data in place then we don't have time to do the extra work. We have to talk to Daylene Meuschke and Barry Gribbons.
- Vice President comments, to get a timeframe to suggest to them, if we typical submit the data at the end of the semester, what is the absolute latest we would want data uploaded?
  - o Senator answers, a month before, at least, that is going to be a quick turnaround. That would be consistent with chairs doing it, if they have only been allowed to two weeks and then adding two weeks on top and allow someone else to review it and consult I think what should be enough time.
- Vice President comments, we should try for October 1st and I'll see what we can do.
  - o Senator asks, if this required?
- Vice President answers, no this is optional on part of whoever is the chair at the moment. I know there is a work load issue, it is just to create a process and document it. Are there other questions? We also provided an example of what the peer review use as a checklist and go over the peer review, it is on pages 56 through 59. This will closely mirror what the new program prompts in the updated program review version rolling out next fall are going to be.
  - o Senator Rebecca Shepherd asks, when it says "peer review may be compensated for two to three hours per peer review."
- Vice President answers, we will have to see how long it takes. The idea is that if it's a collaboration.
  - o Senator asks but it would a specific amount of time each person would get is just hasn't been determined?
- Vice President answers, we have to do trial runs to how long this process takes.
  - o Senator comments, well I would advocate at a minimum three hours, for adjunct evaluations we get three hours. There is the initial meeting, you go in and sit in a class, and then you debrief. I am looking at this process and it is pretty rigorous and if you are getting together or you are communicating with the chair in any way. What are your

goals, and you have to talk to them. At a minimum I think it would be consistent with that and advocate for minimum of three hours if that. In the test trials if we see that is more than that then by all means take it up from there. But for two hours I don't think it's possible.

- Vice President comments, yes. Is anyone representing the Professional Development Committee? But I am sure they will work with us on that. Are there any questions on this? If there is no further questions on this, we will bring it back, we will read through this once, and then we will vote on it at the next meeting. If there are any further changes bring them in before we approve it. I'll make sure to explicitly state that this is an optional process so it is clear.
    o Senator Rebecca asks, is this in there somewhere in the application?
- Vice President answers, it was just assumed.
    o Senator Rebecca states, it should be explicitly stated. It should be obvious.
- Vice President answers, absolutely.
    o Senator Mary Bates, comments, I know this is all the programs split over three years I know you mentioned that. But what is some programs don't care to be reviewed? I would for mine if it wasn't in this third but if I could do it now.
- Vice President answers, the idea with that was being overly optimistic and saying everyone was on board with 80 people going the first year. If we have to do that, that is an absolute last measure. I should change these to suggestions now.

2. Prioritization of Full-Time Faculty Hires-Miriam Golbert (pg. 54-61)
    o Miriam is not here do we want to re-arrange the agenda. Can we make a motion to re-arrange the agenda and make sure we go over items four and five first? Motion to rearrange the agenda by Mary Bates, seconded by Rebecca Shephard. Unanimous. Approved.

3. BP 4020 - Program and Curriculum Development-David Andrus (pg. 78-82)
    o David Andrus was going to lead this item but he is not here. He did send us some communication earlier. David Andrus questions were shared with the senators. I am going to read David Andrus email.

    "Regarding BP 4020 and the definitions of "credit hour", I was hoping you could ask a question on my behalf. (I am assuming Omar is coming to field questions since he is the person that made the proposed revisions.) My question concerns out of class work beyond the 51 or 54 hours of instruction that is to be conducted in the classroom. Is there an obligation on the part of instructors to have students undertake a certain amount of work, per week, outside the classroom that is a ratio match of the in-class 54 hours of instruction? This issue came up when I recently asked someone if textbooks were required for instruction. Some instructors do not use textbooks. And most CORs provide examples of "required textbooks". But, CORs do not generally require textbooks and do not require a minimum of outside classroom work beyond the 54 hours. Some time ago I asked someone in AA about this. They indicated that the credit hour infers there will be some matching ratio of time spent outside the classroom on course work. (Assigning weekly readings from a textbook would suffice.) But, BP 4020 does not indicate this. Thus, and ultimately, what if an instructor does not require a textbook in his or her class? Is there an expectation based on credit hour policy that they ensure an equivalent amount of hours on other type of supplemental work outside the required 54 hours of class time? And if an instructor doesn't use a book and their handouts are quite inferior in content to that of a book, how do we address this in terms of credit hour

policy, academic freedom etc…?"

- o Omar Torres comments, when Lisa Hooper, Sab Matsumoto and few others were at the Curriculum Institute in the summer we learned that there was going to be a forthcoming change in Title V as related to the wording of the credit hour policy is and as what was currently voted on by the board of governors in late July early August and it has been in place ever since. When you look at the "red-line version" which I believe everyone has a copy of in the notes. I want to call your attention to a couple of things (which is on pages 78-82) what the credit hour policy was changed to and I actually brought this to the attention, (Its online and it is Title V section 550), and it does say that one credit hours of community college work shall require a minimum of 48 semester hours of total student work which may include inside and outside hours. The reason I point this out is that is says a minimum of 48 we use a term of multiplier such as 7.0, we usually schedule it on our catalog to max which is 54 hours. That is in the catalog versus when we actually schedule it is in the range between 48-53 hours. We try to be as precise as possible and it would be best to put that. That is what the college does and adhere to when we are scheduling, number 1. Number 2, and everyone should be clear I'd like to point out that I didn't like the way this was worded when it says inside and/or that bothered me. However, that is what was approved in the Title V language by the Board of Governors and this ties into with what David Andrus was getting into. At the curriculum institute (I should have made copies but I didn't) they gave us a PowerPoint or chart which covered what David was addressing regarding the ratios. Depending on whether it is a lecture or lab class, if it's a lab class the ratio of inside to outside of class hours will vary. If for example a lab class, a lab class will not have outside hours on this chart it will read zero and it would read 3 to 4 inside of class hours for a lab for a single unit, if it were a lecture, it would have the ratio of one to two inside and outside respectively. The power point goes into a few different permutations depending on what the class is. The bottom line is, the reason the change was made was because they were wanting to include the fact that for and in the course outline of record if a class does indeed require outside of class hours that has to be included in the course outline of record along with what the total number of hours are for both inside and outside and if you have had a chance to wonderful eLumen product, which is coming along, you will see that eLumen now has outside and inside required hours because we are required to have that information.
- o Senator Lisa Cooper adds, it is calculated for you. You say what percentage of the course is going to be lectured or lab and then it will do the calculations for you. But we are required by law to shows the students all the hours that they are expected to participate in this course. So it is not just the 51 hours that they are sitting in our classrooms but they are obligated to commit at least two maybe more depending on how they learn. That was the whole thing, the governor wanted more clarity, students were thinking that they should be able to learn everything in the one meeting that they have. How often have we heard that, what is ironic is we in "Activity" we are supposed to have homework at home we are the 2 – 1 but our lab peers are not allowed to have homework. So they ask, "How often are you to assign homework?" some assign homework all the time and some don't. But in a lab you would have homework all the time. It is a little odd and we have asked for some clarification regarding lab, you can ask that people do a little bit outside, it can't be a lot. This is all binding legally. My concern, with this is, and everyone understand legally we are bound to do the hours, but his questions about content appropriate and appropriately rigorous supplemental material is I think the big question for you. So what do you think Academic Affairs?

- o Omar Torres responds, you will notice again if you follow along with me, we also included the language about Cooperative Work Experience (CWEE) because that was additional language that was clarified in the current version of the Title V language so it does say, and I am reading from the actual Title V, 75 hours of paid work or 60 hours of non-paid work which we made sure to include that as well because that we not in our previous version of accredit hour policy. We are consistent with Title V. To answer David's question, out of class work beyond the 51-54 hours of instruction, we do have the ration that is the 1-2 ratio, for a standard 3 unit class, if you are teaching in class for a semester 54 hours of work then you are required to assign the students 108 hours of outside work to each the total of 162. You divide that by 54 and that is your 3 unit class that is how they did that calculation. But in terms of the integrity, the outside of class work and consistency amongst multiple faculty teaching in the same discipline for a same course that is a bigger conversation. I think Jason you had read, and I am looking at it now, one of the things David mentioned was the example of the required textbook, one class may have a required textbook and the other one may not. Was that the issue that came up?
4. Vice President confirms, yes.
    - o Omar Torres comments, Lisa please comment if I misspeak. A course outline of record has recommended textbooks. Now, we have to be very careful with that because if it is a CID approved class, the CID will list recommended textbooks and typically we should be listing those textbooks in our COR's or we risk a good chance of having the CID's kicked back to us. So this is one thing, and I mention that because there must be some sort of departmental consistency. Now having said that, as well all now OER is something very vague and we have been more and more encouraged to engage, and part of our equity measure, to assist our students that are struggling financially and otherwise to engage in OER. There is a huge movement to not only encourage faculty to incorporate the use of OER but we also want to make sure that there is integrity associated with it and a resource we are referring our students to a particular OER site and I think it is great that we are doing that. But to David's point I believe that that is something that the department has to scrutinize and what I am most concerned about whether the department is using a required textbook or OER textbook or whatever the case may be. It think that is the right of the department faculty to ascertain whether or not they are going to do that. But I want to make sure that we are doing is, if whatever source is being utilized for students outside of the classroom where there is requirement for those students to have outside of classwork, we are making sure that we are providing and outside of class work and so that students are successful.
    - o Lisa Hooper comments, with OER we are happy to use OER on the core but if you were to add a core to an adjunct would they be able to find the sources that we are using. For articulation purposes they do require that you provide a textbook. Some of the universities that our students would transfer too might not articulate your course without a textbook on it. We ask that you use both, at some point in the future it may not be necessary but right now we are not going to risk this. We are going to have more resources and add OER rather than take the textbook away. You are right Omar, from a collegial perspective we should be collaborating, we should be using the same text as often as can, whether it's a paper text or an open educational resource text. We should do that for the students if it's a paper text or have the opportunity to get it used or a cheaper copy all of those things. But what is someone doesn't, and in an instant the supplemental material that they are offering might not be fully appropriate or might not be rigorous for a college level course. What happens then?
    - o Omar Torres answers, I think that something like that would probably be better

addressed in the administrative procedure. I think that given that the actual Title V language does not go into that detail and if you really think about the difference between a core policy and an administrative procedure the AP going into, typically, more detail even though BP's are pretty long. Usually BP's are, the Chancellor will determine the method by which, such and such is going to ensue and the AP goes into the detail. The AP the board doesn't approve that but we vent that through the Senate and typically bring for example BP4020 would go through curriculum committee because it relates to curriculum development. In coming full circle to David's email my sense is and having thought is that is something that we may want to consider addressing, specifically in the AP. I agree with him and with you that we do want to have consistent standards, we do want to have language in place whereby if an instructor does not what is established by the department and ultimately is serving to hurt the students we want to have a means by which to address that in a way that coincides with department policies and school administrative procedures.

o Senator Lisa Hooper asks, policy committee what do you think?
o Senator Rebecca Shephard answers, I think it's a Pandora's Box.
o Senator Lisa Hooper adds, I think it's a management issue.
o Senator Rebecca Shephard adds, I think one issue is who would be assessing the quality of the materials, we have that same issue with OER. They are not all created equally and many of them are horrendous, they may look nice on the outside but it's worse than Wikipedia. How can you teach a college level course with faulty information? I've seen and I've been encouraged to use this and look at this for your class but I open up a chapter and on two pages I find five errors. There isn't an editorial review of experts, people who can edit and whomever wants to throw stuff in can throw stuff in and change stuff. There is no process to determine accuracy or rigor. I don't think that you can develop an AP for handouts by themselves that didn't also potentially include OER because there is no standard on which to be upheld. When you have publishers that are publishing there is at least editors, there's experts and they still find some errors. In OER there is no such process, anything can be put out in OER format and people are pulling them off because they are free for students. Let use this stuff but students are learning inaccurate information, incomplete, stuff that is not rigorous enough and it's not consistent with our course outline of record. I agree with you that this is a problem but I think it's much bigger than someone who is not using a textbook, it goes into OER's handouts and I'm not sure who would determine. Other than what is stated in the Course Outline of Record and made it thought curriculum. I am not sure how else we would do this. We could have a collegial agreement within departments that are functioning well with each other and try uphold these values and serve out students. But in departments where there isn't that level of communication and if you are looking at full timers and adjuncts and the sheer number of instructors it's hard to maintain that information. It may not be intentional. I don't even know what we would start to write.
o Gary Collis comments, it sounds extraordinarily complex. I suppose you could try and you could 50 people in a room and you would get 50 different opinions.
o Senator Rebecca Shepard adds, you don't want it to limited but you don't want it to broad either because then we are back where we started. So I don't know if there is any purpose in trying to put something down. Gary is on Policy Committee also and has a legal background like David Andrus in terms of what words to event try and use that would allow for Academic freedom but still assess quality. We just processed something that wasn't exactly related to this but it was a statement that as faculty we are going to try to consider these items. It was just written down in terms of best practices. People would have a document that would list these are best practices guidelines that the

college has adopted and try and get people to comply that way or at least to consider some of these issue where we are going to get an agreement.

- o Omar Torres adds, not to put Erin Barnthouse or Saburo Matsumoto on the spot, we've got English and Math respectively, for example the Math department is pretty specific on you use the same textbook for X number of sections you offer a particular course. Whereas Erin, (Erin is actually with the library, my apologizes) please correct if I am wrong, English departments allows instructors to be more flexible and choose whatever books they want for their respective courses. Just with those two departments right there, there is a completely different approach to whatever that standard is. Back to Gary's point you bring in 50 different people with 50 different disciplines and I would image we are going to get vastly different ideas on how to address David's questions. This is not something that the Board of Trustees or through the Board Policy would necessarily, in my opinion, regulate. What the credit hour policy is assigned to do is define what a credit hour is and that's what we are doing in concert with the recent changes in title V. Whether it's through an administrative procedure, or advocacy or at Senate with certain guidelines, how they are set up outside of an AP I think that's for all of you to decide in terms of our integrity of our collective forces here at the college.
- o Senator Rebecca Shephard adds, I don't think that any of this other information belongs in the BP420 and I agree with Omar.
- o Gary Collis adds, I don't think it belongs anywhere at all. I think it would be procedure if anything.
- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd adds, it may just be a senate guideline. I agree with you I don't think it belongs in the BP and I think that may have been what David may have been getting at in terms of what about this question. What do we want to do with this question and where do we want to put it because it does relate loosely to this.
- o Vice President Jason commented, ok I have taken down all of these notes and I will forward to President Rebecca and Senator David Andrus. Are there any other questions or thoughts on this? This whole discussion got me thinking about Winter Session classes at least 30 hours a week if it's a 3 unit class. We will be moving on to Discussion item number 5, we will go back to three later.

5. Mission Statement Proposed by CPT November 20, 2017- Jason Burgdorfer (pg. 81)
   - o Vice President stated, at the College Planning Team meeting in November a new Mission Statement was developed. You can see the current Mission statement just below the new revised proposal at the top of the page. This is just to get feedback on what you guys think before the college and the Board of Trustees formally adopts this Mission statement. This is the Mission statement for the whole college and this is not a school or program but the whole institution. I believe the strikes through and the additions where changes made since November 20th at the CPT meeting.
   - o Senator Rebecca Shepherd states, do we really have to put the words "clear pathways?" Is the pathways program that big that it actually has to be in our college Mission statement? And I am just asking, if it's that big and we have to put it there then we do but is the "clear pathways" really what our primary focus is?
   - o Senator Garret Hooper adds, am I wrong in saying that that was already in there? Is the strikes outs what's being taken out?
   - o Vice President Jason states, the "Pathways" was brought out in an earlier edition, probably September or October.
   - o Senator Rebecca Shephard asks, so "clear certificate or degree pathways" is said before instead of "clear pathways to…"
   - o Vice President, comments, yes. The comments and the concern was that, and I think

that's why it got cut back to "pathways" was because "certificates and degrees" doesn't describe everything that we do and "pathways" can be all encompassing.

- o Rebecca Shepherd, comments, and it says "future education and employment" and I do understand that statewide the push has been that but it has pulled away from the community college and more a moratorium for exploration. But non-credit is part of the college too but personal interest, personal growth we are not putting any of that in there, it is just can you transfer and can you get a job. But if someone wants to take a photography class just because they want to be a better photographer or they want to take a parenting class because they are hoping they can be a better parent at home, those are still some things we do at the community college level and those aren't addressed in the mission statement at all.
- o Senator Lisa Hooper asks, you don't think "skills" captures that?
- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd answers, but it says "skills for future education and employment?" I think "skills" does but when it ends it with "for future education and employment" it doesn't say for "personal growth, future education and employment." "Personal growth," would include non-credit but they are saying that is no longer in our drop down menu for COC in terms of why they might be taking the classes. I don't know, I know they won't like it, we can leave it as is but I just feel as that even in high schools they don't have a moratorium. They have their five pillars of careers and they have to pick when they are fourteen and they are pigeon holed in their more than five career areas. The students in middle school are expected to think about what career they want when they grow up, they don't know much about life how are they supposed to determine what they want to do.
- o Senator Garret Hooper, comments, it is not part of the performance based funding model. I think you have to give up on the personal growth thing.
- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd, ok personal growth is out.
- o Senator Lisa Hooper, comments, just for clarification, even non-credit is not designed for personal growth. Though for credit is, and that's different, that is fee based education. Non-credit is outlined in Title V, it has to have objectives to enhance your ability to be a functional member of the community.
- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd, I am fine with "functional member of the community" because if you are a better parent then that would do that.
- o Senator Lisa Hooper, so it is not necessarily "personal growth and exploration." When we think about the intent of what they are funding they are very purposeful in saying, "We are not going to fund your personal growth and exploration."
- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd asks, so the fee based is the stuff for that, so that's not part of our mission statement? Even though it's not being funded by the state.
- o Senator Lisa Hopper adds, I think we call it something and people explore but we don't call it that.
- o Vice President adds, if you look at the mission's statement from before, it was longer and the goal was to make it more concise. But there are a couple of statements that might lean towards what you are saying, the third line of the old one "the attainment of learning outcomes corresponding to their educational goals" that's more broad based, goals could be a lot of things. Down at the bottom it says "supports the development of global responsibility, and engages students and the community in scholarly inquiry, creative partnerships, and the application of knowledge." That was all thrown out for the sake of conciseness.
- o Senator Gary Collis, the "future" in this strikes me as bizarre. The reason I say that, is if they stuck the word future in front of the word education it seems to make more sense because are we preparing students only for future, because the education we are giving

is the education.
- o Senator Lisa Hooper, comments, for some disciplines it will terminate here.
- o Senator Gary Collis, comments, this somehow suggests that everyone will continue beyond here, either to a workplace or another institution. But if you took the word "future" out it makes more sense. So to encompass the idea that we are teaching people skills for educational purposes, for their own education.
- o Senator Rebecca Shephard, it actually would meet my concern too. It would be education, so I became a better parent, that's educational that's not future education.
- o Vice President, comments, you could be getting skills for your current job. So just delete "future" as a suggestion will make as a body.
- o Senator Gary Collis, yes. I was trying to figure out why they flipped "future education and employment" and then in this current version it suggest that "future" pertains to both "education" and then "future employment." You may not read it that way or that future only qualifies education which is also strange.
- o Senator Carl Perl, comments, if it just says education and you look through the entire very long sentence as a whole "this college provides… (many adjectives)…education for and leading to education" I don't know, maybe it needs to be a more distinct type of education.
- o Senator Lisa Hooper adds, actually all of those things are sort or surplus with clear pathways leading to skills and our employment. It could be skills for future education or employment. I don't even know if we have to go so specific. A missions statement is supposed to be very broad, all-encompassing, I enjoy the fact that we are accessible and highly supportive, learning centered but we are here to help you meet your goal, whatever your goal is and that's unique to the community college environment. Unlike our counterparts and the CSU's and UC's.
- o Vice President adds, accreditation does demand we put in the types of degrees and credentials that we offer in the mission statement.
- o Senator Lisa Hooper comments, we really don't have a lot of autonomy.
- o Vice President comments, that is on the ACCJC Accreditation standard, A.2. I don't know if this addresses that?

> ➢2. "The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission direct institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students."

- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd states, what if we say "to an accessible highly supportive learning center experiences that provide all students with clear pathways leading to….or education and employment." So we don't duplication education or we can call it whatever we want. But you are right it is redundant.
- o Senator Carly Perl adds, maybe just their future and it then encompasses anything you do after now.
- o Senator Gary Collis adds, what if you just put a period after degrees.
- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd, ok I like that too.
- o Vice President asks, and get rid of the rest?
- o Senator Gary Collis adds, do we have to explain why we are giving them degrees?
- o Vice President asks, do we have to put employment in?
- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd, do we have to put for future education and employment? So after skills, credentials, certificates and degrees, period do we have to say for education and employment? But I think they want those words "employment" is our mission.

- o Vice President answers, yes employment is part of the mission.
- o Senator Carl Perl adds, with our outcome based business, we want them to be a placement for employability.
- o Senator Marco Llaguno asks, why would "global responsibility" be taken out also, and I know that is probably for a different discussion but if we are talking about outcomes and I tell my students you guys are here because you want to be leaders in some capacity or other. I am training leaders on a global level or perspective and I want to give them those skills.
- o Vice President adds, I am trying to remember the discussion we had at CPT this kept blowing up and then contracting back down and I believe it was diversity that was meant to encompass that aspect.
- o Senator Deanna Riviera asks, when are we changing it?
- o Vice President answers, well it hasn't been updated?
- o Senator Gary Collis adds, well we have to have ACCJC review it for standards.
- o Omar Torres, comments, and well this is your discussion but I think we are trying to make more of an actual mission statement and I like what you are all discussing today. I don't know necessary when we will change the old one.
- o Senator Deanna Riviera, comments, I don't think we are ready to move forward at all.
- o Senator Lisa Hooper, maybe we can all look at four or five versions that we can all look at and then we can all cut and paste.
- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd, ok Jason that was a good bit of information to know about accreditation, standard one and what is required. If we could get some of those questions answered in terms of what components are required from accreditation, other power that be.
- o Vice President answers, I believe is it just those four questions listed. It is just these.
- o Senator Rebecca Shepherd, states, so long as we are alluding to these right here we are ok. So maybe we can do what Lisa suggest and look at a couple of variations.
- o Vice President, states, let's send it to the next agenda and send any suggestions you may have Rebecca and Marilyn, so we can have them printed out in advance so we can have all the various options by the next agenda. Have these in by next Thursday February 15, 2018 due to the holiday.
- o Senator, David Brills asks, where does this appear?
- o Vice President, answers, it is on the catalog, posters and it is posted on the walls sometimes. It is also posted on the homepage of the college website.
- o Senator, Marco Llaguno, when I was looking at, when I was being hired here, what drew me to this college was the global responsibility.
- o Senator, Lisa Hooper, I think this is a very modern, very forward looking term and I think that's what we try and pride ourselves on and I think it should be in there.
- o Omar Torres, comments, we are putting together an Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) application to attend a conference in June the SLO is pretty urgent. The (ACC&U) website talks about 21st Century Skills and one of the things they've added to their mission statement is about Civic Engagement. If we think about the world we live in currently but I am not going to get political but I think it is more important than ever to engage in Civic Engagement.
- o Dr. Dianne Fierro, comments, If you are looking at it is maybe a little shorter and to make sure that we put the things that we offer, the certificates, credentials and degrees where missing in the old version. Those where the two major things that I remember us discussing.
- o Senator Carl Perl, asks, would the accreditation requirement regarding the outcomes, does that mean the "employment" should stay in as well. It says if we use data, but

obviously there will not be data points in the mission statement, should we include employment?

- o Senator Gary Collis, states, but by looking at outcomes that would imply data.
- o Senator Mary Bates comments, I would think that instead of "degrees for future education" maybe it should read "degrees for transfer" if that's one of the ideas to transfer.
- o Vice President, comments, yes that is tricky because they could transfer or they could get an associate's degree and not transfer. Transfer wasn't on our mission statement at some point in our college history and it is gone now.
- o Senator Mary Bates, comments, well then future education should be there either. Transfer doesn't make sense.
- o Senator Lisa Cooper adds, yes but transfer is just one of the possible outcomes. I think that by naming all the different degrees and certificates you capture all the measureable outcomes that will be data points. Somebody is going to track employment at some point and that should be in there.
- o Senator Mary Bates adds, I like civic engagement, and global responsibility, I think it is important.
- o Senator Saburo Matsumoto asks who make the final decision. Where does it go?
- o Vice President, answers, it has to go through all the various groups such as CPT, Senate, and Student Government and then it is discussed and voted on by the Board of Trustees.
- o Senator Lisa Cooper asks, so everybody has use working on the same thing? How many of us are coming up with options?
- o Dr. Dianne Fierro comments, if you look at the steps, you are Step #4 then it goes through the first readings then it goes back to CPT and then it's approved. Your input is really important and I think you are having a great discussion.
- o Senator Lisa Cooper asks, is this the culmination of input from the other groups?
- o Dr. Dianne Fierro comments, I am looking at the list, this reads spring 2018 but it doesn't look like there are a bunch of groups working on it at the same time. CPT has taken their look at it (that's the note at the bottom of the page) ASG has seen it in the fall 2017, and then Classified Senate has looked it over in the Winter 2018 and now it is here in Academic Senate Spring 2018. According to this list I think it would go back to CPT and then list continues with more first readings and second readings.
- o Vice President instructs Senators to bring ideas back to Rebecca and Marilyn for the next meeting so we can first discuss as a discussion item and then action.

(2. Revisited) Prioritization of Full-Time Faculty Hires-Miriam Golbert (pg. 54-61)

- • Vice President comments, we are going to move on to our next discussion item. Miriam Goldberg was going to give an update on information starting on pg. 60 to 77 showing a narrative and history on some vacancies, new position and which hires have been completed. A few things which have come up there where two replacement positions for faculty that became deans in July of 2016 and the replacements where board approved. There was a Geography position approved in January-February 2016 and that was part of the big batch of 29, Psychology, Sociology to Biology. All those hires have gone through except for Geography, this was a discussion item to provide information that those positions are filled yet and we haven't seen an update from the Staffing Committee as to what's the status of those three positions. The two replacements for English and Theater and then the new authorized Geography position from a year ago.
- • Dr. Dianne Fierro responds. I appreciate that all that material is in there. Just earlier today there

was communication, not sure if your received it, but we are moving out all three of those positions. English, Theater and Geography will all be launched very shortly, we will need to talk to the chairs to get any updates to the job descriptions. We had two replacements that were on the recommended list of staffing, Nursing and Math and there was unfortunately a resignation from Galeen Roe, so there will be replacement for the library position. Then there was a temporary non-credit, business temporary. Sufficed to say all the replacements that have been recommended by the Academic Staffing Committee will be moving forward.

- Vice President confirms, ok all the replacements that have been recommended for hire are moving forward.
- Dr. Dianne Fierro states the ones that have been not yet but have been recommended from December and from the meeting this week will be on this Board Agenda.
- Vice President asks, when are those hires expected?
- Dr. Dianne Fierro, this will be for fall. We are hiring this semester for falls term. I appreciate your patience. We are excited that HR will be able to move forward with these.
- Vice President asks, are there any questions or comments on the background information for academic staffing procedures? I can try and answer for Miriam.
- Senator Rebecca Shepherd asks, so this list that we have in front of us is not indicating others, other than what Dr. Dianne Fierro was mentioning. We've got others on the list, such as strongly recommended that have already been hired. They are not off the list and they are not denoted in anyway. Can you clarify that?
- Vice President, answers, yes, so if you go to the page, which I will clarify, go to the page which reads "Academic Staffing Fall 2015 – Positions in order of ranking." The comment boxes, on pages 61-63, the first item is listed as Nursing. In January of 2016 there was a memo from the Chancellor to the Academic Staffing committee that recommended the hiring of all the positions that the staffing committee, in the fall, had ranked as urgent and all of those have been hired. All of the positions from the strongly recommended list, all of those have been hired except for geography. That is what we are waiting on. Then one position was hired from the recommended list and that was Political Science. To list those positions, to list what they were are on page 68 "New Positions to be Hired" that is the memo. There is a gray memo from the Chancellors office dated February 19, 2016 and it list the positions. The Board authorization to list these positions and are on page 71 under section A. Academic Personal with the estimated hiring dates. As you can see all of those positions where hired over fall 2016 - spring 2017 and Fall 2017.
- Senator Rebecca Shepherd asks, in terms of those that are on the table, the ones that are recommended, other than Political Science that were hired, what is the status of those on that recommended list.
- Vice President answers, those reintegrated with the staffing recommendations that people gave presentations this past fall, they were reintegrated in that list of recommendations. Some of the positions could have been pushed up on the list, pushed down on the list. We don't have that but we can put it up the current recommendation list if you'd like. I am probably not being clear.
- Senator Rebecca Shephard comments, I haven't seen it.
- Senator asks, has it being distributed publically?
- Senator answers, I believe it was sent out there was correction but I believe it was sent out and was shared by Miriam Goldberg last December 2017.
- Vice President shares that the list currently is on the Academic Senate website, under committees, under academic staffing and we have the Academic Senate Committee (ASC) recommendations here and you can click on "fall 2017 ASC Recommended New Faculty and Replacement positions." This is the new list and a lot of people present on it, so that large batch of hires was able to knock out 29 positions and more people presented for more positions so the list is back up to 40 plus positions recommended. The committee this semester choose not

to rank everything in order but instead to put in three broad categories. In that list you saw from a couple of years ago all of those positions where in order of priority. This just puts in alphabetical order within each category.

- Vice Presidents asks Dr. Dianne Fierro to speak to the Chancellor to see if any these have been approved?
- Dr. Dianne Fierro answers, the Chancellor did sent out a memo we are waiting on more budgeting funding formula information before we go forward with any new positions but the two that are on there that are listed as replacements we are moving forward with those right away. We hope to have more information very soon this semester to be able to speak to new positions. All the replacements and the three that had previously been approved we are waiting to be given the ok to move forward. We are all excited to get that going.
- Senator Rebecca Shepherd states, thank you this is very valuable information because we had second position that was from the list but we didn't know where we ended up but I see it now. We are so excited, thank you.
- Vice President confirms again, this is just in alphabetical order, Sociology is not last for that category. Just a shout out to the committee, I think there are still some vacancies. If you want to serve on the Academic Staffing Committee and you are from a school that has a vacancy, we will figure out what those vacancies are, please volunteer. We do need people. Is anyone serving on the Staffing Committee? Senator states, I think Miriam is going to put a call out to the division chairs. As retirements or recommendations come up the committee will recommend or not recommend replacement. Typically the recommendation for new positions, those recommendation are in the fall semester.

E. Unfinished Business

Vice President asks the senators, any comments on any of those unfinished items, anyone working on them or wants to bring them forward?

8. Standard Components for Academic Senate Committee Charters
9. Faculty Professional Development Committee Procedures
10. Ad Hoc Committee Update – OEI Rubrics, Anne Marenco
11. Deliberative Dialog: Campus Culture & Safety
12. Curriculum Committee Procedures, Lisa Hooper
13. Resolution in Support of Resources for the Academic Senate
14. Program Viability Committee recommendation to merge Environmental Sciences with Biology department.

F. New Future Business

Request to place an item for a future agenda is welcomed. Below is a list of topics that will be discussed at a future business date.

4. CCCCO Guided Pathways Workplan
5. TOP Code Alignment Project Update
6. CWEE Courses & Work Based Learning
7. BP/AP 4021 Program Viability

G. In Committee

Vice President comments, that In Committee there are several items going on but David Andrus is not here to present but he will in the next meeting.

Here is a list of policies that the Policy Review Committee is working on in the event someone would like to attend. Please contact David Andrus if you would like to be informed when one of the specific items below will be discussed in committee. Policy Review meets every Thursday from 2:00 – 3:00 pm in BONH 330.

Student Discipline (BP 5529, 5530, 5531)
AP 7120 Recruitment and Selection
Academic Freedom AP 4030
Matriculation Policies BP 5050
AP 5909 International Students
BP 5053 Assessment

H. Announcements

Vice President announces next Curriculum meeting is coming up, next Senate Agenda meeting is taking place on February 22, 2018. Are there any last comments for today? Motion to adjourn this meeting by Mary Bates, seconded by Phillip Marcellin. Unanimous. Approved.

- o Next Academic Senate Meeting – February 22, 2018
- o Upcoming elections for Academic Senate President, Academic Vice President, School Senators, Adjunct Senators, Department Chairs and Curriculum Committee members.
  These are for Fall 2018-2020
- o Currently there is an open adjunct Senate seat for spring 2018.
- o 2018 Accreditation Institute February 23-24, Anaheim
- o 2018 Spring Plenary Session, April 12-14, San Mateo
- o 2018 Career and Noncredit Education Institute, May 4-5, Costa Mesa
- o 2018 Faculty Leadership Institute, June 14-16, San Diego
- o 2018 Curriculum Institute, July 11-14, Riverside

I. Adjournment: 4:46 p.m.

If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in the public meeting, or if you need an agenda in an alternate form, please contact the Academic Affairs Office at College of the Canyons at least 48-hours before the scheduled meeting.

D.2. Peer Review Process for Program Review

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Q&A for the Academic Program Review Peer Review Process

1. Who will the peers be?
   a. Peers that participate in the Program Review peer review process should be trained faculty volunteers. This group may include department chairs, former department chairs, and members of the Program Review Committee, and others who may be interested. There would be an effort to match CTE programs with CTE faculty peers, especially in years that the CTE addendum is due. At least one peer should be from outside of the department's division or discipline-area to provide more of a campus-wide perspective.
2. How many program reviews would each person be responsible for?
   a. Each committee member would be responsible for at least two peer reviews per year
3. How often will the peer review process take place? Is it required?
   a. All of the programs would be split over three years so that only 1/3 of the programs are being peer reviewed in any one year. A random draw at the start of each three year cycle will determine which programs are reviewed for each year of the cycle.
   b. At this point the peer review will be optional.
4. How will the peer reviewers be compensated?
   a. FLEX (2-3 hours per peer review), to be institutionalized as preapproved professional development
5. Would one person read an entire program review for a department or would there be "teams" that each specialize in a different section? SLO section? CTE addendum? Data table?
   a. One person would peer review the whole program review to get the whole picture and would not be split up in sections to accommodate the reviewer's expertise. However the peer review of a CTE program review should be assigned to another CTE faculty.
6. When in the program review process will peers be involved?
   a. The peer review process should occur before the submission of the program review to Level 2. The peer review process should be completed by the end of November.
7. Would the process be different for single-person departments than it is for large departments?
   a. No difference unless the department does multiple program reviews. In that instance perhaps each program review would be looked at separately.
8. Will the feedback from peers be formative or summative? Is the role of the peer review process to help or to evaluate?
   a. Will provide formative feedback
   b. Role of the peer review is to help and improve
9. Will there be written comments? Is there a rubric to help guide written peer review feedback and comments? Are Deans or other admin involved in the peer review process?
   a. A checklist/rubric and overall summary report will be used to document the peer review process and provide feedback.

b. These comments and written feedback should be provided before submission of the program review to level two.

c. These written comments would stay with the author of the program review and will not be forwarded to higher levels during the program review cycle. Peer Review is restricted to level one users.

10. What is the role of the peer validation process for budget requests? Will peers provide feedback regarding justifications and evidence for budget requests? Will peers provide any recommendations?

a. Peer reviewers should provide feedback on budget requests. They should look at if requests are tied to the program's goals, student learning outcomes, facilities/available space, or are pie in the sky.

11. What happens if a peer reviewer finds that there is not enough information provided in a Program Review? Is it sent back?

a. Comments would be provided in a checklist that corresponds to each section of the program review. The checklist will note per section if there is adequate/inadequate information provided or go into more detail in a comment box. The program/department chair can then make changes based on these comments if they wish before submitting the program review to level 2.

12. Are peer review comments/feedback forwarded along with the program review to level 2 and 3?

a. No, but the completed peer review checklists should be centrally stored for accreditation purposes

13. Who makes the final decision as to whether a Program Review is acceptable?

a. The department chair/program chair always makes that final decision. It is not the role of the peer review process to say something is unacceptable or prevent a program review from being submitted. The peer review process provides feedback and recommendation only.

14. At what point do Program Reviews become visible to the rest of campus? How? Are the posted online?

a. As per current practice program reviews will be available to the whole campus after level three of program review has been completed

b. Completed program review will be posted on the program review website.

15. What is the training process for program review? Who? What format?

a. Co-Chairs of the committee and volunteers from the committee would lead flex training sessions on best practices in completing program, process, budget/enrollment data terminology, and the latest changes to the program review module.

b. Training will be done on a roadshow to school or department chair meetings

16. What is the training process for peer reviewers?

a. Committee will train as a whole by piloting the peer review process on select programs and to establish common standards

Academic Program Review Peer Review Checklist/Rubric (Year 1)

Name of Faculty Peer Reviewer: _____

Program:	Department Chair:	Dean:	Date:

Program Review Element	Element Included Yes/No	Revisit Element Yes/No	Comments
GENERAL			
Program Mission Statement: Is included and describes program in question clearly and all populations served by program are represented			
Alignment: Description provided of how the program aligns with the College's mission			
Program Goals: Are included and appear sufficient			
Program Description: Titles and description match program outline in eLumen			
Program Student Learning Outcome: PSLO's included and measurable for each program			
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES			
SLO Reflection: Response to SLO prompt included and match adopted SLOs in eLumen and demonstrates thoughtful reflection on SLO results and impact on program			
INTERNAL FACTORS			
Data Sources: Descriptions and sources provided for outside data (if used)			
Program/Department Changes: Noted and impact on program discussed			

Program Review Element	Element Included Yes/No	Revisit Element Yes/No	Comments
Data Trends: Department trends (growth/decline in students, instructional load, student achievement/success are discussed and compared to the whole college			
Use of Data: Evidence provided of how the department/program is using and incorporating results (data) from assessments in decision making and to improve program quality or meet internal/external demands			
Enrollment Management Analysis: The following data trends are discussed to evaluate programs enrollment data and class scheduling (times of days and offering cycle):			

Enrollment Data Element:	Included Y/N
- Class size	
- Section count	
- Head Count	
- FTES	
- Program Awards	
- Retention	
- Success	
- Majors and Transfers	

Program Review Element	Element Included Yes/No	Revisit Element Yes/No	Comments
Facility Needs: Facility needs are identified and connected to enrollment trends, SLO's, curricular changes, and Educational and Facilities Master Plan for the following sites:			

Instructional Site:	Included Y/N
- Valencia Campus	
- Canyon Country Campus	
- Other Instructional Sites	

Program Review Element	Element Included Yes/No	Revisit Element Yes/No	Comments
Support Staff and Faculty Position Requests: Requests are supported by reasons, data, program objectives, and other evidence. (See Academic and Classified Staffing Forms)			
Equipment Replacement and Scheduled Maintenance: Needs identified and are on Chancellor office equipment replacement list			
Connections to Other Programs: Joint initiatives and connections with other programs noted/checked off			
Technology: Needs identified for curriculum delivery including hardware and software			
EXTERNAL FACTORS			
Economic Trends: Are identified and discussed			
Similar nearby programs: Are described			
Regulations: Externally imposed regulations identified and implications discussed			
Relationships: External relationships/partners identified and implications discussed			
STRENGTHS / CHALLENGES / OBJECTIVES			
Strengths: Departmental strengths identified and explained			
Challenges: Departmental challenges and possible solutions identified			
Objectives: Previous objectives are reviewed and statuses updated			
Objectives: are S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound)			
Objectives: Objectives included that directly relate to results of SLO assessment			
Accomplishments: Additional accomplishments included (optional)			

Program Review Element	Element Included Yes/No	Revisit Element Yes/No	Comments
BUDGET MODULE			
Budget Request Connections: Relationship between objectives and budget requests is clear in budget module			
Budget Request Rationale: Comments in budget module clearly articulate a brief rationale (why) for request AND the details (what) of request			
CTE ADDENDUM (If Applicable)			
CTE Addendum: Complete with all six questions adequately addressed			

CTE Prompt:	Check Box:
- Labor Market Data	
- Data Sources	
- Similar Programs	
- Placement Rate	
- Advisory Committee	
- Perkins Forms	

Program Review Element	Element Included Yes/No	Revisit Element Yes/No	Comments
OTHER			
Faculty Participation: Full time and adjunct faculty consulted in program planning and review listed and include more than just the department chair.			
Consultation Process: Discussed and supporting documents uploaded.			

Peer Review Summary Report:
1. **What are the strengths of this program review? What did you like**
2. **What areas of this program review could be improved? Any recommendations?**

§ 55002.5. Credit Hour Definition.

(a) One credit hour of community college work (one unit of credit) shall require a minimum of 48 semester hours of total student work or 33 quarter hours of total student work, which may include inside and/or outside-of-class hours.

(b) A course requiring 96 hours or more of total student work at colleges operating on the semester system or 66 hours or more of total student work at colleges operating on the quarter system shall provide at least 2 units of credit.

(c) Cooperative work experience courses defined in section 55252 shall adhere to the formula for credit hour calculations identified in section 55256.5.

(d) For programs designated by the governing board as clock hour programs, units of credit shall be awarded in a manner consistent with the provisions of 34 Code of Federal Regulations part 600.2.

(e) Credit hours for all courses may be awarded in increments of one unit or less.

(f) The governing board of each community college district shall establish policy, consistent with the provisions of this section, defining the standards for credit hour calculations. District policy shall specify the credit hour calculation method for all academic activities, expected ratios of in-class to outside-of-class hours for each type of academic activity, standards for incremental award of credit, standard term length, calculation methods for short term and extended term courses, and provisions for monitoring compliance with state and federal regulations related to credit hour calculations.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700 and 70901, Education Code. Reference: Section 70901, Education Code; and 34 Code of Federal Regulations part 600.2.

BP 4020 Program and Curriculum Development

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

4020.2   These procedures shall include:
(a) appropriate involvement of the faculty and Academic Senate in all processes;

(b) regular review and justification of programs and course descriptions;

(c) opportunities for training for persons involved in aspects of curriculum development; and

(d) consideration of job market and other related information for vocational and occupational programs.

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

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

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

4020.6   Consistent with federal regulations applicable to federal financial aid eligibility, the District has designated each class hour as a "credit hour" and established the definition of "credit hour." The class hour is the basic unit of attendance for computing the number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) for apportionment.

Established procedures, pursuant to Title 5 and the California Community College Chancellor's Office Student Attendance Accounting Manual, define a "credit hour" as a clock hour of a total of 60 minutes composed of a segment

of no less than 50 minutes of scheduled contact for instruction and/or examination and a segment of 10 minutes for passing time between classes or a break.

District procedures assure that curriculum complies with the definition of "credit hour." It uses a clock-to-credit hour conversion formula to determine whether a credit hour program is eligible for federal financial aid. The
conversion formula is used to ensure that a "credit hour" program has an appropriate minimum number of clock hours of instruction for each hour unit of credit it claims.

A "credit hour" at College of the Canyons represents the amount of work necessary to achieve intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates ~~not less than:~~

~~(a)~~ 48 – 54 semester hours of total student work, which may include inside and/or outside-of-class hours, ~~One "credit hour" (50 minutes) of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two "credit hours" (100 minutes) of out- of-class student work each week~~ for semester-length (e.g., sixteen weeks) courses for one semester hour unit of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time~~; or~~

> ~~(b)   At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by College of the Canyons, including three "credit hours" (150 minutes) of laboratory work, studio work, and other activities leading to the award of "credit hours.".~~

~~(c)~~ A "credit hour" is assumed to be a 50-minute period. In courses, such as those offered online, in which seat time does not apply, a

"credit hour" may be measured by an equivalent amount of work, as demonstrated by student achievement.

Cooperative work experience courses shall award one semester credit hour for 75 hours of paid work or 60 hours of non-paid work.

See Administrative Procedure AP
4020 Approved 02/26/14; revised
xx/xx/18

Academic Department Proposal Rubric

Section 1 - Basic Information

1. Type of Change Requested (please select all that apply):

☐ Create a New Department from Previously Unaffiliated Existing Courses/Programs	
X Create a New Department by Merging Existing Departments	
☐ Split an Existing Department into One or More Departments	

2. Please provide a brief (no more than a paragraph) description of the change requested and how this change will help the students of the college.

Based on information provided in three proposals regarding splitting and/or merging of the Earth, Space, and Environmental Science (ESES) department, the Program Viability Committee voted to merge Environmental Sciences with Biological Sciences. The remaining disciplines within ESES have been encourage to present one, cohesive, proposal regarding future splits and/or mergers.

Section 2 – Background Information

1. Is the proposal part of a program review recommendation or objective? If not, what has changed since the last program review that would support the proposal?
   Department meeting minutes provide evidence of discussions regarding the merger of Environmental Science with Biological Science.

2. Why is this proposal necessary to achieve programmatic success? For example, for initiating a new department, could the proposed department be absorbed into an existing department instead?

   Environmental Science and Biological Science share many of the same resources. The laboratory space and supplies overlap and the full-time faculty member in Environmental Science also meeting the minimal qualifications to teach Biology and has done so.

3. Is the proposed department's academic discipline common to the California Community College system and mission?

   Not applicable

4. Is the proposal similar to the departmental structures at other institutions? How and why is it the same or different in nature?

In two of the three proposals provided clear evidence that Environmental Science is often part of the Biological Sciences department.

    a) If this departmental structure currently exists at other community colleges, please provide a few examples.
- *LA Mission College and Antelope Valley College merge Environmental Science with Biology.*

    b) If this departmental structure similar to those found at UC or CSU, please provide a few examples.
- *UC Santa Cruz, UC San Diego, CSU Monterey Bay, CSU Chico*

Section 3 – Stakeholders

5. Are the affected faculty members in support of this proposal? Please explain why or why not.

   All members of both the ESES department and Biological Sciences department are in favor of this merger.

6. Does the Office of Academic Affairs support this proposal? Please explain why or why not.

   The Office of Academic Affairs has representation on the Program Viability committee and those members voted in support of this merger.

7. Are there any additional issues raised by the Academic Senate or the Office of Academic Affairs that should be considered?

   Not at this time.

Section 4 – Potential Impacts

1. What will be the size of the proposed department(s)? Is this a relevant factor to consider? If so, why?

   Environmental Science is a relatively small program at this time and as such, cannot stand-alone. The Biological Sciences department is large and does not feel this merger will unduly impact it.

2. Will the proposal provide for a more effective use of time, resources, and faculty? If so, please explain how and why.
   The collaboration between Environmental Science and Biological Science has been happening across department, outside of normal structures and processes. It was successfully argued that this collaboration would be more easily facilitated in the new structure.

3. What is the proposal's impact on existing students?
   There is no anticipated impact on existing students.

4. Would there be any resulting changes to curriculum, and, if so, what is the intended timeline for implementation and approval by the curriculum committee?
   [Note: *Close consultation with the Curriculum Chair, Counseling Office, and Articulation Officer is recommended*].

   None.

5. Will the creation of the department result in new certificates, licenses, degrees or transfer degrees? If so, what will they be?

   No.

6. Would the proposal have any impact on negotiated agreements with either of the two faculty unions? If so, how?

   No.

7. Will exiting full-time faculty be assigned or transferred to the new department? And if so, has funding been secured to provide replacement for any vacancies created by this transfer? [Note: *transfer only can occur if there is a BOT- approved open position (new or replacement*).

   There will be no vacancies created by this merger.

8. Would this proposal require any additional funding or other resources? How will these be provided?

   Not applicable

Section 5 – Implementation Plan

Please provide a detailed implementation plan (including dates) and documentation of any needed funding or other resources (at least one year of documented funding needed).

The Program Viability committee supports the immediate merger of Environment Science with Biology. As this configuration exists at other community colleges and universities, and the disciplines share physical and human resources, the transition is not expected to disrupt programming in any way.

<center>**ACADEMIC SENATE**</center>

<center>**STANDARD COMPONENTS FOR OPERATING PROCEDURES/BYLAWS OF SUB-COMMITTEES**</center>

A. STANDING COMMITTEES

The Academic Senate has established Standing Procedures for Appointments and Committee Creation in accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws of the Academic Senate. In furtherance of those procedures, and in accordance with Article VI(3) of the Academic Senate Constitution, the operating procedures and, or bylaws of all standing sub-committees of the Academic Senate shall be approved by a majority of the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate adopts the following essential features as content requirements for operating procedures/bylaws/charters of ~~all~~ standing sub-committees operating under the Academic Senate:

~~Committee Operating Procedures/Inventory Features~~

1. Name of committee & specification that it is a Standing Sub-Committee of the Academic Senate,

2. Connection to other committees or Board Policies and indicate the connection specifically to Academic Senate's 10+3 responsibilities (BP 7215),

3. Mission Statement of the Committee,

4. Duties and functions of the committee, including identification of how recommendations go to the Academic Senate (frequency and type),

5. Identification of designated Committee Chair(s) and length of term, (NOTE: *Academic Senate committees typically show composition by title, school and/or department, no individual names are listed*),

6. Committee Membership and information on joining/observing (NOTE: *Academic Senate committees typically show composition by title, school and/or department, no individual names are listed*),

7. Responsibilities of Committee Chair(s) and Committee Members, with voting rights of members specifically described,

8. Attendance Expectations (if applicable),

9. Meetings: description of frequency of meetings (can be open-ended or provide options, such as ongoing/monthly, annual, semi-annual, as needed) and length of meeting, and other descriptions of meetings as appropriate for the committee, such as "the first meeting of each academic year is a planning meeting,"

10. Program Review (if applicable),

11. Other information that is relevant to the duties and functions of the committee, including specific citations of Ed Code and/or Title 5.

B. AD HOC COMMITTES AND TASK FORCES
Ad Hoc Committees and Task Force groups are not required to maintain approved operating procedures or bylaws, but may develop such guidelines if it is determined to be necessary. At a minimum, the Academic Senate expects such groups to function according to some manner of recognized parliamentary order and organization. These groups possess the autonomy to determine their own functional guidelines, unless a majority of the Academic Senate determines otherwise.

D.5. Mission Statement

Mission Statement Proposed on November 20, 2017

As an innovative institution of excellence that values diversity, College of the Canyons enriches student lives through an accessible, highly-supportive, learning-centered education that provides all students with clear ~~certificate and degree~~ pathways leading to **skills, credentials, certificates, and degrees for future education and employment**. ~~employment and future education~~.

Current Mission Statement

As an innovative institution of excellence, College of the Canyons offers an accessible, enriching education that provides students with essential academic skills and prepares students for transfer education, workforce-skills development, and the attainment of learning outcomes corresponding to their educational goals. To fulfill its mission, College of the Canyons embraces diversity, fosters technical competencies, supports the development of global responsibility, and engages students and the community in scholarly inquiry, creative partnerships, and the application of knowledge.

ACCJC Accreditation Standard:

A. Mission

1. *The mission describes the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement.*

2. *The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.*

3. *The institution's programs and services are aligned with its mission. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.*

4. *The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.*

Next Steps:

1. Final endorsement from CPT – Fall, 2017
2. Review and endorsement from ASG, Fall, 2017
3. Review and endorsement from the Classified Senate, Winter, 2018
4. Review and endorsement from the Academic Senate, Spring, 2018
5. Presentation to the Board of Trustees, First Reading, Spring 2018
6. Presentation to the Board of Trustees, Second Reading, Spring, 2018
7. Publication and distribution, Spring, 2018