

Academic Senate Agenda
April 14, 2005
3:00 p.m. I-330

I. ROUTINE MATTERS

1. Approval of Senate summary for February 24, 2005 ([pages 2-3](#))
2. Approval of Senate summary for April 7, 2005 ([page 4](#))
 - a. Discussion on non-credit courses ([pages 5 – 9](#))

II. REPORTS/INFORMATION

3. Dena Maloney report on China
4. Academic Freedom Committee
5. Math/English graduation requirements
6. Student Development Office recognition program
7. Faculty SLO Committee

III. ACTION ITEMS

8. ASG proposal on smoking policy revisions ([pages 10 – 11](#))

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

9. Status of California Articulation Number system - CAN has been canned ([pages 12 – 13](#))
10. Memories of Carter Doran

V. Adjournment/Open Forum

**Academic Senate Summary
February 24, 2005**

Attendance: Mike Wilding, Patty Robinson, Joan Jacobson, John Bartke, Mike Gunther, Lea Templer, Michael Dermody, Miriam Golbert, Edel Alonso, Sam Salvatori, Chelley Maple, Fred D'Astoli, Steve Dixon, Sherrill Pennington, Anaid Palmer, Deanna Davis, Debbie Rio, John Albert and Pamela Borrelli

The Summary for February 10th was approved with a correction on page two: Curriculum Committee Recommended "Associate Degree".

Accessibility Guidelines were discussed. Again, these refer to department pages. We are not yet looking at sites for individuals. If there is a problem that cannot be easily resolved, the web author/department chair will be contacted and an attempt made at resolution. If more time is required to select and/or implement an option the web author may appeal to the Accessibility committee, a sub-committee of the Academic Senate for additional time or reconsideration.

The Senate approved the proposal for grades required for majors. All courses that have been designated as required for a student's particular major must be completed with a grade of "C" or better. – All courses for a major must be completed with a grade of "C" or better. This does not affect the GPA.

Mike Wilding brought additional calendar information before the Senate. Some of the topics addressed included:

Additional courses: There is a concern that some students may be going elsewhere for their courses. It is presumed that students would like to take a intersession to "make up" any missing courses. When the intersession courses at another college have been completed, COC courses have already started and it is too late to enroll here, so the students stay at the other college.

FLEX: Flex week would probably be the last week of the intersession, so there would be a possible overlap for those teaching the intersession and those who need to complete winter FLEX hours.

Adjuncts: the 60% law does not cover Intersession, so adjuncts could have additional courses offered. It might also be easier to hire adjuncts if our winter intersession would correlate with the calendars of other schools.

Supplies: Carol Long stated that there would be additional supply money available for the winter intersession; however it would be distributed by the Instruction Office as needed, instead of being automatically assigned to the departmental budgets.

Registration/Book sales: Registration and book sales for the intersession, if approved, would take place during the week of Finals in December.

Staffing: Mike Wilding indicated that, if the intersession is approved, services for library, bookstore, and food would commence on the first day of the intersession (January 3). According to Mike Wilding, Classified staff that otherwise might not be on campus would be asked to see if they would like to come back on campus early.

Vacation/Holidays: Martin Luther King Day would still be a college holiday. Spring Break is negotiable, and could be eliminated (however, some Classified staff may be impacted since they do certain tasks during spring break when students and faculty are not present). Currently we are not coordinating any of our holidays with those of the Hart district.

Pre-Requisites/Grades: Currently we have a 5 day turn around time for grade submission. If we have an intersession, we might want to consider a faster turn around time for grade submission so that we can clear prerequisites and prerequisite challenges for registration. Many colleges have a 48-hour turn around time for grade submission, it was suggested that we might want to consider a 72-hour turn around time.

Union Questions: There are certain questions that are not in the province of the Senate to discuss, although they were pointed out as a topic that the Senate hope would be discussed. These include the salary rate for teaching during the intersession, and the impact of department chairs. There was also some concern on how the intersession might impact the tenure calendar for probationary faculty members.

Length: The Senate strongly endorsed the concept of a 5-week intersession.

Academic Freedom Committee will be meeting soon to review the Academic Freedom Policy of the Board. Stephen Branch will be chairing this committee. If you are interested on being on this committee please contact Michael Dermody or Stephen Branch.

The Student Development Office is proposing a Faculty Recognition program. The Senate is cautious about the program, and would like to have more information on the program, especially the focus of the recognition. The Senate would strongly endorse the Student Development Office recognizing those faculty members who go above and beyond in their support of clubs and other activities sponsored by the Student Development Office.

Adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Our next meeting will be March 10, 2005 at 3:00 p.m. in I-330.

**Academic Senate Summary
Special meeting April 7, 2005
3:00 p.m. I-330**

Attendance: Edel Alonso, Chelley Maple, Joan Jacobson, Sam Salvatori, Lea Templer, Deanna Davis, Claudia Acosta, Miriam Goldberg, Steve Dixon, Yvette Barrios, Nancy Smith, Karen Myers, Jennifer Brezina, Anaid Palmer, John Bartke, Ann Lowe, Michael Sherry, Carole Long, Michael McMahn, James Gilmore, Michael Dermody, Phil Marcellin, Fred D'Astoli and Pamela Borrelli

Thanks to everyone who is able to attend this special meeting!

Congratulations to Edel Alonso on finishing her Ed. D.

Approval was given for the discipline assignment of Jennifer Hauss.

Approval was given for the Curriculum summaries of February 17, March 3, 17 and 23, 2005. The Soccer Class was approved, with the stipulation that no one could be hired for the course until the discipline committee had resolved the outstanding question of discipline assignment for the course. The curriculum committee had not yet made a recommendation regarding a proposed non-credit needlepoint class, so the Senate did not consider the course.

There was an overview of non-credit courses. The written basis for the overview is attached to the minutes.

The Senate stressed the importance of having student services available for non-credit students.

Anyone interested in developing procedures for non-credit courses should contact Michael Dermody.

Adjourned at 4:03 p.m. with our next meeting being April 14, 2005 at 3:00 p.m. in I-330.

NON-CREDIT PROGRAMS AT COC

In recent weeks, there has been great discussion on the question of non-credit courses. Hopefully, this will help to eliminate, or at least answer, some of the questions and concerns that faculty members may have regarding non-credit courses.

WHAT ARE NON-CREDIT COURSES?

Non-Credit courses very similar to the “Adult Education” courses offered by many high school districts.

ARE NON-CREDIT COURSES APPROPRIATE FOR A COMMUNITY COLLEGE?

Yes, non-credit courses are part of the mission for the community college.

Selected sections from the Education Code:

66010.4. (a)

(1) The California Community Colleges shall, as a primary mission, offer academic and vocational instruction at the lower division level for both younger and older students, including those persons returning to school.

(2) In addition to the primary mission of academic and vocational instruction, the community colleges shall offer instruction and courses to achieve all of the following:

(A) adult noncredit instruction [is] reaffirmed and supported as essential and important functions of the community colleges.

(B) adult noncredit education curricula in areas defined as being in the state's interest is an essential and important function of the community colleges.

WHAT IS THE FOCUS OF NON-CREDIT CURRICULUM?

“Noncredit and adult education is publicly funded instruction that provides adults with the knowledge and skills necessary to participate effectively as citizens...Today adult/noncredit education provides the entry point for many Californians who were unsuccessful in high school; who require retraining for employment advancement; who desire a vocational trade or who need a helping hand to acquire the basic skills and English language proficiency necessary to complete collegiate level work. Additionally, noncredit education enables citizens to avail themselves of coursework in citizenship, parenting, home economics, health and safety as well as programs of particular interest to older adults and for persons with substantial disabilities.” *(Statement by Dona Boatright, Interim Vice-Chancellor, Educational Services, presented to the Assembly Select Committee on Adult Education, July 29 2003. Complete statement can be found at <http://www.cccco.edu/reports/bbook%5F03/attachments/tab%5F5%5Fadult%5Fd%5F03.doc>*

IS THIS PART OF COC'S EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN?

No, although non-credit is part of the community college's mission, it has never been detailed in specific details. However, references to the possibility and desirability of non-credit instruction have been made in Accreditation, program review, and other documents.

WHY HAVE WE NOT OFFERED NON-CREDIT CLASSES BEFORE?

Actually, we do offer a non-credit course through the TLC. However, we have not offered these courses in the past for a variety of reasons, including the fact that the college receives a reduced reapportionment for non-credit courses. In addition, no one on the campus was that experienced with the non-credit program.

WHY DO WE WANT TO OFFER NON-CREDIT COURSES AT THIS POINT?

A variety of issues have come together within the last few months. There is an increased view that these courses could be of value to the community; we have an interim dean who is very well-versed on non-credit programs, the system may be increasing the reimbursement rate for non-credit courses, and, frankly, we have an opportunity to increase our base FTE through non-credit courses.

AHA! SO THIS IS ALL ABOUT MONEY?

According to the President, the increased reimbursement is a nice and not something to be overlooked. However, she expressed that her primary enthusiasm for these programs comes from the opportunity to reach out and address needs of the community.

WHAT ARE THE AREAS WHERE NON-CREDIT COURSES MAY BE OFFERED?

According to Ed Code 84757, non-credit courses can ONLY be offered in the following areas:

1. Parenting
2. Elementary and secondary basic
3. Classes and courses for immigrants (including citizenship, ESL, and work force preparation, and job-specific technical training).
4. Education programs for persons with substantial disabilities.
5. Short-term vocational programs with high employment potential.
6. Education programs for older adults.
7. Education programs for home economics.
8. Health and safety education.

IS THIS IN CONFLICT WITH THE HART DISTRICT?

At this point, the courses that the college is proposing are not in conflict with any programs offered through the Hart District's Golden Oak Adult School

WHAT CLASSES IS THE DISTRICT PROPOSING TO OFFER?

At this point, the district would like to offer classes in the categories of ESL, and for older adults.

WHAT IMPACT WILL THIS HAVE ON CREDIT PROGRAMS?

These courses should not detract from the credit courses, since they are non-collegial courses. Departments should not see a loss of students to the non-credit program.

In fact, some departments might even be able to benefit from a potential increase in enrollments:

“Many of our students use noncredit courses as a bridge to higher education. For instance, in four of the larger noncredit CCC districts, noncredit instruction served

as a gateway to transfer for 63 percent of the total college student population. Coordination between a colleges' noncredit and credit workforce preparation instruction and services ensures a seamless experience for adults who begin their higher educational experience in community college noncredit programs. These internal linkages reduce the barriers often faced by students transitioning to postsecondary academic and employment training providers. The transition process is facilitated because noncredit students are introduced to postsecondary credit academic and employment training options at institutions where they are already enrolled." *(-Statement by Dona Boatright, Interim Vice-Chancellor, Educational Services, presented to the Assembly Select Committee on Adult Education, July 29 2003.)*

HOW ARE THESE COURSES APPROVED

These courses are reviewed by the curriculum committee, using the tradition of rigor expected for a COC course (although issues of degree credit, articulation, transfer, etc. are obviously not considered).

WHO CAN TEACH THESE COURSES?

Individuals who teach these courses are considered faculty members. As such, they must meet standard minimum qualifications established in Education Code. In general, a bachelor's degree is required for instructors of non-credit courses (Please see Ed Code 53412 for the complete list of minimum qualifications.)

AREN'T THESE COURSES COMMUNITY EXTENSION COURSES?

Although they may be similar, they are not community extension courses. Community extension courses

- *Do not have to go through curriculum committee approval;
- *are not re-imbursed by the state through FTE apportionment;
- *must be economically self-sufficient.

Obviously, with an increase in non-credit courses, there could be a long-term impact on the community extension program.

WHAT IS THE PAY RATE FOR THESE COURSES?

The rate of pay is not one of the "Academic and Professional" matters that are delegated to the Senate.

ARE NON-CREDIT INSTRUCTORS CONSIDERED FACULTY?

Although the Minimum Qualifications differ, the Ed Code indicates that those who teach non-credit courses are considered faculty members:

Selections from Ed Code

87356. (a) The board of governors shall adopt regulations to establish and maintain the minimum qualifications for service as a faculty member teaching credit instruction, a faculty member teaching noncredit instruction.....

HOW ARE THESE FACULTY MEMBERS HIRED?

The Ed Code provides that the process for hiring faculty members involves the Senate and the local Board:

Selected sections from the ed code:

87359. (b)

The process, as well as criteria and standards by which the governing board reaches its determinations regarding faculty members, shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board.

Currently, we have developed process for hiring full-time and adjunct faculty for the credit classes. The hiring of non-credit faculty will probably follow a similar process.

The current hiring process allows for some adjustment if there is mutual agreement with the Instruction Office, Human Resources, and the Senate.

ARE THESE INSTRUCTORS MEMBERS OF THE NEGOTIATING UNIT?

Non-credit instructors would not be covered by either of the two current faculty bargaining units.

RUMOR CONTROL

We must approve these classes NOW because we have already made commitment to offer these courses?

According to Carol Long, although we have been gauging the community and business interest, no specific commitment has been made to any business or organization to offer these classes.

Does the college have a system in place to register these students?

Although not perfect, a system is in place and will be functional by the time these students register.

I thought that the President was opposed to non-credit classes?

The President has never said that she was opposed to non-credit courses. She has, however, expressed concern over the focus of non-credit courses and the reimbursement rate. However, the business ESL and the older adult community, which the proposed classes focus on, have long been a area of concern for her.

WHAT IS RECOMMENDED?

1. The faculty acknowledges that the non-credit courses are an important part of the overall community college mission, and that these courses could provide important service for members of our community.
2. The faculty does not want to unnecessarily hinder the ability of the college to respond to specific issues and circumstances in a timely manner. As such, the Senate should approve the report from its subcommittee on Curriculum.
3. To ensure that these classes can be offered to students, a hiring process must be developed and approved. The Senate authorizes the Senate president to work with the Instruction Office and Human Resources to make appropriate adjustments to the hiring process until such time that a process specifically for non-credit can be established.
4. To ensure curricular integrity, the Senate should work with the administration to develop and/or revise specific policies and procedures for non-credit courses, including:
 - a. Review of the established approval process for credit courses, to see if any changes need to be made for non-credit courses;
 - b. Review of the hiring procedures for non-credit instructors;
 - c. Establishing processes to ensure communication between credit departments and non-credit course offered in those departments;
5. The Senate will work with the administration to review the initial non-credit offerings, and to forward recommendations as appropriate. Some of the areas that can be reviewed could include:
 - a. The feasibility of expanding the non-credit offerings;
 - b. Procedures to enhance and continue coordination with the programs of Golden Oak/ Hart School District
6. The Senate will express to the Administration and the Board its hope that the question of salary for the non-credit instructors is resolved as soon as possible, to ensure that instructors can be hired for these courses.
7. The Senate requests that it be invited to participate in a review of the community extension program, to see how to better compliment and coordinate the credit/non-credit academic programs with the programs offered by community extension.



Office of the
STUDENT TRUSTEE

March 16, 2004

To: Academic Senate Members

From: Steven Vanover, Student Trustee

Re: Board Policy 726 (smoking policy)

Over past five months the Associated Student Government has been collecting data and meeting with various college officials to discuss the current board policy here at College of the Canyons. During the course of our research we determined that 64% of students surveyed don't support a full ban on smoking. While 34% of students surveyed support a full ban on smoking however, many of the surveys requested better enforcement of the policy and felt that fines should be used in the enforcement process.

Therefore, the Association has taken steps to make minor changes to the policy with consultation from Security and the Board of Trustees. The Association believes that these changes could help reduce the amount of violators of this policy. Furthermore, we have been working with Tammy Castor, Director of Security to increase enforcement of the policy and relocate and add smoking areas on campus.

Recently, the Associated Student Government met with Board of Trustees in a joint meeting where we proposed our changes to the policy which was greatly accepted. The Association was then directed to present said changes to the Academic Senate for their recommendations and approval of the changed policy.

We thank you, for your assistance and consideration in this matter. Should you have any questions don't hesitate to contact Matthew Suedkamp, Associated Student Government President at ext. 3257 or myself at ext. 3258.

Smoking policy (Board Policy 726) proposed changes by the Associated Student Government

Santa Clarita Community College District
POLICY MANUAL

POLICY: BUSINESS SERVICES	Section 726	Page 1 of 1
726.Smoking/Tobacco Usage In and On Campus Facilities		

- A. Smoking shall be allowed only in the specific areas described as follows:
1. The outside area east west of the Student Center Building (where the construction trailer was);
 2. ~~The Flagpole seatwell area of the northwest corner of the Administration Building;~~
 3. ~~The southeast exterior corner of the classroom Building C north of the Fine Arts Building;~~
 4. The Honor Grove semi-circular seatwell (with a permanent structure to be built to provide shelter for the students);
 5. The southeast exterior corner of the Administration Building's emergency exit walkway;
 6. The seatwell area along the walkway from the Honor Grove to the Physical Education Building just east of the right field baseball field fence; and
 7. All parking lots EXCEPT the parking area directly adjacent to the south side of the Laboratory Building L – in that area, smoking is permitted in the parking area midway between the Laboratory and Vocational Technology Buildings;
 8. A designated area near the Cougar Stadium;
 9. An area near the M Building to be determined by Facilities and Security;
 10. The area west of the Interim University Center;
 11. Other areas as designated by the Superintendent-President.

The Classroom Center smoking area is believed to be one of the main issues revolving around the smoking policy therefore, the Associated Student Government proposes moving the smoking area near the building to an area near the M-Building (determined by Facilities and Security). After speaking with Tammy Castor, Campus Security Supervisor who also believes that relocating the smoking area near the Classroom Center to the an area near the M-Building, would help reduce the amount of complaints the College receives from faculty, staff and students regarding smoking in non-designated areas. Relocating this smoking area would also move it into a more visible area allowing Campus Security to ensure that the College environment remains safe for the College Community.

The Associated Student Government would also recommend making a section near the bookstore rear entrance a smoking area, since the Westside of the building is gated off due to construction.

MEMO FROM THE STATE CHANCELLOR REGARDING CAN PROGRAM

April 12, 2005

To: Statewide Colleagues

From: Mark Drummond
Chancellor

Subject: Status of CAN

You are probably aware that the CSU Chancellor's Office informed my office a couple of weeks ago that CSU is terminating its participation in the California Articulation Number System (CAN). CSU has notified staff of the CAN System Office that operations will cease on June 30, 2005, and that the office will close as of that date.

CAN has played three primary roles for community colleges. First, it has been the mechanism for determining comparable CCC and CSU major preparation courses without requiring individual course-to-course articulation between every community college and every CSU campus. This process has been particularly beneficial for smaller, rural colleges that would not have otherwise been able to achieve articulation with some of the more distant and popular CSU campuses. Second, CAN has produced intersegmental common course identifiers to help students determine the appropriate courses for their lower-division preparation for transfer. Although UC has never participated in CAN, it was a structure to accommodate any progress in that direction. Third, CAN has been the mechanism for community colleges to meet our own requirements for common course numbering within the system for the benefit of students who attend more than one community college.

CSU intends to maintain its own process for systemwide articulation of CCC courses that fall within CSU's new Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) project implementing the "45/15" approach contained in SB 1785 (Scott) enacted last year. CSU faculty from each of the 30 highest demand majors have met to identify the two major preparation courses that will be required by all CSU campuses within the 45 common systemwide units. It is our understanding that descriptors for those courses will become the basis for common "CSU Transfer Course Numbers" that will replace existing CAN numbers. CSU faculty will review courses submitted by community colleges through ASSIST to determine their eligibility for the new numbers. Although community college faculty will continue to be invited to participate in this process, it will be in an advisory capacity and the CSU course review will be comparable to current reviews for IGETC and CSU GE Breadth qualification.

For the present, all existing articulation and CAN designations remain in place. We have pressed CSU to determine its intent with regard to major preparation courses that are not included in the LDTP project and have been told that additional courses related to the first 30 majors and a second group of 30 majors will be taken up when the initial LDTP work is done. We are seeking data from CSU to scope the extent of the systemwide articulation to be lost. It is clear that the loss of CAN as an intersegmental "third" numbering system will make it more difficult for some CCC students to determine which community college courses will satisfy major preparation requirements and to avoid repeating courses with equivalent curriculum. It is also clear that there will be increased reliance on campus-to-campus articulation with significant workload implications for articulation officers.

In response to CSU's decision, Executive Vice Chancellor Steve Bruckman, Vice Chancellor Linda Michalowski and Transfer and Articulation Coordinator Jeff Spano expressed these concerns in a meeting with representatives of the CSU Chancellor's Office last week to discuss the effects of this action on the community colleges and to emphasize the critical need for continued community college input into CSU

decisions surrounding transfer options. CSU agreed to immediately begin drafting a Memorandum of Understanding and take other steps to address the following:

- * Formalize CSU's policy on how it will honor currently CAN-designated CCC courses and to provide an analysis of which of these courses are expected to fall within the DTP discipline-specific and campus-specific course requirements;
- * Delineate how CSU will involve community college faculty in its Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) project; and
- * Participate in the establishment of a CCC/CSU Transfer Advisory Committee that would serve as a forum for discussing issues that may come up as the LDTP process and other CSU transfer efforts evolve.

Additionally, this office has been meeting with Department of Finance and the Legislature to ensure that resources budgeted for transfer and articulation purposes, including the \$5,000 CAN grants issued to the colleges by the CAN System Office, remain secure. On April 18th, staff will meet with articulation officers and transfer center directors to identify potential options for mitigating the impact on community college students desiring to transfer and for addressing the CCC legislative obligations.

I will continue to keep you informed and solicit your input as these efforts progress.