

Ventura College Academic Senate

Agenda

Thursday, April 4, 2013

1:30-3:30 pm

Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312

- I. Call to Order
- II. Public Comments
- III. Acknowledgement of Guests
- IV. Approval of minutes
 - a. March 21, 2013
- V. Study Sessions
 - a. Statewide Academic Senate Spring Plenary Session Resolutions & Proposed MQ Changes
- VI. Action Items
 - a. Ventura College Academic Senate Annual Survey of VC Faculty on Professional Life & Satisfaction
 - b. Ventura College Academic Senate Self-Assessment Survey
 - c. Distance Education Handbook (Second Reading)
 - d. AP 4260 – Prerequisites and Corequisites (Second Reading)
 - e. VC/VCCCD Accreditation Midterm reports (First Reading)
 - f. BP 2510 – Participation in Local Decision Making (First Reading)*
 - g. BP/AP 5052 – Open Enrollment (First Reading)
 - h. BP/AP 5300 – Student Equity (First Reading)
 - i. BP/AP 5500 – Standards of Conduct (First Reading)
 - j. BP/AP 5520 – Discipline Procedure (First Reading)
 - k. BP/AP 5530 – Student Rights and Grievances (First Reading)
- VII. President's Report
 - a. Consultation Council report
 - b. Administrative Council report
 - c. DCHR, DCAA reports
- VIII. Senate Subcommittee reports
 - a. Curriculum Committee report
 - b. Professional Development Committee report
 - c. Other Senate Committees reports
- IX. Campus Committee reports
 - a. Accreditation Steering Committee report
 - b. Campus Committees reports
- X. Information Items
 - a. Senate Faculty Awards Form
- XI. Adjournment

According to Title 5, Section 53200, each California Community College shall have an Academic Senate, an organization of faculty whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters.

“Academic and Professional matters” means the following policy development and implementation matters that cover the following areas:

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites.
2. Degree and certificate requirements.
3. Grading policies.
4. Educational program development.
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success.
6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles.
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes.
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities.
9. Processes for program review.
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development.

AND Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

IV. a. Approval of Minutes

Minutes

Ventura College Academic Senate

Minutes

Thursday, 21 March 2013 MCW-312

I. Call to Order

This meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m. The following senate members were present:

Chen, Albert—Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities
Enfield, Amanda—English and Learning Resources
Forde, Richard—Career and Technical Education
Guillen, Guadalupe—Student Services
Haines, Robbie—Senate Secretary
Hendricks, Bill—Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities
Koch, Katherine—Career and Technical Education
Kolesnik, Alex—Mathematics and Sciences
Lange, Cari—Senate Vice President
Morris, Terry—PE/Athletics, Communication Studies, Foreign Languages, and ESL
Muñoz, Paula—Student Services
Pauley, Mark—Senate Treasurer
Rose, Malia—Mathematics and Sciences
Sandford, Art—PE/Athletics, Communication Studies, Foreign Languages, and ESL
Sezzi, Peter—Senate President

The following guests were present:

Margie Cruz—ASVC

II. Public Comments

Forde described a difficulty arising from stolen equipment and the need to keep his lab locked conflicting with M&O workers' tendency to leave doors open.

III. Acknowledgement of Guests

No guests were acknowledged.

IV. Approval of Minutes, 7 March 2013

Forde motioned to approve those minutes, Pauley seconded. The motion carried 10–0–2 with Hendricks and Guillen abstaining.

V. Study Sessions

a. Program Review/Discontinuance Rubric for Instructional Programs

Sezzi pointed out text in the document that stipulates that this document should not be used as a justification for funding or resource allocation. Criteria and weighting of evaluation items were discussed. Senators pointed out concern that faculty have no control over funding, so funding as a self-evaluation item is problematic; Sezzi pointed out that mechanisms now in place give us more control now than we've ever had before. Retention vs. persistence was discussed. This document will be moved to an action item in a future Senate meeting.

b. Annual Survey of VC Faculty on Professional Life and Satisfaction

Discussion of this survey revealed consensus that more data are better, and that survey burnout among faculty was unlikely to continue. The benefits of trend analysis were discussed, as were the quality and the quantitative elements of survey results. Each question on last year's survey was discussed and either deleted or edited, and a new survey was generated. This revised survey will be presented at a future Senate meeting.

VI. Action Items

a. Distance Education Handbook

This item was not yet ready for Senate review.

b. BP/AP 4025—Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education (Second Reading)

Sezzi and Kolesnik reported that degree requirements were “cleaned up” throughout the District, so that essentially no courses are required for a degree at one campus but not at another campus. Sandford motioned to approve this document, Hendricks seconded. The motion carried 12–0–1 with Koch abstaining.

c. AP 5055—Priority Enrollment (Second Reading)

A discussion ensued regarding the order in which students are listed in the first category of enrollment priority on this document. Consensus was reached that the language of that paragraph should remain the same, except that it should be made grammatically clear which student groups are “defined by statute.” Hendricks motioned to approve this document, Muñoz seconded. The motion carried 12–0–1 with Koch abstaining.

d. AP 4260—Prerequisites and Corequisites (First Reading)

Sezzi informed senators that this document allows faculty to create prerequisites outside their discipline, most notably with the establishment of computational and communicative prereqs on non-Math and – English classes. The potential represented in this change were discussed and minor changes to content and spelling/grammar were suggested. It was noted that if more prereqs are established, we should also offer more of those prereqs in order to allow students to take the gatekeeper courses they will then need. Sezzi will provide an updated version of this document to senators with track changes shown for a second reading. Sandford motioned to approve a first reading of this document, Forde seconded. The motion carried 11–0–2 with Muñoz and Koch abstaining.

e. VC/VCCCD Accreditation Midterm Reports

Sezzi noted an encouraging difference between this midterm report and the last self-study report in 2010: this draft was provided to faculty about 6 months in advance, while last time it was provided just a few days in advance. This document was not voted on due to its length and the fact that senators had not had time to read it yet. It will be discussed as a formal first reading by the end of this semester, and a formal second in beginning of Fall 2013.

VII. President’s Reports

a. Administrative Council Report

Sezzi reported that Forde will assist a sustainable business MBA student. Budgeting changes were discussed so that Divisions will have greater control in how they meet FTES goals by less restricted use of set funding amounts. The 75%–25% law was discussed in light of Institutional effectiveness.

b. DCAP, DCAA Reports

DCAP: Got the District’s mid-term accreditation report, nothing else significant was discussed. DCAA: A BP and AP on bookstore was made, but after a brief discussion, it was decided to be of little significance to this Senate.

VIII. Senate Subcommittee Reports

a. Curriculum Committee Report

Kolesnik reported that it was a short meeting focusing on matters discussed above.

b. Other Senate Committees Reports

There was nothing significant to report.

IX. Campus Committee Reports

a. Budget Resource Council Report

Kolesnik and Sandford informed senators that we went over our proposed budget, and that don't yet know how the \$4.5 million in increased funding will be used. Proposition 39 allocates money for energy efficiency projects or instruction in the topic of energy efficiency, and it remains to be seen how that funding will be used. Sezzi reported that the matter of shifting Adult Education to CCs died in committee in Sacramento. Our ice hockey team travelled to Buffalo NY, where they took 4th out of 6 teams.

b. Campus Committees reports

There was nothing significant to report.

X. Adjournment

This meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Draft

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

V. a. Study Session

Statewide Academic Senate Spring Plenary Session

Resolutions & Proposed MQ Changes



45th SPRING SESSION RESOLUTIONS

FOR DISCUSSION ON APRIL 18, 2013

Disclaimer: The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion by the field, and to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at Academic Senate Spring Plenary Session held April 18 - 20, 2013, in San Francisco.

The resolutions that have been placed on the Consent Calendar 1) were believed to be noncontroversial, 2) do not potentially reverse a previous position and 3) do not compete with another proposed resolution. Resolutions that meet these criteria and any subsequent clarifying amendments have been included on the Consent Calendar. To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the *Resolution Procedures for the Plenary Session*.

1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE

- 1.01 S13 Caucuses Procedures and Guidelines and Bylaws Revision
- 1.02 S13 Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
- 1.03 S13 Adding Context to Resolutions

5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE

- 5.01 S13 Call for Statewide Conversation on Funding Formulas to Maintaining Comprehensive Course and Program Offerings

9.0 CURRICULUM

- 9.02 S13 Regional Conjoint Programs for Associate Degrees for Transfer
- 9.03 S13 Conditions of Enrollment for Online Education
- 9.04 S13 Investigate and Determine Appropriateness of Massive Open Online Courses
- 9.05 S13 Eliminating the Word “Discipline” in the Taxonomy of Programs
- 9.06 S13 Dance TOP Codes

10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST

- 10.02 S13 Disciplines List – Chicano Studies
- 10.04 S13 Disciplines List – Health Education
- 10.05 S13 Disciplines List – Peace Studies
- 10.06 S13 Disciplines List – Digital Media
- 10.07 S13 Disciplines List – Pharmacy Technology
- 10.09 S13 Improvements to the Disciplines List Process
- 10.10 S13 Discipline List Motions

18.0 MATRICULATION

- 18.01 S13 CCC ESL Assessment for Placement Test

19.0 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

- 19.01 S13 Adopt the Paper *Sound Principles for Faculty Evaluations*
- 19.02 S13 Adopt the Paper Alternative Methods for the Awarding of College Credit: Credit by Examination for Articulated High School Courses
- 19.03 S13 Develop Training Guidance for Faculty Engaged in Peer Evaluation
- 19.04 S13 Part-time Faculty Nomenclature
- 19.05 S13 Professional Development and Training
- 19.06 S13 Faculty Professional Development
- 19.07 S13 Certification of Faculty to Teach Distance Education Courses

The resolutions on the Consent Calendar are marked within the following packet by an *

1.0	ACADEMIC SENATE	1
*1.01	S13 Caucuses Procedures and Guidelines and Bylaws Revision	1
*1.02	S13 Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges	2
*1.03	S13 Adding Context to Resolutions	2
1.04	S13 Senator Emeritus for Jane Patton	3
5.0	BUDGET AND FINANCE	4
*5.01	S13 Call for Statewide Conversation on Funding Formulas to Maintaining Comprehensive Course and Program Offerings.....	4
7.0	CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE	4
*7.01	S13 Timely Notification of Changes to Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) Narratives and Templates	4
9.0	CURRICULUM	5
9.01	S13 Investigate Regional Coordination of Course Offerings	5
*9.02	S13 Regional Conjoint Programs for Associates Degrees for Transfer	5
*9.03	S13 Conditions of Enrollment for Online Instruction	6
*9.04	S13 Investigate and Determine Appropriateness of Massive Open Online Courses	6
*9.05	S13 Eliminating the Word “Discipline” in the Taxonomy of Programs	6
*9.06	S13 Dance TOP Codes	7
10.0	DISCIPLINES LIST	8
10.01	S13 Adopt the Proposal to Add Kinesiology to the Disciplines List	8
10.02	S13 Disciplines List – Kinesiology	9
*10.03	S13 Disciplines List – Chicano Studies.....	9
10.04	S13 Disciplines List – Teacher Education.....	10
*10.05	S13 Disciplines List – Health Education	10
*10.06	S13 Disciplines List – Peace Studies.....	10
*10.07	S13 Disciplines List – Digital Media	11
*10.08	S13 Disciplines List – Pharmacy Technology.....	11
*10.09	S13 Improvements to the Disciplines List Process	11
*10.10	S13 Discipline List Motion.....	12
13.0	GENERAL CONCERNS	12
*13.01	S13 Support for Local Control in Noncredit Instruction Areas	12
18.0	MATRICULATION	13
*18.01	S13 CCC ESL Assessment for Placement Test.....	13
19.0	PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS	14
*19.01	S13 Adopt the Paper Sound Principles for Faculty Evaluations	14
*19.02	S13 Adopt the Paper Alternative Methods for the Awarding of College Credit: Credit by Examination for Articulated High School Courses	14
*19.03	S13 Develop Training Guidance for Faculty Engaged in Peer Evaluations.....	14
*19.04	S13 Part-time Faculty Nomenclature	15
*19.05	S13 Professional Development and Training	15
*19.06	S13 Faculty Professional Development.....	15
*19.07	S13 Certification of Faculty to Teach Distance Education Courses	16

1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE

*1.01 S13 Caucuses Procedures and Guidelines and Bylaws Revision

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges values all forms of diversity and, as stated in its diversity policy, “recognizes the benefits to students, faculty, and the community college system that are gained by a variety of personal experiences, values, and views that derive from individuals from diverse backgrounds” and “encourages diverse faculty to participate in Academic Senate activities and supports local senates in recruiting and encouraging diverse faculty to serve on Senate standing committees”;

Whereas, Resolution 1.05 S09 called upon the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to create caucuses that were “comprised of those faculty members who self-identify as diverse or faculty belonging to monitored groups with minority or diverse ancestral roots from traditionally underrepresented groups as classified by federal and state guidelines,” and Resolution 1.06 F09 called upon the Academic Senate to expand the focuses of caucuses to “develop a mechanism to confirm that any caucus it recognizes supports the Academic Senate mission, vision, and goals,” resulting in the establishment of policies and procedures for the creation of interest area caucuses to provide a means for otherwise unrepresented voices to be heard;

Whereas, In establishing these processes the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges committed itself to revisit and evaluate the effectiveness, usefulness, and potential adverse effects of establishing and maintaining caucuses; and

Whereas, An inconsistency between the intended purpose of caucuses and the focus of some proposed caucuses has brought to light several issues, including a presumption that formation of a caucus is an Academic Senate endorsement of said caucuses, confusion in the field as individuals and entities mistakenly think that a caucus speaks for the Academic Senate, overlap between proposed caucus activities and existing Academic Senate functions, lack of ongoing member participation leading to nonviability of some caucuses, and caucus creation efforts with only a limited connection to the formal role of the Academic Senate in assuring faculty purview over academic and professional matters;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop procedures and guidelines further clarifying the process for establishing and maintaining a caucus; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges approve the following revision to its Bylaws Article VI: Caucus.

ARTICLE VI Caucuses

Academic Senate caucuses are intended to serve as groups of independently organized faculty to meet, network, and deliberate collegially in order to form a collective voice on issues of common concern that caucus members feel are of vital importance to faculty and the success of students as they relate to academic and professional matters.

The Executive Committee shall establish procedures and guidelines for caucuses that will be posted on the Academic Senate web site. ~~a least ten members from at least four different colleges and at least two districts with common goals and/or interests may form a caucus by sending a letter to the President, including its name, statement of purpose, and list of members. Recognition as a caucus shall be achieved by verification by the Executive Committee that the caucus’ goals and purpose are related to academic and professional matters and notification to the body through normal communication channels. Each May, caucuses will inform the President of their intent to remain active and provide a current list of membership. If a caucus fails to alert the President~~

~~of the desire to stay active, the caucus shall be disbanded and a new letter of intent will need to be created to re-establish a new caucus. The intent is to have caucuses that are active and represent current faculty in California community colleges. Caucus chairs should be elected annually at the first fall meeting of the caucus and submit meeting minutes to the Senate Office.~~

Contact: Kevin Bontenbal, Cuesta College, Executive Committee

***1.02 S13 Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges**

Whereas, Commitment to the public good and accountability to its members and the public at large are core values of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges as noted in its Code of Ethics Policy (10.00), including the eight domains of personal and professional integrity, mission, governance, legal compliance, responsible stewardship, openness and disclosure, program evaluation and improvement, and inclusiveness and diversity;

Whereas, Colleges and universities in the United States are regularly assessed in order to assure internal and external stakeholders about an institution's quality and its commitment to the standards it sets for itself as well as to assist the institution in improving the effectiveness of its programs and operations in order to meet its stated goals, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, a nonprofit organization, might benefit from an enhanced regular evaluation process of its eight domains; and

Whereas, Peer and external reviews are the preferred tools in higher education not just for advancing scholarship but also for assessing and improving policies and processes within institutions and organizations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a task force consisting of equal numbers of Executive Committee representatives and member delegates to develop a process of periodic institutional peer review for assessing the operations, processes, policies, and programs of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges including the composition of the review team, what standards of accountability will be used, what components would comprise such a review, the number of years between reviews, and how commendations and recommendations will be offered at the conclusion of the process; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges task force's recommendation be presented to the body for adoption by the Spring 2014 Plenary Session so that the Academic Senate for California Community College can undergo and complete its first periodic peer review by the Fall 2014 Plenary Session.

Contact: Phil Smith, American River College, Area A

***1.03 S13 Adding Context to Resolutions**

Whereas, With increasing external collaborations and pressures more resolutions are emerging regarding specific proposals that require in depth discipline or program knowledge;

Whereas, Delegates will not have comprehensive knowledge of every discipline and program; and

Whereas, Resolution authors try to compensate for delegates' lack of subject matter expertise in such cases by including obtuse, and sometimes passionate, descriptive language in the body of the resolution, thereby risking confusion or alienation of the delegates;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research the feasibility of allowing the addition of pro and con arguments to contextualize issues addressed by the resolution in a manner similar to our California's Voter Guide and report back to the body by Fall 2013.

Contact: Sarah Thompson, Las Positas College, Area B

1.04 S13 Senator Emeritus for Jane Patton

Whereas, The Bylaws of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) include procedures and criteria for conferring the status of senator emeritus on individuals; and Jane Patton has satisfied those requirements as a retired faculty member of the California Community College System who has completed more than the required five years of significant service to the Academic Senate:

- ASCCC Executive Committee member of the State Academic Senate 2003-2011;
- Served as ASCCC Treasurer, Vice President, and President;
- Served as Area B Representative;
- Chair of numerous Senate committees including Curriculum, Educational Policies, Futures, Occupational Education, and Relations with Local Senates;
- Provided significant leadership in groups such as the Education Roundtable, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), Consultation Council, Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup, and System Advisory Committee on Curriculum;
- Provided significant leadership in facilitating the raising of community college degree standards and student success within the context of the higher standards;

Whereas, Jane Patton has been a colleague who by her example personifies collegiality, dedication, and integrity at her college and statewide, using wit, humor, and passion as tools to promote and argue for the CCC System; and

Whereas, Jane Patton brought a new standard of style and fashion to the Academic Senate Executive Committee in which pink was her signature color, reminded us of the many witticisms to be found in Alice in Wonderland, and regularly shared her appreciation for all things Disney;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges confer upon Jane Patton their highest honor of Senator Emeritus and thank her for her contributions to the faculty and students of California;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage Jane to believe as many as six impossible things before breakfast and to remember that all the best people are bonkers;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage Jane to continue her yearly quests to Telluride, frequent visits to France, and to spend as much time as possible at the happiest place on earth; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges wish Jane, Roger, and Kadie much happiness in all their future endeavors.

Contact: Area B

5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE

***5.01 S13 Call for Statewide Conversation on Funding Formulas to Maintaining Comprehensive Course and Program Offerings**

Whereas, Recent budgetary cutbacks have forced many colleges and districts to reduce their course and program offerings significantly, and, in some cases, rapidly, which, if not done thoughtfully and strategically, may lead to a curriculum that is unbalanced and misaligned with community needs and statewide mission directives;

Whereas, Given the current community college funding model in California in which districts receive apportionment at the same rate for all students, regardless of the underlying costs of particular courses or programs in which they enroll, it may be tempting for community college districts facing a budgetary crisis to target programs with high operational costs such as specialized laboratory classes in science or career technical education (CTE) with externally mandated low enrollment caps or high equipment costs as a way to save money and maintain other programs;

Whereas, Statewide data from the Management Information System (MIS) Datamart indicates that the percentage of Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES) for CTE programs has declined in the last 10 years from 33% to 31% (and this data does not include the recent drastic reductions imposed by numerous districts in the last two years), suggesting that colleges and districts may indeed be unbalancing their curricular offerings by reducing or eliminating high cost CTE programs in an effort to save money and serve the most students; and

Whereas, The current community college funding formula with equal apportionment funding for students in all courses and programs, regardless of cost to offer, may force districts to pit some programs against others in terms of their cost to the district rather than their value to the community;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges initiate and promote a system-wide conversation about funding formulas and other system policies that causes colleges and districts to offer a balanced, comprehensive set of course and program offerings that meets the needs of local communities and is consistent with the mission of California community colleges.

Contact: Phil Smith, American River College, Area A

7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

***7.01 S13 Timely Notification of Changes to Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) Narratives and Templates**

Whereas, Colleges that have been diligent and conscientious in creating and submitting the Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T) Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T) degree proposals based upon Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) have sometimes found that the rules, deadlines, and templates for submitting TMC-based proposals have been changed in a matter that has confused and frustrated the good faith efforts of the colleges to complete curriculum in a timely manner;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with Course Identification Numbering (C-ID) System, the Chancellor's Office, and other related parties to implement a policy that the TMC narratives and templates be updated in a matter that creates a regular predictable timeframe for notification and implementation.

Contact: Mary Ann Valentino, Fresno City College, Area A

9.0 CURRICULUM

9.01 S13 Investigate Regional Coordination of Course Offerings

Whereas, Faculty develop curriculum designed to best serve the educational needs of students and fully intend to offer the courses necessary for students to expeditiously meet their educational goals;

Whereas, Community colleges strive to develop class schedules that allow students to complete basic skills classes, obtain degrees and certificates, and transfer to four-year universities, all within a timely manner;

Whereas, Despite their best intentions, it is often difficult for colleges to offer necessary courses within the timeframe needed for students to complete their educational goals due to minimum class enrollment policies or the high cost of the course; and

Whereas, Colleges are constantly striving to better meet the needs of students and coordination among colleges on course scheduling may ensure that courses that are not frequently scheduled at one college due to historical low enrollments or high costs, may be offered at one or more neighboring colleges thus providing students with additional opportunities to complete their educational goals;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research the feasibility of and suggest possible strategies and effective practices for regional coordination of course offerings among colleges to improve course availability for students and report the findings at the Fall 2014 Plenary Session.

Contact: Craig Rutan, Santiago Canyon College, Curriculum Committee

***9.02 S13 Regional Conjoint Programs for Associates Degrees for Transfer**

Whereas, A conjoint program is defined as “a credit program (degree or certificate) or noncredit program that is offered collaboratively by two or more colleges, whether in the same or different districts (but usually within the same geographical region) ... and each college participating in a conjoint program receives authorization to award the certificate or degree¹”;

Whereas, Colleges that do not currently offer all the courses required for a specific certificate or degree may be able to establish conjoint programs with other colleges in their region that do offer the necessary courses; and

Whereas, Taking courses from several different community colleges concurrently in a region is not uncommon for many students;

Whereas, Each college is mandated by Chancellor’s Office regulations (dated November 30, 2012) and by SB 440 (as of February 21, 2013) to create, by the 2014-15 academic year, associate degrees for transfer in every major offered by the community college district where there is an approved Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) and conjoint programs may help with the development of these degrees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges explore the feasibility of expanding the use of conjoint programs and report the findings and possible next steps at the Fall 2013 Plenary Session.

Contact: Dan Crump, American River College, Legislation and External Policy Committee

¹ Program and Course Approval Handbook, March 2012, p. 31

***9.03 S13 Conditions of Enrollment for Online Instruction**

Whereas, Online learning is a mode of instruction that has become commonplace in our community colleges and some colleges now offer degrees exclusively online;

Whereas, Students may not have the time management skills needed to succeed in an online class or section, may have unrealistic expectations about online education, and may lack the basic technological skills required to succeed in a college online class or section;

Whereas, Student success in an online course depends not only on mastering the course content but also on a student's ability to navigate within the online environment and manage the unique aspects of an online class or section including specific technological skills and higher reading aptitudes; and

Whereas, Section 55200 of Title 5 describes specific characteristics of distance education and online instruction but does not permit colleges to implement a condition of enrollment to ensure students are prepared to succeed in the online environment;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support allowing implementation of appropriate additional preparation in order to enhance student success in online classes or sections; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges investigate what would be required to permit colleges to implement appropriate conditions of enrollment for distance learning courses, including changes to Title 5 if necessary, and research the efficacy of a required orientation designed for students taking online class or section and report the results of the study to the body by the Spring 2014 Plenary.

Contact: Don Gauthier, Los Angeles Valley College, Legislation and External Policy Committee

***9.04 S13 Investigate and Determine Appropriateness of Massive Open Online Courses**

Whereas, Serious academic and proprietary concerns have been raised regarding massive open online courses (MOOCs) including:

- MOOC lectures are “canned,” quizzes and tests are “automated,” students participation is “voluntary,” and students get “little” to no help from faculty;
- In their current incarnation, MOOCs represent “teacher-less classrooms” that can undermine academic integrity and rigor;
- The MOOC instructional paradigm appears to work best for a small portion of self-directed learners, as evident from the fact that only 5% of students complete courses and a much smaller subset that actually pass;
- Mechanisms for awarding credit for MOOCs taken by students (including transferability issues), evaluation of student success and learning outcomes have not been determined.

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research and investigate massive open online courses (MOOCs) through an evaluation based on formative and summative criteria to determine the appropriateness of this new form of instruction for community college students.

Contact: Kevin Bontenbal, Cuesta College, Area C

***9.05 S13 Eliminating the Word “Discipline” in the Taxonomy of Programs**

Whereas, The purpose of the Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) is to collect data and information on but not limited to the following matters: colleges where programs are offered, data on student awards, course enrollment and

Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES) information, spending on instructional programs, and assignable square feet for laboratories;

Whereas, The word “discipline” is used in the TOP as a means to categorize programs and bears no relationship to the minimum qualifications for teaching in disciplines as they are defined in *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* nor is it intended to do so; and

Whereas, The use of the word “discipline” in the TOP is confusing, and may lead some districts to adopt the “disciplines” in the TOP as being state-approved disciplines for the purpose of determining minimum qualifications², even though they do not exist in the Minimum Qualifications discipline list, which may in turn lead to incorrect assignments of faculty to classes or faculty service areas;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that the use of the word “discipline” should be limited to (1) faculty service areas, as defined in §87743.1 of the California Education Code, and (2) to faculty minimum qualifications as defined in the disciplines lists in *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, pursuant to Title 5 §53407; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose the continued use of the word “discipline” in the Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) and urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to work with the Academic Senate to develop alternative language in the TOP to replace the use of “discipline” so that the replacement language clearly differentiates the purpose of the TOP from the purpose of the disciplines lists and delineation of faculty service areas.

Contact: John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Area C

***9.06 S13 Dance TOP Codes**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges supports colleges’ individual and collective efforts to define comprehensive degrees and programs of study that promote transfer and gainful career and technical development, provide more viable options for Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID), Transfer Model Curricula (TMC), and associate for transfer degrees, and help offset projected workforce shortfalls, as evidenced in SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act;

Whereas, Nine of ten University of California and 20 of 23 California State Universities, as well as the nearly all California community colleges offer dance or dance-related programs, including transfer degrees and/or vocational certificates in fields such as, dance history/critical issues in dance, dance performance, dance science, dance and technology and choreography for students who intend to pursue careers and/or degrees in dance-related areas;

Whereas, The Taxonomy of Programs (TOP), revised June 2012, delineates the need for accurate reporting from the Chancellor’s Office to the state and federal government and states that TOP codes were “designed to aggregate information about programs”, with codes and titles serving a variety of purposes such as inventory of

² For example, the TOP lists Environmental Sciences and Technologies as a “discipline,” yet no such discipline exists in the disciplines list. As another example, Physics/Astronomy are a single discipline in the disciplines list, yet the TOP lists Physics and Astronomy as separate “subdisciplines” within the Physical Sciences “discipline.” Even more confusing is the status of Earth Science. In the TOP, Earth Science is a subdiscipline of Physical Science (which, incidentally, is listed as “Interdisciplinary Studies” in the disciplines list), as are Geology and Oceanography. However, Earth Science, Geology and Oceanography are courses taught within the Earth Science discipline.

approved and projected programs, accountability of enrollment and supplemental apportionment and completion rates for state and federal vocational education mandates; and

Whereas, In the Chancellor's Office designation, all current community college dance courses are listed under the single main TOP discipline code for Fine and Applied Arts, with a single subdiscipline code for dance, and a single field code of commercial dance, despite the fact that this field is actually a subcategory of the more prominent field of dance performance not yet designated with a TOP code, though seen in both transfer institutions and vocational areas, and thus there are no TOP code designations that accurately define "the way educational programs are actually organized" at the community college or four-year institutional levels nor do they take into account "the evolution of particular occupations or the terminology practitioners and teachers use to identify their discipline" in the vocational areas of dance, as intended by the Taxonomy of Programs Revised: 2012, Chancellor's Office;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work in collaboration with affected community college dance faculty and the Chancellor's Office to redefine and broaden the categories of existing TOP codes, sub-disciplines, and fields appropriate to dance studies, such as field designations of dance science, dance history/critical issues in dance, dance and technology, and dance performance.

Contact: Kathy Schmeidler and Diana Hurlbut, Irvine Valley College, Area D

See Attachment

10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST

10.01 S13 Adopt the Proposal to Add Kinesiology to the Disciplines List

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Executive Committee, having evaluated the evidence concerning the proposal to add Kinesiology to the Disciplines List, has resolved not to forward the addition of Kinesiology to the Disciplines List to the Board of Governors for adoption because "the identical discipline of Physical Education currently exists and to add Kinesiology would be redundant";³

Whereas, The Academic Senate Executive Committee erred in its assessment that the Kinesiology proposal:

Master's degree in **kinesiology**, physical education, exercise science, education with an emphasis in physical education, kinesiology, physiology of exercise or adaptive physical education OR bachelor's degree in any of the above AND master's degree in any life science, dance, physiology, health education, recreation administration, or physical therapy OR the equivalent [**emphasis added**]

is identical to the current discipline of Physical Education:

Master's degree in physical education, exercise science, education with an emphasis in physical education, kinesiology, physiology of exercise or adaptive physical education OR bachelor's degree in any of the above AND master's degree in any life science, dance, physiology, health education, recreation administration, or physical therapy OR the equivalent⁴

as a master's degree in kinesiology is specifically included in the Kinesiology minimum qualifications (MQ) proposal but not in the Physical Education MQ;

³ Resolution 10.01 S13 Disciplines List — Kinesiology, Executive Committee Resolutions packet, 45th Spring Session Resolutions For Discussion at Area Meetings.

⁴ Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges, January 2012, p. 34. [http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Minimum_Qualifications_Handbook_for_2012-2014_\(MB2\)_020212.pdf](http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Minimum_Qualifications_Handbook_for_2012-2014_(MB2)_020212.pdf)

Whereas, The criteria outlined in the document Disciplines List Proposal Process include “changes within the profession or field” and “inclusion of new degrees” as acceptable criteria for a proposal, which were highlighted in the proposal and faculty in the discipline followed the two-year published review process in good faith; and

Whereas, The proposal was vetted at both the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 Plenary Session hearings where 11 testimonies from ten different colleges supported and no testimonies opposing the proposal were recorded;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Board of Governors adopt the proposed addition of Kinesiology to the Disciplines List.

Contact: Kim Harrell, Folsom Lake College, Area A

10.02 S13 Disciplines List – Kinesiology

Whereas, Oral testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of minimum qualifications for faculty in the California community colleges, known as the "Disciplines List," supports the following addition of the Kinesiology discipline:

Master’s degree in kinesiology, physical education, exercise science, education with an emphasis in physical education, kinesiology, physiology of exercise or adaptive physical education OR bachelor’s degree in any of the above AND master’s degree in any life science, dance, physiology, health education, recreation administration, or physical therapy OR the equivalent; and

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, having evaluated this evidence, does not support the addition of Kinesiology because the identical discipline of Physical Education currently exists and to add Kinesiology would be redundant;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the proposed addition to the Disciplines List for Kinesiology not be sent forward to the Board of Governors for adoption.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, SEAP Committee
See Appendix A: Disciplines List Revision Summary Report

***10.03 S13 Disciplines List – Chicano Studies**

Whereas, Oral testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of minimum qualifications for faculty in the California community colleges, known as the "Disciplines List," supported and opposed the following addition of the Chicano Studies discipline:

Master’s degree in Chicano Studies OR Ethnic Studies OR the equivalent.

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, having evaluated this evidence, supports the addition of Chicano Studies;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Board of Governors adopt the proposed addition to the Disciplines List for Chicano Studies.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, SEAP Committee
See Appendix A: Disciplines List Revision Summary Report

10.04 S13 Disciplines List – Teacher Education

Whereas, Oral testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of minimum qualifications for faculty in the California community colleges, known as the "Disciplines List," both supported and opposed the following addition of the Teacher Education discipline:

Master’s in education, teaching, special education, curriculum and instruction, or in a recognized K-12 subject matter, AND hold or have held a state approved K-12 teaching credential, OR the equivalent.

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, having evaluated this evidence, supports the addition of Teacher Education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Board of Governors adopt the proposed addition to the Disciplines List for Teacher Education.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, SEAP Committee
See Appendix A: Disciplines List Revision Summary Report

***10.05 S13 Disciplines List – Health Education**

Whereas, Oral testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of minimum qualifications for faculty in the California community colleges, known as the "Disciplines List," supports the following revision to the discipline of Health Education:

Master’s degree in health science, health education, biology, nursing, physical education, kinesiology, exercise science, dietetics, ~~or~~ nutrition or Public Health OR bachelor’s degree in any of the above AND master’s degree in ~~public health, or~~ any biological science OR the equivalent.

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, having evaluated this evidence, supports the revision to the discipline of Health Education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Board of Governors adopt the proposed revision to the Disciplines List for Health Education.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, SEAP Committee
See Appendix A: Disciplines List Revision Summary Report

***10.06 S13 Disciplines List – Peace Studies**

Whereas, Oral testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of minimum qualifications for faculty in the California community colleges, known as the "Disciplines List," supports the following addition of the Peace Studies discipline:

Master’s in Peace Studies, Peace and Conflict Studies, Peace and Justice Studies, or the equivalent.

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, having evaluated this evidence, supports the addition of Peace Studies;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Board of Governors adopt the proposed addition to the Disciplines List for Peace Studies.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, SEAP Committee
See Appendix A: Disciplines List Revision Summary Report

***10.07 S13 Disciplines List – Digital Media**

Whereas, Oral testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of minimum qualifications for faculty in the California community colleges, known as the "Disciplines List," opposed adding the following new discipline to the non-Master's list called Digital Media;

A Bachelor's degree in Computer Graphics, Digital Media, Multimedia, Animation, Fine Arts with an emphasis in digital media, or related field from an accredited college or university, and two years of non-teaching experience in a related discipline, or the equivalent.

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, having evaluated this evidence, opposed the revision;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges not forward the proposal to change the Disciplines List for Digital Media to the Board of Governors.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, SEAP Committee
See Appendix A: Disciplines List Revision Summary Report

***10.08 S13 Disciplines List – Pharmacy Technology**

Whereas, Oral testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of minimum qualifications for faculty in the California community colleges, known as the "Disciplines List," both supported and opposed adding the following new discipline to the non-Master's list called Pharmacy Technology;

Any bachelor's degree and two years of professional experience, or any associate degree and six years of professional experience, or any associate degree, and an accredited Pharmacy Technician Certification (CPhT), and four years of professional experience.

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, having evaluated this evidence, supports the revisions to the discipline of Pharmacy Technician;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Board of Governors adopt the proposed revision to the Disciplines List for Pharmacy Technician.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, SEAP Committee
See Appendix A: Disciplines List Revision Summary Report

***10.09 S13 Improvements to the Disciplines List Process**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges reviews the Disciplines List in the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*⁵ every two years to recommend additions and changes to the Board of Governors;

Whereas, During every two-year cycle the Academic Senate evaluates the process used to revise the disciplines list and makes modifications as necessary (e.g., recommending a new category requiring a "Specific Bachelor's degree or Associate Degree List" during the last review);

⁵ [http://ascce.org/sites/default/files/Minimum_Qualifications_Handbook_for_2012-2014_\(MB2\)_020212.pdf](http://ascce.org/sites/default/files/Minimum_Qualifications_Handbook_for_2012-2014_(MB2)_020212.pdf)

Whereas, Transparency, awareness, participation, and a thorough understanding of the Disciplines List review process is difficult since the process only occurs every two years; and

Whereas, While the current Discipline List Revision Process provides directions and timelines to the field, there is limited information about the entire process including the roles and responsibilities of Senate committees and how the Executive Committee makes determinations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges consolidate the information in the three Disciplines List Process documents, and pertinent information from the paper, *Disciplines List Review Process* (ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee, 2004) to create a Disciplines List Process Faculty Handbook to ensure all pertinent information to the process is consistent, housed in one place, and can be used by both faculty at large and the Standards, Equity, Access, and Practice Committee to ensure clarity and effectiveness of the process.

Contact: Kim Harrell, Folsom Lake College, Area A

***10.10 S13 Discipline List Motion**

Whereas, The Disciplines List Process sometimes culminates in a situation in which the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges submits a resolution to recommend *not forwarding* the discipline to the Board of Governors for adoption, leading to a great deal of confusion about the true meaning and consequences of an Aye or Nay vote to a negatively stated resolution;

Resolved, That the Executive Committee modify the Discipline List Process so that resolutions about additions to the Minimum Qualifications document are stated positively and that the body determines by a simple Aye vote when a discipline will be forwarded to the Board of Governors with a recommendation to adopt and a simple Nay vote when a discipline will not be forwarded to the Board of Governors for adoption.

Contact: Phil Smith, American River College, Area A

13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS

***13.01 S13 Support for Local Control in Noncredit Instruction Areas**

Whereas, The Legislative Analyst's Office December 2012 report, "Restructuring California's Adult Education System" and the January 2013 Governor's trailer bill have both proposed cutting the approved noncredit instruction areas from the current number of ten to six, thereby eliminating older adults, parenting, home economics, and health and safety;

Whereas, The approved noncredit instruction areas that are being considered for elimination have historically given California's community colleges the ability to address local areas of need, including but not limited to older adults who are returning to the workforce because of economic hardship, older adults who need to increase or sustain their mental and physical agility, parents who hope to prepare their young children for the education system, parents who are interested in developing and modeling successful behaviors, and mature drivers who want to update their road skills;

Whereas, The elimination of approved noncredit instruction areas would change the California community college's commitment to educating the people of California and would greatly alter the term "community" in the title adopted by the system in 1967, and local districts would be rendered unable to provide accessible educational opportunities to communities identified as demonstrating real need; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges have continually demonstrated support for noncredit instruction by supporting resolutions as far back as 1989 that aim to improve the quality of noncredit education in the state, and recently resolutions have called for the Academic Senate to assign responsibility for adult education to California community colleges (06.03 F11), and oppose the elimination of non-CDCP noncredit classes (13.02 F11);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the idea that California community colleges must remain flexible enough to respond to the changing needs of their respective populations by retaining local control in choosing which of the ten noncredit approved instruction areas to offer courses in; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community colleges oppose the elimination of any of the ten noncredit approved instruction areas currently defined in Education Code.

Contact: Candace Lynch-Thompson, NOCCCD-School of Continuing Education, Area C

18.0 MATRICULATION

***18.01 S13 CCC ESL Assessment for Placement Test**

Whereas, The need for a California community college-developed ESL assessment for placement test has been articulated by the 2007 Academic Senate for California Community College's Consultation Council on Assessment Task Force, the 2009 Academic Senate/California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) Action Planning Group on Assessment, and the California Community College English as a Second Language (ESL) Placement Test Development Project (sponsored by the 2009-2011 California Community College Assessment Association and CCCCCO);

Whereas, California community college (CCC) students, faculty, and instructional programs benefit from ESL assessment test content that more effectively measures the specific knowledge and skills expected of entering CCC students at various course placement levels than currently available instruments ;

Whereas, California community colleges and the Chancellor's Office benefit from affordable placement instruments based on test specifications and content which are developed, managed, and owned by the CCCCCO; and

Whereas, A multi-level ESL placement instrument written by CCC content area experts (i.e., CCC ESL faculty), through a project funded by the CCCCCO and led by the California Community College Assessment Association (CCCAA) has so far accomplished the following:

- Development of comprehensive ESL test-specifications (2009-2010)
- Development of Novice through Advanced-level Reading passages and test items, and Language Structure test items (2010-2011)
- Field-testing, psychometric analysis, and revision (if needed) of 45 Reading passages, 232 Reading test items, and 285 Language Structure items
- Development of a (Novice-Advanced level) Writing Sample scoring rubric

yet CCCCCO funding of the project was suspended in early 2012, with no clear indication when and if funding would resume;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to resume field testing and test item developments so as to provide California community colleges with a developed ESL assessment for placement.

Contact: Kitty Moriwaki, City College of San Francisco, CO Assessment Workgroup

19.0 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

***19.01 S13 Adopt the Paper Sound Principles for Faculty Evaluations**

Whereas, Academic Senate Resolution 19.05 F11 directed the Academic Senate to “survey districts on the processes and criteria used for faculty evaluation and work with statewide bargaining organizations to analyze the results and identify and formulate effective practices for the purpose of updating the 1990 paper Guidelines for Developing a Faculty Evaluation Process”;

Whereas, A survey for local academic senate presidents regarding faculty evaluations was completed December of 2012; and

Whereas, The results of the December 2012 faculty evaluations survey were used to inform the content of the paper *Sound Principles for Faculty Evaluations*, and this paper has been properly reviewed by representatives from various interested constituent groups including faculty bargaining units;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Sound Principles for Faculty Evaluations*.

Contact: David Morse, Long Beach City College, Governance and Internal Policy Committee

See Appendix B

***19.02 S13 Adopt the Paper Alternative Methods for the Awarding of College Credit: Credit by Examination for Articulated High School Courses**

Whereas, Resolution 21.01 (Fall, 2007) encouraged “local senates to eliminate the practice that delays the awarding of credit to secondary students participating in legitimate articulation agreements or dual enrollment arrangements with the college” and resolution 09.05 (Fall, 2008) called upon the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges to “research and share effective practices for credit by exam processes with local senates”; and

Whereas, It was determined by the Statewide Careers Pathways Advisory Committee that Title 5 changes were necessary to further facilitate the awarding of credit for articulated high school courses and guidance for colleges was needed to effectively implement policies and practices that removed the delay of credit;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Alternative Methods for the Awarding of College Credit: Credit by Examination for Articulated High School Courses*

Contact: Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Executive Committee

See Appendix C

***19.03 S13 Develop Training Guidance for Faculty Engaged in Peer Evaluations**

Whereas, The evaluation of faculty is a critical process for developing teaching excellence and preserving academic quality in California community colleges and is a shared responsibility of academic senates, faculty bargaining units, and college administrations;

Whereas, As noted in the Academic Senate Paper *Sound Principles for Faculty Evaluations*, most colleges do not have a process in place for training peer evaluators, and such training would be a valuable tool for enhancing the quality and integrity of faculty evaluations; and

Whereas, In a Fall 2012 Plenary Session breakout on faculty evaluations, participants suggested that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should provide guidance for local colleges regarding the training of peer evaluators;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with statewide bargaining organizations and other relevant constituencies to develop training materials and/or other guidance to help local colleges and districts establish effective training processes for faculty engaged in peer evaluation.

Contact: David Morse, Long Beach City College, Governance and Internal Policy Committee

***19.04 S13 Part-time Faculty Nomenclature**

Whereas, There are numerous terms available to define the role, rank, or position of part-time faculty, yet the only terminology in Education Code that pertains to part-time faculty is “temporary” and “part-time” faculty or academic employees;

Whereas, Choosing terminology to refer to academic colleagues is an act that conveys not only employment status but also respect, equity, and acknowledgement of shared obligations and responsibilities; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urges local senates to include part-time faculty in shared governance and, hence, decision-making;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend local senates engage with their part-time faculty in an open and inclusive discussion and democratic decision regarding local terminology used to refer to part-time faculty.

Contact: Ken Bearden, Butte College, Area A

***19.05 S13 Professional Development and Training**

Whereas, The Student Success Task Force Recommendation 6.1 calls for the creation of a continuum of mandatory professional development opportunities and affirms the need for faculty professional development;

Whereas, Faculty need ongoing professional development and training that is extensive and on-going with an instructional design focus as well as training that facilitates other aspects of community college faculty roles;

Whereas, The Chancellor’s Office Professional Development Committee has created recommendations to support professional development that affirm the role of the Academic Senate that is stipulated through AB 1725;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to assist colleges in creating professional development programs for faculty that extend beyond the activity model to professional development pathways that use a variety of methods to enhance the skills of faculty as master teachers and support full engagement in all academic and professional matters.

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College, Area B

***19.06 S13 Faculty Professional Development**

Whereas, The need for professional development has always existed, it has continued to grow as faculty responsibilities increase;

Whereas, Current Education Code (§87153) and the subsequent Flex Calendar procedures allow flexibility and cast such a broad net that activities to increase self-esteem are included and the Guidelines for Implementation of the Flexible Calendar Program allows for personal growth that enhances well-being;

Whereas, The current tide of new developments in community colleges including but not limited to changes in accreditation, the Student Success Task Force, and development of transfer degrees necessitates faculty professional development to focus on academic and professional matters; and

Whereas, The current fiscal situation of the California Community College has severely reduced funding for professional development;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support limitations on professional development activities to only include professional development on academic and professional matters until such time as the funding stream increases beyond the base Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) funding amounts for colleges to allow all activities listed in Education Code §87153(a-i) including activities that increase self-esteem and activities for personal growth.

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College, Area B

***19.07 S13 Certification of Faculty to Teach Distance Education Courses**

Whereas, Federal and state regulations, as well as accreditation standards, require that colleges ensure that distance education (DE) course offerings meet the same standards of instructional quality as on-site courses;

Whereas, Distance education pedagogical methods differ significantly from on-site instructional pedagogy, and as a result, effective, quality DE instruction requires faculty with relevant skills and training in distance education delivery and pedagogy to promote student success in this modality;

Whereas, In its paper *Ensuring the Appropriate Use of Educational Technology: An Update for Local Academic Senates* (Spring 2008), the Academic Senate states that colleges could “consider possible use of board-approved local minimum qualifications” that include technology skills but does not address the possible inclusion in local minimum qualifications of certification in DE pedagogical methods; and

Whereas, Title 5 §55208(a) requires that faculty assigned to distance education sections meet the same discipline minimum qualifications as on-site faculty, in accordance with Title 5 §53410, but is silent on qualifications beyond the required preparation to teach in a given discipline, such as qualifications to teach in the distance education modality;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges survey colleges to determine what local requirements exist for certification of faculty to teach in the distance education modality and communicate those results to the body by Spring 2014; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to explore possible revisions to Title 5 that clarify the role of local academic senates in certifying the qualifications of faculty assigned to teach DE courses, including, but not limited to, training in DE course management systems and training in DE pedagogical methods.

Contact: John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Area C

TAXONOMY OF PROGRAMS PROPOSED REVISION, DANCE

Sample Model of Top Code Designations (DRAFT)

1008.00 – Dance

1008.1 – Dance Performance

1008.11 – Commercial Dance*

1008.2 – Dance Science

1008.21 – Pilates*

1008.3 – Dance History/Critical Issues

1008.4 – Dance and Technology

Final determination of TOP code designations will be ascertained after collaboration within affected community college dance faculties.

**ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
DISCIPLINES LIST REVISION PROPOSALS**

February 19, 2013

Information for Proposed Disciplines List Changes

Italics indicate a proposed addition

~~Strikeout~~ indicates a proposed deletion

Notation of "Senate" or department name after listing of position indicates that the college senate or department took a position; otherwise position is that of an individual.

SECTION I: REVISIONS TO DISCIPLINES (MASTER'S)

PROPOSAL #1:

Proposed Revision Discipline: Kinesiology

Organization: Los Rios CCD Senate

Standards, Equity, Access, and Practices (SEAP) Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward

Reason: The SEAP Committee suggests that this proposal moves forward for adoption.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward

Reason: The Executive Committee recommended that the proposal to add "Kinesiology" not move forward to the Board of Governors for adoption because the proposed discipline is not new but is identical to an existing discipline and therefore redundant.

Current Minimum Qualifications:

Add new discipline.

Proposed Change:

Master's degree in kinesiology, physical education, exercise science, education with an emphasis in physical education, kinesiology, physiology of exercise or adaptive physical education OR bachelor's degree in any of the above AND master's degree in any life science, dance, physiology, health education, recreation administration, or physical therapy OR the equivalent.

Rationale: Kinesiology is listed as an acceptable degree to meet minimum qualifications for the dance, health, and physical education disciplines, and yet it is not given a discipline of its own; On the community college level four community colleges have approved AA-T degrees in kinesiology with seven more colleges moving their AA-T degrees through the process; At the CSU level no less than nineteen CSU universities offer majors in kinesiology; And there is a clear movement from physical education degrees towards degrees in kinesiology at the CSUs as evidenced by 48 degree options in kinesiology and only six in physical education.

Hearing testimonies: The testimonies made by the following individuals at two hearings (Spring 2012/Fall 2012) were supportive of this proposal.

<u>Name</u>	<u>School/Org</u>	<u>Testimony</u>	<u>Position</u>
Zerryl Becker	College of the Desert	Hearing	Senate Support
Kale Braden	Cosumnes River College	Hearing	Senate Support
Riley Dwyer	Moorpark College	Hearing	Senate Support
Susanna Gunther	Solano College	Hearing	Senate Support

Kim Harrell	Folsom Lake College	Hearing	Department Support
Carolyn Holcroft	Foothill College	Hearing	Senate Support
Ginni May	Sacramento City College	Hearing	Senate Support
Jan McEveely	Los Angeles City College	Hearing	Individual Support
Dan Smith	Mt. San Antonio College	Hearing	Senate Support
Matt Wright	Folsom Lake College	Hearing	Senate Support
Connie Zuercher	Los Rios District	Hearing	Senate Support

PROPOSAL #2:

Proposed Revision Discipline: Chicano Studies

Organizations: San Diego Mesa College

Standards, Equity, Access, and Practices (SEAP) Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward

Reason: The SEAP Committee suggests that this proposal moves forward for debate.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward

Reason: The Executive Committee agreed with the SEAP Committee recommendation.

Current Minimum Qualifications:

Add new discipline.

Proposed Change:

Master's degree in Chicano Studies OR Ethnic Studies OR the equivalent

Rationale: The rationale for adding Chicano Studies to the disciplines list based on the growth in programs and departments at the UC, CSU, and private universities/colleges that offer undergraduate and advanced graduate degrees in Chicano Studies. Having Chicano Studies on the disciplines list will clarify the minimum qualifications for teaching and hiring.

Hearings testimonies: The above strikeout noted in the proposed change were presented at the Fall 2012 hearing and approved by the author. The following testimony was received based on the original language and does not necessarily reflect their current position on the proposal or change.

<u>Name</u>	<u>School/Org</u>	<u>Testimony</u>	<u>Position</u>
Diana Bennett	San Mateo CCD	Hearing	Senate Support
Nenagh Brown	Moorpark College	Hearing	History Faculty Oppose
Riley Dwyer	Moorpark College	Hearing	Senate Oppose
Jan Lombardi	San Diego City College	Hearing	Senate Support
Madeleine Minkes	San Diego Mesa College	Hearing	Chicano Studies Dept. Support
Leigh Anne Shaw	Skyline College	Hearing	Senate Oppose

PROPOSAL #3:

Proposed Revision Discipline: Family and Consumer Studies/Home Economics

Organizations: Cuesta College

PULLED WITH AUTHOR'S CONSENT

PROPOSAL #4:Proposed Revision Discipline: Teacher EducationOrganizations: Association of California Community College Teacher Education ProgramsStandards, Equity, Access, and Practices (SEAP) Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward

Reason: The SEAP Committee suggests that this proposal moves forward for adoption.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward

Reason: The Executive Committee recommended that this proposal be forwarded to the body for adoption.

Current Minimum Qualifications:

Add new discipline

Proposed Change:*Master's in education, teaching, special education, curriculum and instruction or in a recognized K-12 subject matter, **AND** hold or have held a state approved K-12 teaching credential, **OR** the equivalent.*Rationale: This proposal seeks to create a new discipline within the California Community College System titled: Teacher Education. The rationale for this proposal is based on the following:

- 1) The expanded role of the community colleges in K-12 teacher preparation has resulted in an expansion of the education curriculum offered and articulated with CSU, UC, and California Independent Colleges and Universities.
- 2) The content of these teacher education courses and the articulation agreements with universities require faculty to possess expertise in K-12 teacher preparation requirements, state content standards, state teacher performance expectations, effective teaching methods and pedagogical practices, and possess experience in a K-12 setting.
- 3) Although a current Education discipline exists within the community colleges, the minimum qualifications are too broad, do not specify K-12 teaching experience and do not align with state and national teacher preparation program accreditation standards. A proposal to change/narrow the minimum qualifications for this existing discipline was previously rejected.

NOTE: Proposal was revised since the Fall 2012 hearing to clarify the proposal.

Hearing testimonies: The testimonies presented at the Fall 2012 hearing largely supported the proposal.

However, concern was raised that the new proposal does not include a Master's in Early Childhood Education as an option. The recommendation was not supported by the authors of the proposal

<u>Name</u>	<u>School/Org</u>	<u>Testimony</u>	<u>Position</u>
Steve Baptista	Santa Ana College/ACCCTEP	Hearing	ACCCTEP Support
Kathryn Browne	Skyline College	Hearing	Senate Oppose
Dianna Chiabotti	Napa Valley College	Hearing	Department Support
Michael DiCarbo	Riverside City College CCD	Hearing	District Senate Support
Stephanie Dumont	Golden West College	Hearing	Individual Support
Corinna Evett	Santiago Canyon College	Hearing	Education Faculty Support
Jan Lombardi	San Diego City College	Hearing	Individual Support
Monica Porter	Santa Ana College	Hearing	Senate Support
Janis Perry	Santiago Canyon College	Hearing	ACCCTEP Support

Craig Rutan	Santiago Canyon College	Hearing	Individual Support
Peter H. Sezzi	Ventura College	Hearing	Senate Support
Leigh Anne Shaw	Skyline College	Hearing	Senate Oppose

PROPOSAL #5:
Proposed Revision Discipline: Health Education
Organizations: City College of San Francisco

Standards, Equity, Access, and Practices (SEAP) Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward
Reason: The SEAP Committee suggests that this proposal moves forward for adoption.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward
Reason: The Executive Committee recommended that this proposal be forwarded to the body for adoption.

Current Minimum Qualifications:
Master’s degree in health science, health education, biology, nursing, physical education, kinesiology, exercise science, dietetics, or nutrition OR bachelor’s degree in any of the above AND master’s degree in public health, or any biological science OR the equivalent.

Proposed Change:
Master’s degree in health science, health education, biology, nursing, physical education, kinesiology, exercise science, dietetics, ~~or~~ nutrition *or Public Health* OR bachelor’s degree in any of the above AND master’s degree in ~~public health~~, ~~or~~ any biological science OR the equivalent.

Rationale:
The Health field has been evolving for the past decade. The current minimum qualifications for teaching in the Health discipline have not kept pace. Specifically, a Master of Health Science degree meets the minimum qualifications to teach in the Health field while a Master of Public Health is acceptable only with certain Bachelor’s degrees. This proposal seeks to expand the minimum qualifications by adding Master of Public Health. At issue are three factors: 1) The health science discipline overlaps considerably with the public health discipline: it is difficult to distinguish the main differences between the two. Institutions such as Johns Hopkins University and CSU Los Angeles have been updating the names of their departments and degrees from Health Science to Public Health. 2) Health science is an incredibly broad field, as is public health; they both encompass clinical, education and policy areas (to name a few), and specifying the area for the Master of Public Health degree (i.e. Health Education) that meets the minimum qualifications while not specifying any area for the Master of Health Science degree is arbitrary and capricious. 3) Master of Health Science programs, which are in fact diminishing in number (there is only one among all the CSUs and UCs in California), vary tremendously in their core curriculum requirements and there is no consistency or standard for graduates with this degree.

NOTE: Proposal was revised since Fall 2012 hearing to clarify the proposal.

Hearing testimonies: The testimonies presented at the Fall 2012 hearing supported the proposal.

<u>Name</u>	<u>School/Org</u>	<u>Testimony</u>	<u>Position</u>
Carolyn Holcroft	Foothill College	Hearing	Senate Support
Karen Saginor	City College of San Francisco	Hearing	Senate Support
Leigh Anne Shaw	Skyline College	Hearing	Senate Support

PROPOSAL #6:

Proposed Revision Discipline: Peace Studies

Organization: San Diego City College

Standards, Equity, Access, and Practices (SEAP) Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward
Reason: The SEAP Committee suggests that this proposal moves forward for adoption.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward
Reason: The Executive Committee recommended that this proposal be forwarded to the body for adoption.

Current Minimum Qualifications:
Add new discipline

Proposed Change:
Master's in Peace Studies, Peace and Conflict Studies, Peace and Justice Studies, or the equivalent.

Rationale:
Peace studies is an academic field of inquiry within the social sciences that examines prevention, de-escalation and resolution of conflict as well as post conflict peacebuilding. Peace Studies considers the root causes of a conflict through the interdisciplinary approach to build peace in a nonviolent manner by addressing human rights violations, establishing just and equitable societies, and ensuring ecological sustainability. With over 400 academic institutions offering Peace Studies around the world, the number of trained educators in the field of Peace Studies has exponentially increased.

Peace Studies is a growing field and is supported by a multitude of academic and research institutions such as the Peace and Justice Studies Association, the National Peace Academy, and the International Peace Research Association. In addition, Peace Studies is widely being adopted within various disciplines to add this perspective to their research and academic purview. For example, the International Studies Association founded in 1959 with over 5,000 members in 80 countries has a special section on Peace Studies and featured a substantial number of presentations focused on this field at the recent 2012 conference held in San Diego, California.

Due to the interdisciplinary nature and global reach of Peace Studies, students may secure a professional career working for non-profit agencies, international organizations, governmental agencies, public institutions and educational institutions. Students may select a professional or academic focus such as peacebuilding, conflict management, mediation, international justice, international relations, international or sustainable development. Career options for a graduate from a Peace Studies program may include the following: Program Coordinator, Human Rights Advocate, Community Liaison, Relief / Aid Worker, Peace Activist, Mediator, Educator, and Board Member for a Non-Profit Organization.

Hearing testimonies: The testimonies presented at the Fall 2012 hearing supported the proposal.

<u>Name</u>	<u>School/Org</u>	<u>Testimony</u>	<u>Position</u>
Stephanie Dumont	Golden West College	Hearing	Individual Support
Corinna Evett	Santiago Canyon College	Hearing	Individual Support
Cathy Harlow	San Diego City College	Hearing	Individual Support
Jan Lombardi	San Diego City College	Hearing	Individual Support

Richard Mahon	Riverside City College	Hearing	Individual Support
Wheeler North	San Diego Miramar College	Hearing	Individual Support
Monica Porter	Santa Ana College	Hearing	Individual Support
Deanna Shelton	San Diego City College	Hearing	Senate Support
Katie Zanoni	San Diego CCD	Hearing	Individual Support

SECTION 2: REVISIONS TO DISCIPLINES (NON-MASTER’S)

PROPOSAL #A:
Proposed Revision Discipline: Stagecraft
Organization: Cosumnes River College Senate

PULLED WITH THE AUTHOR’S CONSENT

PROPOSAL #B:
Proposed Revision Discipline: Digital Media
Organization: Modesto Junior College Senate

Standards, Equity, Access, and Practices (SEAP) Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward
Reason: The SEAP Committee suggests that this proposal be pulled because of concerns raised during the hearing.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward
Reason: The Executive Committee found the rationale unclear and agreed with the SEAP Committee.

Current Minimum Qualifications:
Add new discipline.

Proposed Change:
Bachelor’s degree in Computer Graphics, Digital Media, Multimedia, Animation, Fine Arts with an emphasis in digital media, or related field from an accredited college or university, and two years of non-teaching experience in a related discipline, or the equivalent.

Rationale:
Digital Media is defined as a broad range of programs that combine computer and other electronic technologies with skills and techniques from various fine arts and communication disciplines. There is currently no discipline that covers broad-based digital media or computer graphics programs. Community colleges tend to approach these disciplines from one of two directions; they specialize in one or two areas, such as animation or digital imaging, or they provide a big picture overview of the entire digital media realm. The disciplines list does not currently have a discipline that fits either approach. The closest match is multimedia. Since there is no description included for Multimedia, an assumption is being made that the term “Multimedia” is defined in top code 0614.10.

Hearing testimonies: The testimonies presented at the Fall 2012 hearing did not support the proposal.

<u>Name</u>	<u>School/Org</u>	<u>Testimony</u>	<u>Position</u>
Diana Bennett	San Mateo CCD	Hearing	Senate Support
Karen Saginor	City College of San Francisco	Hearing	Senate Oppose

Dan Smith
Riley Dwyer

Mt. San Antonio College
Moorpark College

Hearing
Hearing

Individual Oppose
Senate Oppose

PROPOSAL #C:

Proposed Revision Discipline: Pharmacy Technology

Organization: Santa Rosa College Senate

Standards, Equity, Access, and Practices (SEAP) Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward

Reason: The SEAP Committee suggests that this proposal moves forward for adoption.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Forward Not Forward

Reason: The Executive Committee recommended that this proposal be forwarded to the body for adoption.

Current Minimum Qualifications:

Any bachelor's degree and two years of professional experience, or any associate degree and six years of professional experience.

Proposed Change:

Any bachelor's degree and two years of professional experience, or any associate degree and six years of professional experience, *or any associate degree, and an accredited Pharmacy Technician Certification (CPhT), and ~~two~~ four years of professional experience.*

Rationale:

Pharmacy Technicians who obtain nationally accredited certification and recertification above and beyond the requirements for licensure:

- Experiential and Competency-based National Examination on level with two years of matching practice knowledge and involvement in the industry.
- Financial payroll compensation starting pay elevated to the two year service rank.
- 2-year experiential capstone standard in the industry since 1995. Place at the table for all professionally trained, ethically sound practitioners recognized by national corporations: CVS, Kaiser, Walgreen's, Safeway, Rite-Aid, Target, Eckards, and others.
- Established by the American Pharmacists Association; the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists.
- Mandated by major pharmacy organizations and State Licensing Boards of Pharmacy.
- The National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA) was created in 1987 by the Institute for Credentialing Excellence to help ensure the health, welfare, and safety of the public through the accreditation of a variety of certification programs that assess professional competence. NCCA uses a peer review process to: establish accreditation standards; evaluate compliance with the standards; recognize organizations/programs which demonstrate compliance; and serve as a resource on quality certification. Certification programs that receive NCCA accreditation demonstrate compliance with the NCCAA's Standards for the Accreditation of Certification Programs, which were the first standards for professional certification programs developed by the industry. To date, NCCA has accredited over 200 programs from more than 100 organizations, including Pharmacy Technician Certification Board National Examination.

NOTE: Proposal was revised since the Fall 2012 hearing to clarify the proposal.

Hearing testimonies: The above strikeout noted in the proposed change were presented at the Fall 2012 hearing and approved by the author. The following testimony was received based on the original language and does not necessarily reflect their current position on the proposal or change.

<u>Name</u>	<u>School/Org</u>	<u>Testimony</u>	<u>Position</u>
Carolyn Holcroft	Foothill College	Hearing	Senate Support
Candance Lynch- Thompson	NOCCD- School of Cont. Ed	Hearing	Senate Oppose
Monica Porter	Santa Ana College	Hearing	Individual Oppose

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. a. Action Item

**Ventura College Academic Senate Survey of
VC Faculty on Professional Life and Satisfaction**

2013 Ventura College Academic Senate Annual Survey of Faculty Satisfaction

Support for Faculty (Page 1)

1. As a faculty member at Ventura College, do you feel that you are supported to perform your job as an instructor, counselor or librarian?

Lickert Scale

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not supported
at all

Absolutely 100%
supported at all times

Comments Box:

2. Compared to last academic year (2011-12) do you feel that you are more supported this academic year (2012-13) to perform your job as an instructor, counselor or librarian?

Lickert Scale

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not supported
at all

Absolutely 100%
supported at all times

Comments Box:

3. Please list any concrete ideas that you think Academic Senate can do to support you as Ventura College faculty:

Large Comments Box:

Resources for Faculty (Page 2)

4. As a faculty member at Ventura College, do you feel that you have the resources necessary to perform your job as an instructor, counselor or librarian?

Lickert Scale

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all

Absolutely

Comments Box:

5. Compared to last academic year (2011-12) do you feel that you have access to more resources this academic year (2012-13) to perform your job as an instructor, counselor or librarian?

Lickert Scale

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Nothing's
changed

Infinitely more
access

Comments Box:

In-Classroom vs. Outside-Classroom Activities (Page 3)

6. What percentage of your time as a faculty member do you spend on directly-related instruction activities (i.e., prep, teaching, grading, etc.) / student services versus outside-of-classroom/-student services related activities (i.e., meetings, SLOs, CORs, program review, clubs, etc.)

A
Percentage Box

B
Percentage Box

A = directly-related instruction activities
B = meetings, SLOs, CORs, program review, clubs, etc

7. Ideally, what should this percentage balance between directly-related instruction/student service activities versus outside-of-classroom/-student service related activities

A
Percentage Box

B
Percentage Box

8. Given that faculty primacy in the development and updating of course outlines, determination and assessment of SLOs, involvement in the reflective self-evaluation and request for resources through program review, hiring of peer faculty, involvement with student clubs, etc., will all rightfully remain the right, responsibility and obligation of faculty, especially for full-time faculty, what concrete suggestions do you have to help correct the balance between directly-related instruction/student service activities versus outside-of-classroom/-student service related activities if you think this is currently out of balance?

Large Comments Box:

Senate Business (Page 4)

9. Do you review the Senate agenda and minutes?
Always
Sometimes
Never
10. Do you RECEIVE feedback from your Senate representative(s)?
Always
Sometimes
Never
11. Do you PROVIDE feedback to your Senate representative(s)?
Always
Sometimes
Never
12. Please provide any additional comments about your Academic Senate here. Thanks!

Demographics:

Please indicate your faculty status: (FT / PT)

Please indicate your division: (Divisions)

Please indicate your length of service as a faculty member at Ventura College: (Years)

Please provide any additional comments you may wish to add here. Thanks!

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. b. Action Item

Ventura College Academic Senate

Self-Assessment Survey

Your participation in this annual survey will assist in our reflective self-assessment of the effectiveness of the Ventura College Academic Senate. Thank you in advance for your participation in this self-appraisal effort.

1. Did the Academic Senate set and have clearly documented goals for this year?

- Yes
- No

2. Was the meeting frequency of the Senate sufficient to meet our goals and charge (i.e., the 10+1)

- Yes
- No

Please explain your response:

3. To what degree do you agree with the following statement: "The goals of the Senate were accomplished effectively"?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain your response:

4. Did the Senate respond in a timely manner to academic and professional issues as they arose throughout this past academic year?

- Yes
- No

Please explain your response:

5. Is the Senate meeting environment conducive to open discussion of relevant issues?

- Yes
- No

Please explain your response:

6. Are there any issues that you are aware of that the Senate did not address/discuss this year but should have?

- Yes
- No

Please explain your response:

7. Are there any issues that you are aware of that the Senate SHOULD NOT have addressed/discussed this year but did?

- Yes
- No

Please explain your response:

8. Are the Senate agendas/minutes posted and accessible in an easy to find location and in a timely manner?

- Yes
- No

Please explain your response:

9. Where should the Senate office be located?

- MCE/MCW Bldg Complex
- Science Building
- Campus Center Bldg
- Library/LRC Bldg
- Admin Bldg
- Any ol' place where a room is available
- Other (Tell us where!!!) _____

10. Discuss academic and professional matters, goals or agenda items that need completion, topics for future consideration by the Senate, and/or changes needed to improve the effectiveness of this Senate.

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. d. Action Item

AP 4260 – Prerequisites and Corequisites

Book	VCCCD Board Policy Manual
Section	Chapter 4 Academic Affairs
Title	BP 4260 Prerequisites, Co-requisites <u>and Advisories on Recommended Preparation</u>
Number	BP 4260
Status	Active
Legal	Title 5, Section 55200
Adopted	February 16, 2006

The Board establishes prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories on recommended preparation for courses in the curriculum upon recommendation of the Chancellor in consultation with the Academic Senates. All such prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories shall be established in accordance with the standards set out in Title 5. Any prerequisites, co-requisites or advisories shall be necessary and appropriate for achieving the purpose for which they are established. The procedures shall include a way in which a prerequisite or co-requisite may be challenged by a student on grounds permitted by law. Prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories shall be identified in District publications available to students.

See Administrative Procedure 4260.

AP 4260 Prerequisites, Co-requisites and Advisories on Recommended Preparation

The faculty in the discipline or, if the college has no faculty member in the discipline, the faculty in the department are responsible for approving courses and establishing their associated prerequisites/co-requisites as separate actions. The approval of a prerequisite or co-requisites must be based on the determination that it is an appropriate and rational measure of a student's readiness to enter a degree-applicable credit course or program.

Determinations about prerequisites and co-requisites shall be made only on a course-by-course or program-by-program basis, including those establishing communication and computational skill requirements *(per Title 55003(a) and (j) respectively)*.

Courses for which prerequisites or co-requisites are established will be taught by a qualified instructor and in accordance with the course outline, particularly those aspects of the course outline that are the basis for justifying the establishment of the prerequisites or co-requisites *(per Title 55003(b)(2) and (3))*.

A. Establishing Prerequisites and Co-requisites

In order to establish a prerequisite or co-requisite, the prerequisite or co-requisite must be determined to be necessary and appropriate for achieving the purpose for which it is being established *(per Title 55003(b)(1))*. Necessary and appropriate shall be understood to mean reasonably needed to achieve the purpose that it purports to serve: absolute necessity is not required *(per Title 55000(h))*. Prerequisites and co-requisites may be established only for any of the following purposes *(per Title 55003(d))*.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

1. The prerequisite or co-requisite is expressly required or expressly authorized by statute or regulation; or
2. The prerequisite will assure that a student has the skills, concepts, and/or information that is presupposed in terms of the course or program for which it is being established, such that a student who has not met the prerequisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course (or at least one course within the program) for which the prerequisite is being established; or
3. The co-requisite course will assure that a student acquires the necessary skills, concepts, and/or information, such that a student who has not enrolled in the co-requisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course or program for which the co-requisite is being established; or
4. The prerequisite or co-requisite is necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or the health and safety of others.

B. Level of Scrutiny

The level of scrutiny required for establishing prerequisites, co-requisites, and advisories on recommended preparation are content review or content review with statistical validation (per Title 5 55003(a)).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

1. Content review is a rigorous, ~~systemic~~ systematic process conducted by discipline faculty that identifies the necessary and appropriate body of knowledge or skills students need to possess prior to enrolling in a course, or which students need to acquire through simultaneous enrollment in a co-requisite course (per Title 5 55000 (c)). At a minimum, content review shall include the following;

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Right: 0.2", Space After: 13.75 pt

a. Careful review of the course including components such as course outline of record (COR) syllabi, sample exams, assignments, instructional materials, and/or grading criteria

b. Using the CORs of both the target and proposed prerequisite course, identification of required skills/knowledge student must have prior to enrolling in the target course and matching those skills/knowledge to the proposed prerequisites course

c. Documentation that verifies the above steps were taken.

2. Statistical validation is a ~~compilation~~ compilation of data according to sound research practices that shows a student is highly unlikely to succeed in the course unless the student has met the proposed prerequisite or co-requisite (per Title 5 55003(f)). When this level of scrutiny is used, the college shall follow the guidelines specified in Title 5 55003(g).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

C. Exemption from Scrutiny

Formatted: Underline

A prerequisite or co-requisite shall be exempt from scrutiny if it satisfies any of the following criteria (per Title 5 55003(e)): 1. It is required by statute or regulation; or 2. It is part of a closely related lecture-laboratory course pairing within a discipline; or 3. It is required by a four-year institution; or 4. Baccalaureate institutions will not grant credit for a course unless it has a particular communication or computational skill prerequisite.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

D. Curriculum Review Process

Formatted: Underline

~~Each The college's~~ Curriculum Committee is responsible for the curriculum review process, and its membership is determined in a manner that is ~~determined by mutually agreeable to the college administration and the college's Academic Senate~~ (per Title 5 55002(a)(1)). ~~A college C~~Curriculum ~~C~~committee reviews and approves the

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

establishment of prerequisites, co-requisites, and advisories on recommended preparation only upon the recommendation of the Academic Senate except that the Academic Senate may delegate this task to the Curriculum Committee without forfeiting its right or responsibility under Title 5 53200-53204.

When content review is used to establish prerequisites or co-requisites in reading, written expression, or mathematics for degree applicable courses not in a sequence, the college Curriculum Committee will do all the following:

- * Provide training to Curriculum Committee members on the establishment of co-requisites/prerequisites
- * Inform faculty about regulations regarding the establishment of co-requisites/prerequisites using content review
- * Direct faculty to the college's Office of Institutional Research to help with the following: a) identify courses that may increase the likelihood of student success with the establishment of a prerequisite or co-requisite; b) prioritize which courses should be considered for the establishment of new co-requisites or prerequisites; c) monitor any disproportionate impact that may occur based on the establishment of a prerequisite or co-requisite
- * Assure through communication with the college's Executive Vice-President's Office that prerequisite course, co-requisites courses, and courses that do not require prerequisites or co-requisites, whether basic skills or degree-applicable courses, are reasonably available.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

1. Standards for Approval of Prerequisites and Co-requisites.

A College's Curriculum Committee's will review the course outlines to determine if a student would be highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade unless the student has knowledge or skills not taught in the course. The course outline will be reviewed to determine if success in the course is dependent upon communication or computation skills, in which case the course shall require as prerequisites or co-requisites eligibility for enrollment in associate degree credit courses in English and/or mathematics, respectively (per Title 5 55002(a)(2)(D) and (E)). If a course requires pre-collegiate skills in reading, written expression, or mathematics, the college will do the following (*per Title 5 55003(l)*).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", First line: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

- a. Ensure these courses and sections are offered with reasonable frequency
- b. Monitor progress on student equity in accordance with title 54220 as follows:

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.25", First line: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.25"

* The college will conduct an evaluation to determine if the prerequisite has a disproportionate impact on student success.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", First line: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5"

* Where there is disproportionate impact on any group of students,

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", First line: 0.5"

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

—college will, in consultation with the ~~Chancellor~~ President or designee, develop and implement a plan setting forth the steps the district will take to correct the ~~d disproportionate~~ disproportionate impact.

2. Periodic review of Prerequisites and Co-requisites.

Using an appropriate level of scrutiny, the college will review all established CTE courses and program prerequisites, co-requisites, and advisories every two years to ensure they remain necessary and appropriate; all other established course and program prerequisites, co-requisites, and advisories will be reviewed every six years (*per title 5 55003(b)(4)*).

E. Challenging Co-requisites and Prerequisites

Whenever ~~a prerequisite and/or~~ co-requisites courses ~~are~~ established, sufficient sections shall be offered to reasonably accommodate all students who are required to take the ~~pre-or~~ co-requisite. A ~~prerequisite and/or~~ co-requisite shall be waived when space in the ~~pre-and/or~~ co-requisite course is not available (per Title 5 55003(m)). A student may challenge any prerequisite or co-requisite by submitting a challenge form at the time of registration to the Admission and ~~R~~ecords/Records and Registration Office. The student will be enrolled in the requested class if space is available. The challenge will be reviewed and the student notified of the decision within five (5) working days per AP 5052. If the challenge is denied, the student will be dropped from the class and refunded all applicable fees (*per Title 5 55003(o)*).

Grounds for challenge are as follows (per Title 5 55003(p)):

1. The prerequisite or co-requisites not been established in accordance with the district's process for establishing prerequisites and co-requisites
2. The prerequisites or co-requisites is in violation of Title 5 55003
3. The prerequisite or co-requisite is either unlawfully discriminatory or is being applied in an unlawfully discriminatory manner
4. The student has the knowledge or ability to succeed in the course or program despite not meeting the prerequisite or co-requisite
5. The student will be subject to undue delay in attaining the goal of his or her educational plan because the prerequisite or co-requisite course has not been made reasonably available.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", First line: 0.5", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0"

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", First line: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Formatted: Default

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. e. Action Item

VC/VCCCD Accreditation Midterm Reports

Ventura College

Midterm Report

Submitted
by
Ventura College
4667 Telegraph Road
Ventura, CA 93003

Submitted
to
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 15, 2013

CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL MIDTERM REPORT

October 15, 2013

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association
of Schools and Colleges

From: Ventura College
4667 Telegraph Road
Ventura, CA 93003

This institutional *Midterm Report* is submitted to the ACCJC for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's accreditation status.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community and the District Administrative Center and believe that this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Mr. Bernardo Perez, Chair, Board of Trustees, Ventura County Community College District

Dr. Jamillah Moore, Chancellor, Ventura County Community College District

Dr. xxxxx, President, Ventura College

Dr. Art Sandford, Academic Senate President, Ventura College

Mr. Peder Nielsen, Classified Senate President, Ventura College

Contents

Statement of Report Preparation.....	1
College Recommendation 1.....	2
College Recommendation 2.....	7
College Recommendation 3.....	13
College Recommendation 4.....	18
College Recommendation 5.....	23
College Recommendation 6.....	24
College Recommendation 7.....	28
College Recommendation 8.....	29
District Recommendation 1.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
District Recommendation 2.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
District Recommendation 3.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
District Recommendation 4.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
District Recommendation 5.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
District Recommendation 6.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
District Recommendation 7.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Commission Concern Regarding Board Governance.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Response to Self-Identified Issues in the 2010 Self Study Planning Agenda.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Statement of Report Preparation

This *Midterm Report* describes Ventura College's and the Ventura County Community College District's responses to the recommendations made by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) and the alignment to the Accreditation Commission Standards.

We certify there has been considerable opportunity for the Board of Trustees, Ventura County Community College District constituents, and Ventura College faculty, classified staff and administrators to participate in the review of this report. We believe the *Midterm Report* accurately reflects the nature and substance of progress since the Team visits on October 31, 2011, April 16, 2012, and November 13, 2012.

The college-specific portions of this report were compiled by the Ventura College Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the College Planning Council, and edited by Kathy Scott, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. The following faculty, staff, and administrators played a role in helping the College to address one or more of the college-specific accreditation recommendations:

The district-wide portions of this report were compiled by the District Director of Administrative Relations and the Vice Chancellors, with input and review by the Chancellor and the District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) and additional input and review feedback through the established participatory governance structure. The district-wide portion of the report was edited by Clare Geisen, District Director of Administrative Relations.

The District and the College have provided all reports from the ACCJC to the District communities to ensure transparency and clear communication of the various actions and steps taken to address the concerns of the Commission. The draft *Midterm Report* was made available to the entire District and College staff and to student leaders. The final reviews of the District portion of the report were conducted by the Board of Trustees, Chancellor, Chancellor's Cabinet, District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP), and the Consultation Council, an advisory committee representing District and Colleges' constituencies.

College Recommendation 1

Recommendation, October 2010:

As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard the team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to identify measurable student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support programs. In conjunction with this effort the college should assess all learning outcomes and incorporate analysis of student learning assessments into course and program improvements. This effort must be accomplished by the year 2012 as a result of broad-based dialogue and administrative, institutional and research support. (I.B.1-7, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e-f, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Update:

In November 2010 and in response to the preliminary recommendations from the accrediting team, an interim Student Learning Outcome Oversight Group (SLOOG) was developed consisting of faculty, deans, the Academic Senate president, and the Learning Resources Supervisor (C1-01). Additionally, two faculty SLO facilitators were selected and reassigned a portion of their teaching load to work with the faculty on SLO work. Course SLOs had been in existence for several years, and during December 2010, program level SLOs were established (C1-02) and mapped to the courses at which they would be assessed (C1-03). An SLO Toolkit was created and put online to assist faculty and staff with SLO work (C1-04).

Throughout the end of fall 2010 and during the first few weeks of spring 2011, the SLOOG created new SLO and SUO processes and forms, which were approved by the Academic Senate in February 2011 (C1-05, C1-06, and C1-07). The department chairs, department coordinators, and appropriate service supervisors or leads were then trained on the new forms and processes. Assessments using the new forms began during the spring 2011 semester, with a requirement for every course and service to have one SLO or one SUO assessed that semester (C1-08). For instructional areas, rubrics were created by faculty teaching that course and used for measurement purposes. Sample rubrics were posted on the SLO website (C1-09). The elements on the forms included performance expectations (goals), outcomes, findings, initiatives for improvement, and requests, where appropriate, for resources in order to connect the SLO/SUO processes to program review. These elements were reviewed and discussed extensively within departments and programs in relation to assessments that were conducted during the semester. Faculty SLO facilitators worked regularly with faculty across the disciplines. Extensive training sessions were also held during the Department Chair and Coordinators' meetings (C1-10).

A college reorganization relating, in part, to the need to address SLO work, took place in March 2011, after input from campus forums and surveys. An Office of Institutional Effectiveness, with a dean overseeing SLOs, program review, integrated planning, and accreditation, was created, in the reorganization (C1-11). This dean served as chair of SLOOG and later began serving as administrative support for the campus SLO Committee.

During this same semester (spring 2011), a program review task force was similarly working to improve the program review process. Several members of the SLOOG served on this task force because efforts to connect SLOs with program review were present at the outset of the SLO effort. In the SLO assessment forms that were created, questions about initiatives needed to improve student learning were included as were areas to request resources if needed.

At the conclusion of the 2010/2011 academic year, an electronic survey about the new SLO/SUO process was conducted to gather data about participation, successes, and areas in which to improve (C1-12).

Additionally, the first annual SLO Report, written by the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and the SLO faculty facilitators, with input from the Academic Senate, was created, distributed to the campus electronically, posted online, and included in the *Annual Planning Report* for 2011 (C1-13). It reviewed the work that had been done over the academic year, reported the survey data, and listed areas of success, and areas to improve.

On Mandatory Flex Day of the fall 2011 semester, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and the SLO facilitators addressed the campus on issues pertaining to SLOs and SUOs. SLO work was also conducted during division and department meetings that took place that same day (C1-14).

During this same semester, the SLOOG was replaced by a new SLO/SUO participatory governance committee and called the SLO Oversight Committee (SLOOC). The committee is chaired by the lead faculty SLO facilitator, with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness providing administrative support (C1-15).

During the fall 2011 semester, the college decided to move away from what had been termed “Core Competencies” and instead create ISLOs. At the SLO Committee, numerous models were examined, and extensive discussions took place about what skills we felt our students should have at the completion of a degree or transfer. SLO Committee members also discussed these skills with faculty and staff from their divisions and brought back input, which was further discussed at the SLO Committee. After several weeks of discussions, the SLO Committee decided to combine ISLOs with GE SLOs, and a draft of five ISLOs was created (C1-16). The GE/ISLOs were forwarded to the Senate for further discussion. The Senate approved them in March 2012 (C1-17). Work was conducted to include the GE/ISLOs in mapping activities and documents (C1-18).

In spring 2012, course SLOs and service SUOs continued to be assessed. Formal tracking continued to ensure that rubrics for courses were also completed and that faculty and staff were “closing the loop” on any initiatives created the prior semester (C1-19).

In spring 2012, the college began reviewing different software programs for SLO management. After evaluation and discussion, the decision was made to go with TracDat as it had the capability of managing SLOs, program review and, ultimately, strategic planning. Additionally, initiatives to improve student learning could be created and tracked to ensure “closing of the

loop.” The purchase of TracDat was approved by the district Administrative Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), and was subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees.

Training sessions for department chairs and coordinators took place regularly throughout the 2011/2012 academic year with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the SLO faculty facilitators, and the TracDat facilitator in attendance at most regular meetings (C1-20). In spring 2012, training for PSLO and ISLO assessments was provided in anticipation of the assessments for these SLOs that would be done in the fall semester. Pilot assessments by three programs (Child Development, Human Services, and Medical Assisting) were conducted by faculty teaching those courses, and those faculty provided the training to the department chairs at the end of the spring 2012 semester (C1-21).

TracDat was installed during the summer of 2012 and training sessions by the vendor were provided. Over the summer, data were input, and plans for training faculty and staff in the summer/fall were established. A TracDat facilitator was appointed to work with faculty and oversee the system.

At the conclusion of the 2011/2012 academic year, the SLO survey was conducted again with greater percentages of respondents saying that they were involved in the SLO/SUO process in their divisions (C1-22). The SLO Annual Report was again written and distributed as was the year’s *Annual Planning Report* (C1-23). These processes and reports will continue to be generated on an annual basis.

In fall 2012, the SLO Committee agreed to add two ISUOs to the existing GE/ISLOs in order to allow the services to map to institutional goals and to support the college mission. The ISUOs were approved by the Classified Senate, and they were also sent to the Academic Senate, which similarly approved them (C1-24). The issues are included to reinforce the belief that services 1) support or facilitate a positive learning environment for students and 2) facilitate institutional accountability with statutes, mandates, local policy and procedures and state or federal laws.

Additionally, a five year rotational plan for all SLO/SUO assessments was created and approved by the SLO Committee (C1-25). The rotational plan called for the five GE/ISLOs to be assessed during specific semesters during which campus-wide discussions would be scheduled to allow faculty across the disciplines to discuss their assessments and collaborate on ways in which to improve student learning in these areas. Programs and departments would be allowed to schedule their own course SLO and PSLO assessments during the five year period allowing for re-assessments when appropriate based on changes in instruction or resources acquired through program review (C1-26).

In fall 2012, PSLOs were assessed by programs (areas with degrees and/or certificates) and ISLOs #1 (Communication) by programs and departments mapping to this ISLOs (C1-27). Faculty SLO facilitators worked extensively with program and departments, helping them embed these assessments where applicable.

The college submitted its College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation to ACCJC in October 2012 explaining our reasons for believing that the institution met

proficiency per the SLO rubric (C1-28). Prior to its submission, the report was read and revised with input from SLO Committee members and the Academic Senate. The report provided the college's performance on SLOs at all levels, and included the following information:

- 98% of college courses have defined CSLOs
- 85% of college courses have ongoing assessment of CSLOs
- 93% of college programs have defined PSLOs
- 93% of college programs have ongoing assessment of PSLOs
- 100% of college support programs have defined SUOs
- 100% of college support programs have ongoing assessment of SUOs

Additionally, 98% of programs or departments that map to ISLO #1 (Communication) have conducted assessments.

Per the directive in the ACCJC 2013 Annual Report, PSLO assessment results have been put on the college's website and made available to students and the public (C1-29).

In spring 2013, faculty and staff continued to work on SLOs and SUOs. Specific tasks for this semester included TracDat "clean up" (review of courses in TracDat to verify that these are the courses currently being offered at least on a rotational basis, review of course SLOs, and verification of all mapping); completion of the five year rotation plans, completion of any PSLO rubrics not previously written; and a program/department meeting with an SLO faculty facilitator (C1-30).

The annual SLO survey was conducted for a third time at the end of the spring 2013 semester (C1-31), and the *Annual Planning Report*, which included the 2012/2013 SLO Report (and results of the survey), was completed and made available to the campus community on the SLO website (C1-32).

In addition to the work being undertaken by the college to comply with the Standards in regards to student learning outcomes, the college was awarded a Title V HSI grant (2012-2017) with a focus on increasing transfer velocity rates. As part of that grant, the college included an objective to have instructional programs associated with identified high-impact barrier courses reach Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement, as explained in WASC's SLO rubric (C1-33). The SLO Executive Committee decided to use the form/tool created to gather this information for all disciplines (beyond the scope of the grant), and so during the spring 2013 semester, each division held a facilitated meeting in which departments/programs identified their status for six specific items using a 1-5 scale (C1-34). A separate form with four items was created for the services (C1-35). From this self-assessment activity, large group discussions were held at the division level, with suggestions for what works being shared as well as ideas for improvement (C1-36). We will continue to use this form/data in future years as a way for faculty and staff to reflect upon their overall performance in regards to SLO assessments.

In fall 2013, each program, department, or service will assess CSLOs, PSLOs, or SUOs as required by the five year rotational plan for that area. ISLOs and ISUOs are specifically scheduled in order for the institution to be assessing and discussing them on an institutional

level. For 2013/2014, the college is scheduled to assess ISLO #2, Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and ISUO #X, XXXX (C1-37).

Evidence for College Recommendation 1:

- C1-01 SLOOG Minutes
- C1-02 PSLOs
- C1-03 PSLO Mapping
- C1-04 SLO Toolkit
- C1-05 SLO Individual Faculty Form
- C1-06 SLO Course Summary Form
- C1-07 SUO Form
- C1-08 Timeline/Calendar for Spring 2011 (see evidence from 2011)
- C1-09 Sample Rubrics
- C1-10 DC Minutes Spring 2011
- C1-11 Organizational Chart
- C1-12 2011 SLO Survey
- C1-13 2011 Annual Planning Report
- C1-14 2011 Flex Day SLO Work
- C1-15 SLOOC Minutes (Sept. 2011) – first meeting of SLOOC
- C1-16 SLOOC Minutes related to ISLOs
- C1-17 ISLOs
- C1-18 GE/ISLO Mapping
- C1-19 SLO/SUO Tracking documents, including “Closing the Loop”
- C1-20 DC Minutes 2011/2012
- C1-21 Embedded SLO Assessment Pilots – Spring 2012
- C1-22 2012 SLO Survey
- C1-23 2012 Annual Planning Report
- C1-24 ISLOs and ISUOs
- C1-25 5 Yr. Rotational Plan for SLOs
- C1-26 Sample 5 Yr. Rotational Plan (Medical Assisting)
- C1-27 PSLO and ISLO Checklists – Fall 2012
- C1-28 SLO Report to ACCJC, Fall 2012
- C1-29 PSLO Assessment Results posted to website
- C1-30 Email to faculty re: Spring 2013 SLO Work
- C1-31 2013 SLO Survey
- C1-32 2013 Annual Planning Report
- C1-33 Title V Grant Objectives
- C1-34 SLO Ratings Form – Spring 2013
- C1-35 SLO Ratings Form – Spring 2014
- C1-36 SLO Input from facilitated meetings
- C1-37 5 Yr. Rotational Plan that includes ISUOs

College Recommendation 2

Recommendation, October 2010:

In order to fully meet this Standard the team recommends that the college must increase its research capacity to serve the programs and fully integrate its research efforts into the program review process. Further, Student Learning Outcomes need to become an integral part of the program review process, including incorporating the research function, detailed discussions, and appropriate analysis from the SLO data research. (I.B.1, I.B.2, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, ER 10 and 19).

In our 2011 Follow-Up Report to the Commission, the college provided a lengthy narrative about the work that had been done between November 2010 and October 2011. In its response to the Follow-Up Report and site visit, no further action was indicated as necessary by the Commission. The following update provides a summary of the work completed on this item.

Update:

1. Increased Research Capacity

In March of 2011, an Office of Institutional Effectiveness was established with a dean assigned responsibility for institutional research, integrated planning, program review, and SLOs (C2-01). One of the immediate priorities of this office was the creation of an Institutional Effectiveness Report, which would contain disaggregated data for student goal attainment, graduation rates, transfer rates, licensure certification pass rates, and success rates for distance education students. The completion of this report became a top priority for the Institutional Researcher who met regularly with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness on the content, format/presentation and organization of the data to ensure that it was thorough as well as being easily understandable.

At the college's mandatory flex day in August 2011, portions of the report pertaining to student success and retention were presented to the campus and suggestions for improvement were solicited (C2-02). The campus was also made aware of how completed portions of the report could be accessed online. As additional portions were completed, those sections were added to the college website.

During the spring 2012 semester, the College Planning Council worked on the development of Core Indicators of Effectiveness, which would become an integral part of the Institutional Effectiveness Report. The council looked at various models, created draft documents, revised the documents with input from division representatives, and in May 2012, passed the final version (C2-03). The college's Core Indicators include items pertaining to course completion, success and retention rates, student satisfaction, student engagement (as measured by the CCSSE), Accountability Reporting for the CCC, degrees, certificates, and transfer status, licensure pass rates, annual FTES, faculty productivity, 75/25 ratio, and achievement of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. Additionally, a Scorecard that provides a summary of the item, outcome

selected, and the result was provided for the college to track progress is an easily readable format. It, also, is part of the Institutional Effectiveness Report (C2-04).

In August 2012, the Institutional Effectiveness Report, in its entirety, was completed and put online. The college was notified of its completion at the mandatory flex day (C2-05), and a subsequent email with a link to the report was sent by the college President in an update dated XXXX (C2-06).

For the August 2012 Flex Day campus-wide meeting, the Institutional Researcher also worked with the faculty on the Basic Skills Committee to present a basic skills workshop to the campus community. A report presenting the numbers of basic skills students in courses across the curriculum was presented to the group, after which a panel of successful basic skills students and a panel of faculty who developed strategies for working with basic skills students in courses across the curriculum spoke to the campus. It was an extraordinarily well-received presentation and a very successful collaboration between a campus committee and the Institutional Researcher. A Toolkit providing student focus group suggestions to faculty and faculty-developed strategies was distributed to all attendees and was also posted on the college website under Basic Skills (C2-07).

On the Institutional Effectiveness/Institutional Research website, additional reports have been added, and they are updated on a regular basis. Some of the reports or surveys were created at the request of faculty or specific campus committees (i.e. Basic Skills, Distance Education) some of which were created as a result of the college reorganization that took place in March, 2011. Reports on academic performance (i.e. basic skills, tutoring, accelerated instruction, grades by division, discipline and course), distance education, and supplemental instruction are all easily accessible as are results of student surveys such as those pertaining to assessment, the library, and the welcome center. Industry surveys and scans, and data pertaining to the college's Santa Paula site are also provided (C2-08).

The Institutional Researcher is also responsible for completing reports relating to the college's two Title V HSI grants. The objectives of the Title V Cooperative Grant (with Oxnard College), 2010-2015, include improving support for learners and increasing active and collaborative learning, both of which are measured by the CCSSE and tie in with the college's Core Indicators of Effectiveness (C2-09). Additional objectives in this grant are designed to reduce the gap between success rates in distance education classes and traditional face-to-face classes and to increase the persistence of first time Hispanic students. The objectives of the individual Title V Transfer Grant (2012-2017) include increases in transfer velocity rates, decreases in the gap between transfer velocity rates between all students and Hispanic students, increased student success rates in identified high-risk barrier courses, decreases in the gap between all students and Hispanic students in the high-risk barrier courses, and movement from proficiency status to continuous quality improvement (as identified on WASC's SLO rubric) for SLO performance (C2-10).

Additional research continues to be conducted in the area of CTE outcomes in a collaborative effort between our office of Institutional Research and the RP Group. In 2011, Ventura College partnered with 11 other colleges throughout the state in a pilot project coordinated by the RP

Group. The objectives of the *CTE Employment Outcomes* study were to gather data on employment outcomes for individuals earning CTE degrees or certificates (completers), or those who completed at least 12 units in a specific vocational area but not re-enroll the next year (leavers). Data from the pilot indicated that both completers and leavers were generally satisfied with the training and education received, and both groups had wage gains (C2-11). Ventura College entered into an MOU with the RP Group to participate in the next round of this study, which will include 35 colleges/districts (C2-12). We will be utilizing email, phone, and regular mail in an attempt to get a larger response rate. We will disaggregate the raw data by vocational area in order to use the results for discussions with advisory committees as well as for program review purposes. The RP Group Reports for 2011 can be found on both the CTE Division website as well as under Institutional Effectiveness/Research. The individual report is due to the college in June 2013, and the statewide report is due in July 2013 (C2-13).

2. Integration of Research into Program Review

In early spring 2011, in response to recommendations from the accrediting team, a Program Review Task Force was created to revise the program review documents and process at the college. One of the main goals was to ensure that data would become more integral to the program review process. The new program review was built around program student learning outcomes, student success outcomes, and program operating outcomes. The PSLOs were already established for most programs, but student success outcomes, and program operating outcomes needed to be created (C2-14).

The Vice President of Business Services put together an extensive data library for the instructional areas, pulling information from Banner regarding demographics; rates of student success, retention, and degree/certificate completion; grade distribution, budget, productivity, and inventory (C2-15). Using the data library (and the categories listed above) individual templates for each program were populated during the summer with data specific to that program (C2-16). In fall, the program review documents were presented to the department chairs, and training was provided on how to analyze data (C2-17). A program review facilitator was also appointed to help faculty in analyzing the data, creating student success outcomes and program operating outcomes based on data, and completing the forms. In addition, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Vice President of Business Services, and two classified supervisors (for service areas) assisted departments, programs, and individual faculty. Requests for resources that were put into program review were required to be based on program review data provided through the data library or SLO data.

For service areas, institutional data was not as readily available, and in many cases, the data needed to be collected in the form of response cards, surveys, and focus groups. Training for services was held (C2-18), and discussions took place about what to collect and how to collect it. Some services requested assistance from the Institutional Researcher and that service was provided.

College planning parameters created by the College's Executive Team (College President, Executive Vice President, and Vice President of Business Services) based on an analysis of data were also required to be addressed by program and departments completing program review

(C2-19). Areas with few degrees or certificates were put on possible discontinuance list, and program faculty members were asked, in the program review process, to analyze the data and to make an argument, if they chose, for continuation of the program.

Data was taken into account in the prioritization of initiatives from program review. Firstly, programs prioritized their initiatives. Then, division meetings were held to prioritize division initiatives, and, again, data was used in making those decisions. The requests were then sent to the appropriate committees -- Budget Resource Council, Facilities Oversight Group, Technology Committee, and Academic Senate Staffing Priorities – which also utilized data and rubrics (C2-20) to analyze the requests. Committee recommendations were sent to the College's Executive Committee, which also used to data to provide the final college ranking (C2-21).

In 2012, the same program review process was used although improvements and changes were made based on information received through a campus-wide electronic survey and input from key campus committees (C2-22 and C2-23). The major changes involved the use of facilitators, a simplification of the program review form, an additional program review meeting at the division level, revision of the timeline, and consistency in division presentations to the College Planning Council. It had been determined in 2011 that it would be beneficial to use a facilitator to lead the discussion and about the prioritization of initiatives in the division meetings. A subsequent survey and committee input determined that the addition of a facilitator was a positive change. The other change involved a simplification of the program review template. Survey and other campus input indicated that the form was perceived to be overly long and repetitive, so an attempt was made to simplify it. The repetition was removed, and instead of populating the program data onto the templates themselves, the data was provided via an online depository from which faculty pulled their own data for analysis (C2-24). Surveys and input from the Department Chairs and Coordinators Council and from the College Planning Council indicated that instructional faculty were not in favor of this form of data delivery, so the process will be changed for program review in 2013 (C2-25) .

As we work to continue to improve our program review process for 2013, we transitioned portions of program review to TracDat as has been done by other institutions. Another program review task force, which includes the Institutional Researcher, the Vice President of Business Services, and the current Academic Senate President, looked at models that have incorporated TracDat (C2-26) and decided on a new format, but the overall process of including and analyzing data will remain the same. The benefits of using TracDat, though, involve the ability to sort data, including initiatives created for purposes of improvement, into specific reports, which will allow for easier monitoring and greater accountability.

After each year's program review process, surveys are completed and input gathered both from the College Planning Council, which serves as the Program Review Committee, and the Department Chairs and Coordinator's Council whose members are primarily responsible for the completion of program review documents in a collaborated effort with faculty and staff in their program or department. The data is compiled into the annual program review report (C2-27).

3. Analysis of SLO Data Research

SLO documents that were created in late 2010 were designed to provide faculty with the ability to assess student learning, collaborate with their program faculty and staff, and make improvements where necessary. Additionally, the documents were created with the intention of linking the data to program review. SLO forms required performance targets, findings, initiatives, and requests for resources (where needed) (C2-28 and C2-29). Additionally, instructional programs were required to map relationships between courses, program SLOs, and institutional SLOs (C2-30).

SLO processes were also designed to ensure that dialogue and collaboration occurred. First, departments or programs were required to decide which SLO would be assessed that semester, what the performance indicator would be, what instrument(s) would be used, and what the timeframe would be (i.e. formative or summative). After the assessments had been completed, faculty were required to meet with others teaching the same course to share findings, make and collect suggestions for improvement, and create initiatives that would be part of program review (both with or without needed resources) (C2-31).

In 2012, the college (along with Moorpark College) purchased TracDat as a way to manage more effectively all the data that was being generated from the SLOs. Instead of dealing with forms and depositories that were often very difficult for faculty, TracDat allowed us to input and retrieve data easily and to sort it in any way needed. Some faculty members are still being trained on its use, but many have already found it to be a vast improvement over the past process.

In fall 2011, and spring 2012, course SLOs were assessed and tracked, with special emphasis on “closing the loop” for initiatives/improvements to student learning that were created from prior assessments (C2-32). In fall 2012 and spring 2013, assessment of program and institutional SLO assessments were conducted, analyses completed, and initiatives to improve student learning created (C2-33 and C2-34). Programs and departments are in the process of creating five-year rotational plans in which all course, program, and institutional SLOs will be assessed regularly (C2-35).

Evidence for College Recommendation 2:

- C2-01 Organizational Chart
- C2-02 August 2011 Flex Day Agenda
- C2-03 Ventura College Core Indicators of Effectiveness
- C2-04 Institutional Effectiveness Report
- C2-05 August 2012 Flex Day Agenda
- C2-06 President’s Update dated XXXX
- C2-07 Basic Skills Toolkit
- C2-08 Institutional Research Website
- C2-09 Title V Co-op Grant Objectives
- C2-10 Title V Transfer Grant Objectives
- C2-11 *CTE Employment Outcomes* – RP Group
- C2-12 Email dated XXXX from RP Group
- C2-13 Institutional Research Website
- C2-14 2011 Program Review Template
- C2-15 2011 Program Review Data Library
- C2-16 2011 Chemistry Program Review (sample)

- C2-17 DC Training Minutes
- C2-18 Program Review training for services
- C2-19 2011/2012 Planning Parameters
- C2-20 Rubrics for college committees
- C2-21 2011 Program Review Initiatives
- C2-22 2011 Program Review Survey
- C2-23 2011 Program Review Report
- C2-24 2012 Program Review Data Library
- C2-25 2012 Program Review Survey
- C2-26 Emails regarding Long Beach City College Program Review
- C2-27 2012 Program Review Report
- C2-28 SLO Individual Form
- C2-29 SLO Course Summary Form
- C2-30 SLO Mapping Documents
- C2-31 Email to department chairs regarding SLO work
- C2-32 Fall 2011, Spring 2012, SLO tracking sheets with "Closing the Loop"
- C2-33 Fall 2012 checklists for program and institutional SLO assessments
- C2-34 2012/2013 PSLO and ISLO TracDat reports
- C2-35 5 Year Rotational Plan (template and sample – Medical Assisting)

College Recommendation 3

Recommendation, October 2010:

In order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the college strengthen the content of its program review process to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with particular emphasis on student demographics, enrollment, program completion, retention, success, and achievement of student learning outcomes. Improvements to its programs should then be based on these results. (I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e, II.C.2.i, II.B.2., II.B.3-4, II.C.2).

Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from October 31 to November 1, 2011 report):

The team finds that the college has partially met the requirements of Recommendation 3. It noted that major work had been accomplished in the revamping of the program review process, the use of data, establishing the link to total cost of ownership, and that outcomes were being used to determine resource allocation. Work should be continued in the assessment of the program review process and that the policy for program viability/discontinuance be completed and implemented.

Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from November 13-14, 2012 report):

The team finds that the College has met this recommendation and would encourage the College to include, in its midterm report, evidence supporting a continuation of the implementation of its enhanced program review process to ensure its sustainability, documentation of its local program viability/discontinuance process, and continuation of its aggressive progress on the assessment of course, program, and institutional student learning outcomes to achieve sustainability status.

Update:

In the fall of 2011, Ventura College piloted a new process that linked program review to the College's new integrated planning model. A comprehensive data library containing enrollment, demographic productivity, program completion, retention, and success data was developed by the Vice President of Business Services and input into each program review template. Programs also included their own program student learning outcomes data (already established) and created new student success outcomes, and program operating outcomes. Initiatives and requests for resources were required to be generated from data in order to be considered for funding, thereby addressing Total Cost of Ownership issues. The new program review model contained the following elements: program description, performance expectations, operating information, performance assessment, findings, initiatives, and a process assessment (C3-01). A Program Review Handbook was created by the Academic Senate and made available on the College website (C3-02).

Program discontinuance was also part of the new program review process. In spring 2011, the college's Executive Team (College President, Executive Vice President, and Vice President of Business Services), published the Planning Parameters, a planning framework for program review in the early fall 2011 semester (C3-03). The planning parameters document contained a list of courses and programs that administration was considering discontinuing, pending any compelling contrary arguments that emerged through program review. Programs on the list were encouraged to use the program review process and data to explain the significance of the program and/or courses if they intended to make an argument to maintain them. In February 2012, the District adopted Administrative Procedure 4021, which established a process for program discontinuance at the district level (C3-04). The Academic Senate was involved in the creation of the AP, and the process that was utilized by the college in fall of 2011 reflected what was subsequently put into the procedure.

Program review presentations were made to the College Planning Council by the respective deans or Vice President, with input from faculty and staff. Faculty members with programs on the proposed discontinuance list were provided with time to present their arguments for continuation or revision of their program to the College Planning Council.

A complete assessment of the program review process occurred in 2011. A college-wide electronic survey was conducted (C3-05), and additional input was gathered from both the College Planning Council, which serves as the Program Review Committee, and the Department Chairs and Coordinator's Council. The 2011 Program Review Report, which summarized the process and provided a list of strengths and suggestions for improvement, was written and presented to the College Planning Council (C3-06).

To make the necessary improvements to the process based on input received through the assessment, a Program Review Subcommittee was formed in spring of 2012. The subcommittee, which looked at program reviews for both instructional areas and services, suggested a number of changes, including recommendations to utilize a facilitator in division meetings, to simplify the program review form, to add an additional program review meeting at the division level in order to analyze initiatives more thoroughly and to collaborate where possible, and to have more consistency in program review presentations (C3-07). Additionally a program review rubric was included in which programs would analyze their own program in terms of specific elements: enrollment demand, resources, productivity, retention and success rates, participation in SLO work and, for CTE programs, employment outlook (C3-08).

In early fall 2012, the planning parameters were again published to provide a planning framework for programs and services to consider in their program review documents that would be created that semester (C3-09). Programs and services participated in the revised program review process that included the use of a facilitator, an additional division meeting, a simplified form, and a rubric for self assessment. The same process for program discontinuance was used, with faculty from programs on the proposed discontinuance list encouraged to make presentations to the College Planning Council. Faculty and staff generally felt more comfortable with the process the second time, and the Council felt very positive about the experience from input gathered from the committee at the conclusion of the presentations (C3-10). The 2012 program review report, which was included in the 2012 *Annual Planning Report*, summarized the process, the changes, and provided a list of strengths and suggestions for improvement (C3-11).

Suggestions for improvement to the process were solicited using the same assessment processes as were used in 2011: a campus-wide electronic survey, input from the College Planning Council, and input from the Department Chairs and Coordinators Council (C3-12). The primary recommendations in 2012 stemmed from concerns that insufficient time was provided to complete the program review, that program review data needed to be provided in a more user-friendly format, and that improvements needed to be made in the tracking of created initiatives. The input was summarized in the 2012 Program Review Report (C3-13). Members of the SLO Executive Committee believed that connecting program review with TracDat was also important for us to do in the next cycle of program review.

In spring 2013, an initial program review subcommittee was formed to examine input/recommendations made from the campus about the 2012 program review process. The initial subcommittee included the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Vice President of Business Services, the Institutional Researcher, the Academic Senate President, and the Supervisor of Learning Resources/TracDat Facilitator. Along with examining the recommendations from the assessments, the subcommittee analyzed the feasibility of utilizing TracDat for the student learning outcomes, student success outcomes, and program operating outcomes portions of the program review reports. The committee examined models of other colleges that are using TracDat for program review purposes. The model selected as the leading contender for our own process was the one created by Long Beach City College. Its process utilizes TracDat for annual planning purposes (with goals) and contains a separate program review document that summarizes and analyzes planning, performance of goals, and SLO/SUO performance. In February, 2013, initial discussions between Ventura College and LBCC took place (C3-15). On March 15, 2013, the video conference took place between members of the program review Subcommittee and LBCC.

A decision was made to bring the LBCC model to a larger group for input. This group met in April 2013, and at the end of spring 2013, a revised program review process was established for implementation in fall 2013.

Another change that will go forward for program review in 2013 involves the data library. Responsibility for providing program data now resides with the Institutional Researcher who worked during the late spring and summer on creating data for each individual instructional program that could be accessed through a link on the program review website. Moving this function from the Vice President of Business Services to the Institutional Researcher helped to ensure that the process of providing data will be sustainable.

In spring 2013, the local process for program viability/discontinuation as it relates to the District AP was made clear in documentation written and approved by the Academic Senate (C3-16). This document was presented to the College Planning Council at its meeting in March 2013 (C3-17). This local process, which was utilized in the 2012 program review process, will be followed during program review, which will take place in fall 2013.

In response to the Commission's January 31, 2013 letter to the colleges, our revised program review process for 2013 will also include a greater focus on student achievement at the program level. While we have student success outcomes in place for programs, we will ensure that additional emphasis and training are put on these program set standards. Program standards will

also reflect institutional standards developed by the College Planning Council and published in the Core Indicators of Effectiveness document in fall 2012 (C3-18).

The extensive progress that has been made on SLO/SUO assessments continues (see Recommendation #1 for percentages of SLOs, SUOs, and assessments, by category). In fall 2012, program and institutional SLO assessments were conducted (C3-19). In the new 2013 program review template that was created, additional emphasis was put on the inclusion of SLO assessment results and identified improvements. Individual programs, departments, and services will also be accountable in their program reviews for SLO assessment compliance (C3-20). TracDat reports of ongoing assessments will be a required attachment, and those not participating in the SLO or SUO effort to a sufficient extent will not receive resources. The college understands the need for initiatives and the allocation of resources to be clearly connected with student learning and the analysis of program/department data.

Division meetings held in spring 2013 in which departments and programs self assessed their progress on SLO/SUO performance further reinforced the need for faculty and staff participation in numerous areas/activities associated with SLOs/SUOs (i.e. student awareness of SLOs, ongoing dialogue, and clear links with program review) (C3-21 and C3-22).

The college has made great strides in ensuring that the entire campus community understands that SLOs are now a way of life and must be assessed and analyzed along with achievement data by every program and department. Programs and departments have completed five year rotational plans and understand clearly that regular and ongoing assessment of SLOs is a responsibility of every department and program (C3-23).

Evidence for College Recommendation 3:

- C3-01 2011 Program Review Template
- C3-02 Program Review Handbook
- C3-03 2011-2012 Planning Parameters
- C3-04 AP 4021
- C3-05 2011 Program Review Survey
- C3-06 2011 Program Review Report
- C3-07 Program Review Subcommittee Agenda and Minutes
- C3-08 Program Review Rubric for academic and CTE programs
- C3-09 2012 Planning Parameters
- C3-10 CPC Minutes, Nov. 2012 (at conclusion of program review and +/- list)
- C3-11 2012 Annual Planning Report
- C3-12 2012 Program Review Report
- C3-13 2012 SLO Survey
- C3-14 Email regarding LBCC Program Review
- C3-15 Email regarding CCC Confer with LBCC
- C3-16 Academic Senate Standard Operating Procedures
- C3-17 Email from Academic Senate President regarding local program discontinuance policy
- C3-18 Instructions for 2012-2013 Program Review
- C3-19 Fall 2012, PSLO and ISLO Checklists
- C3-20 Instructions regarding SLO/SUO inclusion in program review
- C3-21 SLO Ratings Worksheet

C3-22 SUO Ratings Worksheet
C3-23 5 Yr. Rotational Plan Samples

College Recommendation 4

Recommendation, October 2010:

In order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the college must examine and provide evidence that appropriate leadership is addressing the various initiatives and programs on campus that support student learning. Efforts in online learning technology, basic skills initiatives, and SLOs lack an oversight committee or person responsible to oversee each of these projects and to ensure that they are implemented college wide in a manner that best serves the interests of student learning. (II.A, II.B)

Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from October 31 to November 1, 2011 report):

The team finds that the college has partially satisfied Recommendation 4. The intense work that the college has accomplished in its reorganization under the leadership of the president should be commended. The college should continue to develop an effective assessment process both formative and summative with broad participation to be able to determine the degree to which this structure meets the intent of the standards cited.

Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from November 13-14, 2012 report):

The team found that the College has met this recommendation and would encourage it to include, in its midterm report, evidence of conducting a follow-up evaluation that is broad-based, representative of the entire campus, to assess the effectiveness of the administrative reorganization structure.

Update:

In June 2011, the college implemented a new organizational structure after engaging in a series of steps to gather college input. These steps included large-group meetings, campus forums, and online surveys to identify gaps in the organizational structure and to develop possible solutions.

The new structure included the following elements: (1) the combination of all career and technical education programs into one division; (2) the assignment of distance education oversight and faculty professional development to the Dean of Social Science & Humanities (with the resultant renaming of that division to Distance Education, Professional Development, Social Science & Humanities); (3) the assignment of oversight for the Santa Paula program and the departments of Communication, English as a Second Language, and Foreign Language to the Dean of Physical Education/Athletics (with the resultant renaming of that division to Communication, Kinesiology, Athletics & Off-Site Programs); and (4) the assignment of oversight for planning, program review, student learning outcomes, institutional research, basic skills, and accreditation to the Dean of Communication & Learning Resources (with the resultant renaming of that division to Institutional Effectiveness, English & Learning Resources) (C4-01).

In addition to organizational structure changes, several new campus committees were formed to support efforts in institutional effectiveness, online learning technology, basic skills initiatives, professional development, and student learning outcomes. The committees included the following:

- College Planning Council
- Distance Education Committee
- Basic Skills Committee
- Faculty Professional Development Committee
- Student Learning Outcomes Committee

The charge and membership of each committee can be found in the college's *Making Decisions* document, which is updated on a regular basis and made available on the college website (C4-02).

In January 2012, six months after the implementation of the new organizational structure, the College President invited all College employees to participate in an online survey to assess the new structure (C4-03). Respondents were asked to identify on a five-point Likert scale their degree of satisfaction with the way that distance education, professional development, institutional effectiveness, basic skills, and off-site programs were addressed by the structure. Programs that had changed divisions as a result of the reorganization (Communication, Foreign Languages, and English as a Second Language) were also asked to rate the degree to which they were satisfied with the new reporting relationship. In addition, respondents were invited to add additional thoughts about the organizational structure through open-ended "comments" sections (C4-04).

In February 2012, another College Open Forum, to which all faculty and staff were invited (as well as student leaders), was devoted to collecting feedback regarding the effectiveness of the new organizational structure (C4-05 and C4-06). At this forum, the results of the online survey were shared and used as the starting point for small group discussions about the merits of the new system and the additional improvements needed. The results of the focus group discussions were shared in one of the College President's weekly *Updates*, along with a written summary of the results of the online survey (C4-07).

The deans and committees used this feedback to make modifications to their operations.

- The distance education program developed a more formal program of training for online instructors.
- A software program (TracDat) was identified to facilitate the SLO/SUO documentation and assessment processes and to allow the institution to more easily track initiatives and close the loop on prior assessments.
- The Basic Skills Committee presented a campus-wide workshop on the Mandatory Flex Day in an effort to make more faculty members aware of basic skills students and their needs. The workshop included both student and faculty panels, and each faculty member was provided with a *Toolkit* of resources and strategies for teaching basic skills students across the curriculum.

- The Professional Development Committee held follow-up luncheons for the participants of the 2011 Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence and created new professional development opportunities, such as “Lunch and Learn” workshops, open to all faculty.
- Outreach efforts were expanded for the Santa Paula site. New outreach activities included “Registration Days” events, ESL Registration Week, application and financial aid workshops, orientation meetings for new students, and participation in Higher Education Day and Parent College Night at local high schools.

Summative committee self evaluations were conducted at the end of the spring 2012 semester for new or reorganized campus committees, including the College Planning Council (CPC) (C4-08), the Budget Resource Council (BRC) (C4-09), the Academic Senate (C4-10), the Classified Senate (C4-11), the Curriculum Committee (C4-12), the SLO Committee (C4-13), the Basic Skills Committee (C4-14), the Professional Development Committee (C4-15), and the Distance Education (DE) Committee (C4-16). The surveys asked committee members about the continued relevance of the committee charge, the establishment of committee goals, the completion of goals, other committee achievements, the timeliness of tasks, the overall environment of the committee, and suggestions for improvement. Some committee-specific questions were also asked (i.e. the College Planning Committee specifically asked about the new program review and program discontinuance processes). Each committee reviewed the results of the evaluations and made adjustments, as necessary, to ensure that college committees continue to improve the way their members understand their charges, create clear goals, work to meet those goals, and operate in an environment conducive to open and honest discussion.

Committees used their self-assessment survey data and self determined goals to determine the direction of the respective committee for the 2012/2013 academic year. Examples of activities created from this input included the following:

- The College Planning Council (under a Program Review Subcommittee) revised the program review process (C4-17), and the CPC utilized the new process for its 2012/2013 program review (C4-18). Members created and approved a 2012/2013 strategic plan, aligning it to Board Goals (C4-19). They engaged in facilitated meetings to develop strategies to improve performance on the CCSSE (on the Core Indicators of Effectiveness) and to provide input for district planning.
- The Distance Education Committee has been working on strategies to reduce the gap between success rates in distance ed and traditional classes including the creation of a fully online training program for faculty to learn the new Desire2Learn platform, the enhancement of student orientations for online learning scheduled at registration times and again at the beginning of the semester, the creation of a training center, the revamping of the Faculty Resource Center with new equipment, group training sessions on such topics as effective online discussions to enhance instruction, and the enhancement of the DE website (C4-20).
- The Basic Skills Committee has continued to work closely with the Institutional Researcher to ensure that requests for data by members of the Math, English, and ESL

Departments for program review and other purposes are addressed and that reports are made available to these departments and analyzed by the committee (C4-21). The committee continues to focus on ensuring that all members of the campus community are aware of the numbers and the needs of basic skills students throughout the campus. And committee members collaborate each year on the best use of local BSI funds.

- The Professional Development Committee continues its work to ensure that it is responsive to the faculty as a whole and that it offers a large number of professional development opportunities throughout the semester on a large variety of topics. Committee members continue to improve the website and to advertise professional development in a number of creative ways. They also continue, through their work with the Title V co-op grant, to prepare for and offer the Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence (SITE) each summer to participants from all three colleges in the district (C4-22).
- The SLO Committee's goals focused on the continued implementation and improvement of TracDat, the development of five-year rotational plans by each program, department, and service, the formation of ISLO committees to create ISLO rubrics to be used by the campus for those not already completed, and the creation of additional connections between SLOs and program review (C4-23).

In spring 2013, and on schedule with the integrated planning calendar that calls for a revisit of the organizational structure every three years, the campus engaged in such a review. In February, 2013, an electronic survey was distributed to all college employees by the Institutional Researcher (C4-24). Numerous reminders and emails about the importance of the survey were sent out, and as a result, 149 responses were received, a far higher rate than had been received previously.

To supplement the survey data and to ensure that more campus voices were heard, a series of questions about the reorganization were asked in special division meetings established for the purpose of reviewing the organizational structure and gathering SLO status information (C4-25). The meetings were run by facilitators, not deans (and in most cases the deans stepped out of the room) in order to gather the most honest feedback possible. Facilitators clearly explained that the discussion would be focused on the structure, not on specific managers. The purpose of the discussion was to analyze the merits of the new structure from the point of view of that division, to determine whether mistakes were made, and if so, to learn from the mistakes for the future.

A summary of the electronic and division responses was distributed to the campus by the College President in an email update (C4-26). A summary was also provided to the College Planning Council and to the Administrative Council at their April 2013 meetings (C4-27). Copies were also provided to chairs of the new committees that were established as a result of the reorganization for their use in modifying services and activities for the coming year.

The College will continue to review the organizational structure every three years, with the next review scheduled for spring 2016.

Evidence for College Recommendation 4:

- C4-01 Ventura College Organizational Chart, July 2012
- C4-02 Making Decisions at Ventura College, 2012-2013
- C4-03 President's Update #50, January 10, 2102 (regarding online survey of College employees)
- C4-04 Assessment of Campus Organization (online survey results)
- C4-05 President's Update #52, January 25, 2012 (invitation to open forum regarding organizational structure feedback)
- C4-06 President's Update #53, January 31, 2012 (reminder regarding open forum regarding organizational structure feedback)
- C4-07 President's Update #55, February 14, 2012 (summary of feedback regarding open forum focus groups and online survey)
- C4-08 College Planning Council survey results
- C4-09 Budget Resource Council survey results
- C4-10 Academic Senate survey results
- C4-11 Classified Senate survey results
- C4-12 Curriculum Committee survey results
- C4-13 SLO Committee survey results
- C4-14 Basic Skills Committee survey results
- C4-15 Professional Development committee survey results
- C4-16 Distance Education committee survey results
- C4-17 2012 Program Review Subcommittee Minutes
- C4-18 2012 Program Review Template
- C4-19 2012-2013 Ventura College Strategic Plan
- C4-20 DE Committee Report to CPC, January 30, 2013
- C4-21 Spring 2013 List of BSI Research Projects
- C4-22 SITE 2012 and 2013 brochure
- C4-23 SLOOC Minutes, November 2012
- C4-24 Results of electronic survey regarding reorganization, February 2013
- C4-25 Division input on 2010 College Reorganization – results
- C4-26 President's Update regarding organizational structure, April 2013
- C4-27 CPC Minutes, April 2013

College Recommendation 5

Recommendation, October 2010:

In order to fully meet this Standard by fall 2012, the team recommends that the college must negotiate with its local bargaining unit that a component of the faculty evaluation process includes the faculty member's effectiveness in producing learning outcomes. (III.A.1.c)

Update:

Ventura College is part of a three-college district and thus cannot independently negotiate the faculty evaluation process with the bargaining unit that represents the faculty of multiple institutions. Negotiations for the agreement expiring on June 30, 2103 commenced during the spring 2013 semester. Article 12 (Evaluation) was a proposed bargaining topic in the initial proposals for both the District and AFT Local 1828 (C5-01, C5-02).

While the college administration waited for negotiations to be completed, the Deans were oriented to the manner in which they could work within the language of the existing collective bargaining agreement to ensure that faculty evaluations included an assessment of effectiveness in producing learning outcomes. Specifically, the President informed the Deans that she would be looking for references to student learning outcomes for the fall 2012 evaluations and for all subsequent evaluations (C5-03), and she provided the Deans with examples of the range of behaviors that might be observed that would document the degree to which faculty members have been involved in assessing student learning and using that assessment to improve instruction (C5-04). Numerous items in the current evaluation form can be used to ensure participation in the student learning outcomes process. Using this strategy, the Deans and the President were able to address the accreditation standard while waiting for the formal contract negotiations to conclude.

Evidence for College Recommendation 5:

- C5-01 Ventura County Community College District's Initial Proposal to AFT Local 1828, January 2013
- C5-02 AFT 1828 Initial Proposal, January 15, 2013
- C5-03 Memos from President to Deans, November 15, 2012
- C5-04 Student Learning Outcomes as Addressed Through Faculty Evaluation Process

College Recommendation 6

Recommendation, October 2010:

As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the college must develop a funding plan for new and modernized facilities based on the concept of Total Cost of Ownership. The plan must address the necessary staffing and other support costs to operate these facilities. (III.B.2.a)

Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from October 31 to November 1, 2011 report):

The team finds that the college has partially satisfied Recommendation 6. With the exception of the program review revisions to include the equipment inventory that, in turn, better informs the facilities/equipment prioritization process, most other strategies have either been recently implemented or are planned to be implemented at a later date. The college should aggressively activate its implementation plan as well as a strategy for assessing these actions to better ensure its optimal allocation of resources.

Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from November 13-14, 2012 report):

Even though the Infrastructure Funding Model is new for fiscal year 2012-13, the model should be evaluated throughout the planning process to make sure it is meeting the requirements of the Total Cost of Ownership. The team determined that the College has fully met this recommendation.

Update:

The Total Cost of Ownership is now addressed through a modification to the District Budget Allocation Model, and through the work of three College committees: the Budget Resource Council (BRC), the Facilities Oversight Group (FOG), and the Technology Committee.

In February 2012, the District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS) proposed a modification to the general Budget Allocation Model (C6-01) and the establishment of an Infrastructure Funding Model (C6-02). This new model was adopted by the Board of Trustees on March 13, 2012. Under the model, lottery proceeds, interest income, and other specific revenue categories are segregated from the general Budget Allocation Model. This designated Fund (Fund 113), is a recurring revenue stream designed to provide foundational funding to the College as a base resource. Existing College resources as described above will continue to be allocated to augment this new Infrastructure Funding Model. Under the adopted model, specific expenditure categories are now established for:

- Scheduled maintenance and capital furniture (including classroom, faculty and administration)
- Library materials and databases
- Instructional and non-instructional equipment
- Technology refresh (hardware and software)

- Other (restricted to one-time and not on-going expenditures, such as new program/process start-up costs, staff innovation, and program specific accreditation)

A transition plan, described in the documentary evidence provided, was used as a vehicle to move the funds from the general Budget Allocation Model to the Infrastructure Funding Model over a period of years beginning with FY13.

The District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS) is the venue that is used to evaluate and reassess the Budget Allocation Model, as well as the new Infrastructure Funding Model. This evaluation, which involves the feedback from constituent representatives, is conducted each year prior to the development of the budget.

During the last three years, the state has not funded scheduled maintenance nor Instructional Equipment and Library Materials. Consequently, the College has transferred its general fund year-end balances to provide funds for scheduled/deferred maintenance (Fund 419), computer technology refresh and non-computing equipment (Fund 445). In total, the College has expended over \$3.6 million for these needs. These non-recurring dedicated funds are in addition to the new recurring infrastructure funds.

The College has protected the existing positions in technologies, maintenance and operations when, due to very significant budget reductions, has had to reduce the number of classified and manager positions.

The Budget Resource Council (BRC) receives recommendations from both the Facilities Oversight Group (FOG) and the Technology Committee, and then analyzes the budget requirements of the prioritized requests and develops a plan to address these budget requirements.

FOG, which oversees facilities and equipment of a non-computing nature (i.e. vehicles, furniture, lab equipment, kilns, etc.), provides coordination for the periodic revision for the College's Facilities Master Plan and meets regularly to address the College's cost of ownership needs. As part of the College planning, program review and budget allocation cycle, FOG receives requests for facilities improvements from the College Planning Council (CPC) and creates an implementation plan to advance these requests (C6-03).

The College's Technology Committee provides coordination for the periodic revision of the campus Technology Plan, which includes a detailed Technology Refresh Plan built around a four-year replacement cycle (C6-04).

A thorough physical assessment of our inventory was completed in July 2013, with every room or space on the campus included. We now have an expected life table, which will provide key information for program review and other purposes. The inventory list is now in a sustainable database and can be sorted by department, room, type of equipment, or tag number. Photographs of all equipment have been taken and are part of the database. Using the reconciled inventory list, which divisions are required to maintain and update each year, programs now have the ability through the program review process to create initiatives and request appropriate resources to meet their operating and student performance goals (C6-05). Additionally, the BRC adopted

an Inventory Rubric to be applied during the inventory of all of the fixed assets owned by the institution (C6-06).

Each year after programs have presented their program reviews to the CPC, a compiled list of prioritized requests for facilities improvements, based on program findings, is given to FOG. Software and technology prioritized requests, based on program review findings, are given to the Technology Committee. Other equipment requests, based on program review findings, are given to the BRC. These groups assign the committee rating of *required, high, medium, low or not ranked* to each request based on the overall needs of the College, taking into consideration new technologies, if appropriate, and the ways in which resources can be leveraged. The committees' ratings are then forwarded to the College President, Executive Vice President, and Vice President of Business Services for the final College ranking. The lists of initiatives (C6-07), with all rankings, are then shared with the CPC and the College administration for implementation. Divisions are notified about funded requests and have until the next program review cycle (approximately 12 months) to submit purchase orders.

Total Cost of Ownership is also being addressed with state officials in relation to capital outlay. In March 2013, college and district officials met with one of the State's Facilities Planning and Utilization Specialists to review the state's assessment of the campus, which includes facilities, the 2013-2014 space inventory, our five year capital plan, and our future growth eligibility (C6-08). The facilities assessment, which the state official explained as containing "everything" identified \$93,875,742 in Total Cost to Repair, \$289,523,783 in Cost to Replace (building structures only), and 32.42% for Facilities Condition Index. While these numbers are significant, the state Facility Planning and Utilization Specialist said that we are "better than most." However, the numbers for Cost to Repair indicate the need for the state to fund scheduled maintenance again.

In this same meeting, we were provided with our Space Inventory. Our Total Room Assigned Square Footage is 434,599, and our outside gross square footage is 620,516, for an efficiency rate of 70%, which the State Facilities Specialist similarly noted is "better than average."

In the meeting with state, district, and college officials, we also discussed our future building needs. Our Administration Building is seriously outdated as is our cafeteria building. While we are currently not serving food and do not have the same need for a Student Center as such a building was conceived several years ago, we do have a need to put some new student services (i.e. Financial Aid, CalWorks, DSPS, and EOPS), many of which are currently housed in very old and separate buildings, into more of a one-stop center that could house administrative staff on the top floor. In the coming months, we will consider putting together an Initial Project Proposal (IPP) and, if approved in concept by the State Chancellor's office, will put together the Final Project Proposal (FPP) for such a building.

In this same meeting, we also discussed Fusion, the State's Planning Module software, which provides us with a real-time database that allows us "see" the details of all of our facilities. Access to Fusion will be provided to those individuals responsible for facilities oversight so that changes or updates to our facilities are carefully tracked. We will also utilize the Fusion Planning Module for scenario planning prior to the creation of an IPP or an FPP.

Our Facilities Master Plan, which is a rolling five-year plan, will be revised to meet the needs of our changing campus. We will ensure that we continue to address the Total Cost of Ownership needs identified through program review as well as to identify building projects in the areas of growth, modernization, or safety that may be needed in future years.

Evidence for College Recommendation 6:

- C6-01 Budget Allocation Model
- C6-02 Infrastructure Funding Model
- C6-03 Facilities Improvements List
- C6-04 Technology Strategic Plan (for Technology Refresh Plan)
- C6-05 College Equipment Inventory List
- C6-06 Inventory Control Rubric
- C6-07 Program Review Initiatives Spreadsheets
- C6-08 Ventura College Capital Outlay Meeting (Presentation PowerPoint)

College Recommendation 7

Recommendation, October 2010:

In order to fully meet this Standard the team recommends that the president of Ventura College, in combination with the executive leadership, needs to develop a more comprehensive system of campus communication that promotes a climate of open dialogue, broader involvement in an understanding of college planning processes, and increased access to information and institutional outcomes. (IV.A.1)

Update:

The campus communication system is multi-faceted. Campus-wide communication techniques include the following:

- The College President sends a written weekly update to the entire campus. These updates cover a number of topics, including status reports on accreditation, planning, and program review; reminders of procedures for updating the classification of course tiers and for holding department chair elections; announcements of personnel changes; solicitations for participation in forums and/or to provide input on issues of campus-wide concern; lists of professional development opportunities and upcoming events (C7-01).
- The College President hosts a monthly open forum to share information, to prompt group discussion, and to solicit opinions on a number of issues, including input on revisions to the college mission statement and the college organizational structure; presentations on new campus programs and demonstrations of new technologies or other institutional innovations; question and answer questions about budget (C7-02).
- A formal committee structure promotes dialogue and governance involvement on issues of concern. Committees address and promote dialogue about planning, program review, student learning outcomes, budget procedures, facilities, professional development, basic skills, distance education, curriculum, learning communities, safety and technology. Operational committees, such as the Department Chair and Coordinators Council and the Administrative Council, promote dialogue about the implementation and improvement of college procedures.
- The College Planning Council (CPC) serves as a key committee for promoting dialogue and discussion on a variety of topics, including significant changes that are taking place in the areas of financial aid, enrollment priorities, and repeatability as well as potential changes that may result from the most recent state budget (C7-03). The College President is an active member of this committee, bringing issues forward and encouraging dialogue. Also on this committee are the other members of the Executive Team (the Executive Vice President and the Vice President of Business Services), deans, supervisors, members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, other faculty, and classified staff. CPC is a well-attended meeting, and members are

provided the opportunity to interact and discuss important issues with people from across the campus. Two facilitated meetings occurred in the College Planning Council during Spring 2013, one to discuss challenges and ideas in regards to issues at the state level and to gather ideas for district/college planning, and the other to gather ideas about how to improve the college's performance in the area of student engagement. Both of these meetings were seen as very positive in terms of promoting dialogue and gathering ideas for future planning (C7-04).

- Department and division meetings promote dialogue about department and division plans, the prioritization of staffing and equipment needs, and the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. Facilitated division meetings in spring 2013 provided division members the opportunity to reflect and give input on both the college's SLO performance and our organizational structure.
- Recent efforts to facilitate meetings across the campus as a way to promote dialogue prompted the President and others formally trained in facilitation to institute a program to train other campus leaders in utilizing facilitation techniques to enhance broader participation and group engagement in campus meetings. The first group being trained includes managers, the Academic Senate president, other faculty, classified staff, and the Director of the College's Foundation (C7-05). In fall 2013, a second group of college employees will receive the training. It is our intention to make a significant effort to include more discussion into major campus committees.

As described extensively in the response to College Recommendation 3, the college's planning and program review process was revised to ensure broader participation and discussion at the department and division levels and facilitated prioritization of needs at the division level. Data and analysis-intensive department-level program reviews are posted on the college web page for ease of campus and public access.

An Annual Planning Report, which explains progress made toward institutional effectiveness measures and summarizes the results of program review and the progress made toward the development and assessment of student learning outcomes, is distributed each fall. Also distributed each fall is a published Integrated Planning Manual, describing the steps involved in planning and the integration of the college's master plan and strategic plan (C7-06 and C7-07).

Evidence for College Recommendation 7:

- C7-01 Email updates by College President to campus (#1 through XXX)
- C7-02 Emails pertaining to Campus Forums
- C7-03 CPC Minutes, 2011-2013
- C7-04 CPC Input from facilitated meetings, spring 2013
- C7-05 Emails regarding facilitation training, spring 2013
- C7-06 2011 Annual Planning Report
- C7-07 2012 Annual Planning Report

College Recommendation 8

Recommendation, October 2010:

As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the college President must develop an ongoing systematic and comprehensive system to assess the effectiveness of the college's organizational structure, campus planning processes, and community in a timely manner. (IV.B.2.a-b, IV.B.2.c)

Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from October 31 to November 1, 2011 report):

The team finds that the college has partially satisfied Recommendation 8 having restructured the use of personnel and resources to address the issues cited in this recommendation. The evaluation of the reorganization plan should be completed as outlined in the Follow-up report and the results implemented. Attention should be given to the college institutional effectiveness goals being aligned with the District's goals.

Conclusion (from ACCJC Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report from November 13-14, 2012 report):

The team finds that the College has satisfied this recommendation and would encourage Ventura College, along with its two sister Colleges and the District, to continue to assess how well the alignment of District and College goals is being maintained.

Update:

As described in the response to College Recommendation 4, the College implemented a new organizational structure in July 2011 (C8-01). This structure was evaluated during the spring 2012 semester. In January 2012, six months after the implementation of the new organizational structure, the College President invited all College employees to participate in an online survey to assess the new structure (C8-02). In February 2012, a College Open Forum was devoted to collecting feedback regarding the effectiveness of the new organizational structure (C8-03). At this forum, the results of the online survey were shared and used as the starting point for small group discussions on the merits of the new system and the additional improvements needed. The results of the focus group discussions were shared in one of the College President's weekly *Updates*, along with a written summary of the results of the online survey (C8-04). Since February 2012, the deans and committees have used this feedback to make modifications to their operations, as described more fully in the response to College Recommendation 4. In addition, the College has built into its integrated planning process a calendar for the ongoing assessment of the organizational structure (C8-05). In accordance with this calendar, the College Planning Council (CPC) will assist the College President in engaging the campus in a review of the organization structure every three years, with the next review scheduled for spring 2013.

Documentation in support of efforts to assess the organizational structure and the College planning process are found in the response to College Recommendation 4 in this report.

The development of a data set to quantify the College's Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness was discussed throughout most of the spring 2012 semester at both the Academic Senate and the CPC. Input was gathered from division representatives about what should be included in the Core Indicators and the document list of data elements was revised numerous times based on this input and subsequent Academic Senate and CPC discussions (C8-06). The final version of the Core Indicators list was approved at the May 9, 2012 meeting of the CPC (C8-07).

The work that was done at Ventura College to identify the data elements by which to measure institutional effectiveness was used later during the spring 2012 semester to document and support progress made at both the College and District level toward the Board of Trustee's planning goals. Ventura College's Core Indicators, along with documents submitted by the institutional researchers at Moorpark College, Oxnard College, Ventura College, and the District Administrative Center, assisted in the development of a data set common to all three Colleges in the District (C8-08). At the conclusion of this development process, the data elements in the district-wide report (which align with the Board's goals) replicated the data elements in Ventura College's Core Indicators, thus ensuring the necessary alignment of the College institutional effectiveness goals with the District goals.

In preparation for development of the new VCCCD Master Plan, a number of facilitated meetings took place, both at the campuses and at the district level, in spring 2013. The first of these meetings at Ventura College took place with the College Planning Council (CPC) (C8-09). An initial review of the district Mission Statement was conducted, and from there, committee members divided into small groups. They first engaged in a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) exercise, looking at a number of significant issues (i.e. Financial Aid changes) at the state level that the college must now address in a meaningful way. Groups reported their responses out to the larger group, and a large-group discussion took place. Groups then met again, this time to respond to specific questions:

- In light of increased state and national emphasis on student completion, what might be done in order to create clear pathways to degrees, certificates, and transfers?
- In light of proposed unit caps and penalties for unsuccessful course attempts, what might be done in order to decrease course withdrawals and failing grades?
- Is there anything about our relationship with our educational partners that could be improved or that needs to change?
- In light of rapid technological advancements and increased options available for students on both the state and national level, what do we need to do to remain competitive in the online arena?
- What should be the relationship of the three colleges in our district to each other?
- What must we do to retain organizational vitality? (for internal groups)
- What could the district and its three colleges do better to meet community needs? (external groups)

The same facilitated process and questions were used to gather input from the Academic Senate, the Administrative Council, the Classified Senate, Student Services, and the College Foundation. An open forum was held for students, hosted by the Associated Student Body (ASB). At the district level, a Community Advisory Board, augmented by additional citizen representatives, was asked for their responses as was a P-16 Council put together by the district. Responses from each group were compiled and forwarded to the District Committee on Planning (DCAP) (C8-10). *Note to Peter – Want responses from all groups or just summary?-*

On April 15, a facilitated District Master Planning meeting was held at Oxnard College with members from all three colleges and the district office. Results from the meeting will also be used by DCAP in fall 2013 to help create the next District Educational Master Plan. Once the new District Educational Master Plan is developed, the colleges will develop their own goals so that the district and colleges goals will be clearly connected.

Evidence for College Recommendation 8:

- C8-01 Ventura College Organizational Chart, July 2012
- C8-02 Assessment of Campus Organization (online survey results)
- C8-03 President's Updates #52, January 25, 2012 (invitation to open forum)
- C8-04 President's Updates #55, February 14, 2012 (summary of feedback regarding organizational structure feedback)
- C8-05 Ventura College Planning Cycle Flowchart (from 2013 Integrated Planning Manual)
- C8-06 CPC and Academic Senate Minutes, Spring 2013
- C8-07 Ventura College Core Indicators of Effectiveness
- C8-08 VCCCD and Ventura College Shared Effectiveness Measures (p. 12 of Ventura College Institutional Effectiveness Report)
- C8-09 CPC Minutes, February 2013
- C8-10 DCAP Summary of Planning Responses from college district and community focus groups
- C8-11 Email regarding District Master Planning Meeting on April 15, 2013

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. f. Action Item

BP 2510 – Participation in Local Decision Making

BP 2510 PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL DECISION MAKING

Legal

Education Code Section 70902(b)(7); Title 5, Sections 53200 et seq., (Academic Senate), 51023.5 (staff), 51023.7 (students); Accreditation Standard IV.A

Adopted

November 8, 2005

Last Revised

April 12, 2011

Last Reviewed

March 10, 2011

The Board is the ultimate decision-maker in those areas assigned to it by state and federal laws and regulations. In executing that responsibility, the Board is committed to its obligation to ensure that appropriate members of the District participate in developing recommended policies for board action and administrative procedures for the Chancellor's action under which the District is governed and administered.

Each of the following shall participate effectively as required by law (AB 1725) in the decision-making processes of the district:

Academic Senate(s) (Title 5, Sections 53200-53206.)

The Board or its designees will consult collegially with the Academic Senates, as duly constituted with respect to academic and professional matters, by the following methods as defined by law. ~~The district and academic senates shall have the obligation to reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or Board Policy in academic and professional matters. The Governing Board may change policies regarding academic and professional matters in mutual agreement with the senate or after a good faith effort to reach agreement only for compelling legal, fiscal, or organizational reasons.~~

The Board or its designees shall rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senates concerning the following academic and professional matters:

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines;
2. Degree and certificate requirements;
3. Grading policies;
4. Policies for faculty professional development activities;
5. Processes for program review; and
6. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports.

The Board or its designees shall reach mutual agreement by written resolution with the Academic Senates on academic and professional matters concerning the following policy areas:

1. Educational program development
2. District and college governance structures as related to faculty roles;
3. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
4. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success; and
5. Other academic and professional matters as are mutually agreed on by the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senates.

The board shall determine on an annual basis the amount of release time to be granted the senate presidents for the purpose of performing those participative functions as may be requested by the

district and its colleges. Academic senate presidents or designees will receive remuneration for participating fully in governance during the summer months.
Procedures to implement this section are developed collegially with the Academic Senate.

Staff (Title 5, Section 51023.5.)

Staff shall be provided with opportunities to participate in the formulation and development of district policies and procedures that have a significant effect on staff. The opinions and recommendations of the classified representatives and other recognized employee organizations will be given every reasonable consideration.

Students (Title 5, Section 51023.7.)

The Associated Students shall be given an opportunity to participate effectively in the formulation and development of district policies and procedures that have a significant effect on students, as defined by law:

(1) grading policies;

(2) codes of student conduct;

(3) academic disciplinary policies;

(4) curriculum development;

(5) courses or programs which should be initiated or discontinued;

(6) processes for institutional planning and budget development;

(7) standards and policies regarding student preparation and success;

(8) student services planning and development;

(9) student fees within the authority of the district to adopt; and

(10) any other district and college policy, procedure, or related matter that the district governing board determines will have a significant effect on students.

The recommendations and positions of the Associated Students will be given every reasonable consideration. The selection of student representatives to serve on district committees or task forces shall be made after consultation with the Associated Students.

Except for unforeseeable emergency situations, the Board shall not take any action on matters subject to this policy until the appropriate constituent group or groups have been provided the opportunity to participate.

Nothing in this policy will be construed to interfere with the formation or administration of employee organizations or with the exercise of rights guaranteed under the Educational Employment Relations Act, Government Code Sections 3540, *et seq.*

See Administrative Procedure 2510.

AP 2510 PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL DECISION MAKING

Legal

Education Code Section 70902(b) (7); Title 5, Sections 53200 et seq; 51023.5; 51023.7
Accreditation Standard IV.A.2, IV.A.5

Adopted

April 12, 2011

Last Reviewed

March 10, 2011

Employee and student participation in District decision-making is outlined in the VCCCD Participatory Governance Handbook.

Revision DRAFT

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. g. Action Item

BP/AP 5052 Open Enrollment

Book VCCCD Board Policy Manual
Section Chapter 5 Student Services
Title BP 5052 OPEN ENROLLMENT AND ENROLLMENT LIMITATIONS
Number BP 5052
Status Active
Legal Title 5 Section 51006, 55003 and 58106
Adopted April 18, 2006

The policy of the Ventura County Community College District is that, unless specifically exempted by statute or regulation, every course, course section, or class, reported for state aid, wherever offered and maintained by the district, shall be fully open to enrollment and participation by any person who has been admitted to the college(s) and who meets such prerequisites as may be established pursuant to section 55003 regulations contained in Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 55200) of Subchapter 4 of Chapter 6 of Division 6 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. The Chancellor shall assure that this policy statement is published in the catalog(s) and schedule(s) of classes and addenda to the schedule of classes on the college's websites.

~~Enrollment in specific courses or programs may be limited due to health and safety considerations, facility limitations, faculty workload, the availability of qualified instructors, funding limitations, the constraints of regional planning, or legal requirements imposed by statute, regulations or contracts. The District may use procedures that are consistent with any of the approaches described in Title 5 Section 58106 for determining enrollment into affected courses when any of the factors for enrollment limitations are present. Enrollment may also be subject to any the enrollment priority system pursuant to language contained in established by AP 5055 titled Enrollment Priorities.~~

The Chancellor shall establish administrative procedure that includes the right of a student to challenge an enrollment limitation established pursuant to section 58106 of Division 6 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

See Administrative Procedure 5052.

Book	VCCCD Administrative Procedure Manual
Section	Chapter 5 Student Services
Title	AP 5052 OPEN ENROLLMENT <u>AND ENROLLMENT LIMITATIONS</u>
Number	AP 5052
Status	Active
Legal	Title 5, Sections 51006, 58106, 58108
Adopted	April 14, 2009
Last Reviewed	March 12, 2009

All courses of the District shall be open to enrollment in accordance with Board Policy 5052 and a priority enrollment system consistent with Title 5, Section 58108 and Administrative Procedure 5055. Enrollment may be limited to students meeting properly validated prerequisites and co-requisites, or due to other non-evaluative, practical considerations, as determined by the ~~Chief Instructional Officer~~ Executive Vice President.

Enrollment in specific courses or programs may be limited due to health and safety considerations, facility limitations, faculty workload, the availability of qualified instructors, funding limitations, the constraints of regional planning, or legal requirements imposed by statute, regulations or contracts. The District may use procedures that are consistent with any of the approaches described in Title 5 Section 58106 for determining enrollment into affected courses when any of the factors for enrollment limitations are present. Enrollment may also be subject to ~~any~~ the enrollment priority system pursuant to language contained in established by AP 5055 titled Enrollment Priorities.

Such procedures shall be consistent with one or more of the following approaches:

- (1) limiting enrollment to a first-come, first served basis or using other nonevaluative selection techniques to determine who may enroll; or
- (2) limiting enrollment using a registration procedure authorized by section 58108; or
- (3) in the case of intercollegiate competition, honors courses, or public performance courses, allocating available seats to those students judged most qualified; or
- (4) limiting enrollment in one or more sections of a course to a cohort of students enrolled in one or more other courses, provided however, that a reasonable percentage of all sections of the course do not have such restrictions; or
- (5) limiting enrollment using any selection procedure authorized by statute; or
- (6) with respect to students on probation or subject to dismissal, the governing board may, consistent with the provisions of sections 55031 and 55032, limit enrollment to a total number of units or to selected courses, or require students to follow a prescribed educational plan.

No student is required to confer or consult with or required to receive permission to enroll in any class offered by the District, except as provided for in Administrative Procedure 5055 and those other District programs that utilize authorized restricted enrollment.

Students are not required to participate in any preregistration activities not uniformly required, and no registration procedures are used that result in restricting enrollment to a specialized clientele, except as provided for in Administrative Procedure 5055 and those other District programs that utilize authorized restricted enrollment.

A student may use Administrative Procedure 5530 to challenge an enrollment limitation on any of the following grounds:

- The limitation is unlawfully discriminatory or is being applied in an unlawfully discriminatory manner
- The District is not following its enrollment procedures
- The basis for the limitation does not in fact exist

The student shall bear the burden of showing that grounds exist for the challenge. Challenges shall be handled in a timely manner, and if upheld, the district shall waive the enrollment limitation with respect to that student. Should a challenge be upheld because it is determined that the limitation is unlawfully discriminatory or is being applied in an unlawfully discriminatory manner, the district shall upon completion of the challenge advise the student that he or she may file a formal complaint of unlawful discrimination. Completion of the challenge procedure shall be deemed to be an effort at informal resolution of the complaint under Title 5, section 59327 and AP 5530.

Challenges are submitted to the ????? for official consideration.

DRAFT

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. h. Action Item

BP/AP 5300 Student Equity

Book VCCCD Board Policy Manual
Section Chapter 5 Student Services
Title BP 5300 STUDENT EQUITY
Number BP 5300
Status Active
Legal Education Code Sections 66030; 66250, et seq.; 72010 et seq.; Title 5, Section 54220
Adopted April 18, 2006

~~The Board is committed to assuring student equity in educational programs and college services. The Chancellor shall establish and implement a student equity plan that meets the Title 5 standards for such a plan. The Colleges of the District shall establish and implement a student equity plan that meets Title 5 standards for such practice.~~

See Administrative Procedure 5300.



Book VCCCD Administrative Procedure Manual
Section Chapter 5 Student Services
Title AP 5300 STUDENT EQUITY
Number AP 5300
Status PROPOSED – NO AP 5300 IN VCCCD BOARDDOCS
Legal Education Code Sections 66030, 66250 et seq., and 72010 et seq.; Title 5 Section 54220

Adopted

Last Reviewed

Each college in the District has a student equity plan. The Student Equity Plan shall be developed, reviewed, maintained, and updated under the supervision of the EVP for Student Learning, or designee, on each campus.

The plan is filed as required to the Chancellor’s Office of California Community Colleges following approval by the Board.

The Student Equity Plan shall address:

- Involvement by appropriate people from the community who can articulate the perspectives and concerns of historically underrepresented groups.
- The active involvement of the groups on campus.
- Campus-based research as to the extent of student equity.
- Institutional barriers to equity.
- Goals for access, retention, degree and certificate completion, English as a Second Language (ESL) and basic skills completion, and transfer for each historically underrepresented group.
- Activities most likely to be effective to attain goals, including coordination of existing student equity related programs.
- Sources of funds for the activities in the plan.
- A schedule and process for evaluation of progress toward the goals.
- An executive summary that describes the groups for whom goals have been set, the goals, the initiatives that the District/each College will undertake to achieve the goals, the resources budgeted for that purpose, and the District officer or employee who can be contacted for further information.

Original draft_KEngelsen_received 3.06.13
DTRW-SS review 3.07.13_first reading
DCAA review 3.28.13 with revisions at this meeting to AS
Sent for Academic Senate review 4.01.13

~~The Student Equity Plan shall be developed, reviewed, maintained, and updated under the supervision of the EVP for Student Learning, or designee, on each campus.~~

Original draft_KEngelsen_received 3.06.13
DTRW-SS review 3.07.13_first reading
DCAA review 3.28.13 with revisions at this meeting to AS
Sent for Academic Senate review 4.01.13

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. i. Action Item

BP/AP 5500 Standards of Conduct

BP 5500 STANDARDS OF CONDUCT—DRAFT 2013

Book	VCCCD Board Policy Manual
Section	Chapter 5 Student Services
Title	BP 5500 STANDARDS OF <u>STUDENT</u> CONDUCT
Number	BP 5500
Status	Active
Legal	Education Code Section 66300; Accreditation Standard II.A.7.b
Adopted	April 13, 2010
Last Reviewed	March 11, 2010

The Chancellor shall establish procedures for the imposition of discipline on students in accordance with the requirements for due process of the federal and state law and regulations.

The procedures shall clearly define the conduct that is subject to discipline, and shall identify potential disciplinary actions, including but not limited to the removal, suspension or expulsion of a student.

The Board shall consider any recommendation from the Chancellor for expulsion. The Board shall consider an expulsion recommendation in closed session unless the student requests that the matter be considered in a public meeting. Final action by the Board on the expulsion shall be taken at a public meeting.

The procedures shall be made widely available to students through the college catalog and other means. Students who violate any of the following standards for student conduct while on the college campus or at on or off-campus college-sponsored activities are subject to the procedures outlined in Administrative Procedures 5520: Student Discipline Procedures:

1. Causing, attempting to cause, or threatening to cause physical injury to another person or to one's self.
2. Possession, sale or otherwise furnishing a weapon, including but not limited to, any actual or facsimile of a firearm, knife, explosive or other dangerous object, or any item used to threaten bodily harm without written permission from a district employee, with concurrence of the College President.
3. Use, possession (except as expressly permitted by law), distribution, or offer to sell alcoholic beverages, narcotics, hallucinogenic drugs, marijuana, other controlled substances or dangerous drugs while on campus or while participating in any college-sponsored event.
4. Presence on campus while under the influence of alcoholic beverages, narcotics, hallucinogenic drugs, marijuana, other controlled substances or dangerous drugs except as expressly permitted by law. This includes the use or possession of medically authorized marijuana while on school property.
5. Committing or attempting to commit robbery or extortion.
6. Causing or attempting to cause damage to District property or to private property on campus.
7. Stealing or attempting to steal District property or private property on campus, or knowingly receiving stolen District property or private property on campus.
8. Willful or persistent smoking, use of other tobacco products, or "electronic cigarettes" in any area where smoking has been prohibited by law or by regulation of the college or the District.
9. Engaging in harassing or discriminatory behavior based on disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other status protected by law.

The District's response to instances of sexual harassment will follow the processes identified in Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 3430.

10. Engaging in *stalking, intimidating conduct or bullying against another student through words or actions, including direct physical contact; verbal assaults, such as teasing or name-calling; social isolation or manipulation and cyberbullying.*

~~119.~~ Obstruction or disruption of classes, administrative or disciplinary procedures, or authorized college activities.

~~124.~~ Disruptive behavior, willful disobedience, profanity, vulgarity or other offensive conduct, or the open and persistent defiance of the authority ~~of,~~ or persistent abuse ~~of,~~ District/college personnel in performance of their duties.

~~132.~~ Academic dishonesty, cheating, or plagiarism.

~~143.~~ Forgery; alteration or misuse of District/college documents, records or identification; or knowingly furnishing false information to the District/college or any related off-site agency or organization.

~~154.~~ Unauthorized entry to or use of District/college facilities.

~~165.~~ Violation of district/college rules and regulations including those concerning student organizations, the use of District/college facilities, or the time, place, and manner of public expression or distribution of materials.

17. Engaging in expression which is obscene, libelous or slanderous, or which so incites students as to create a clear and present danger of the commission of unlawful acts on District premises, or the violation of lawful District regulations, or the substantial disruption of the orderly operation of the District.

~~186.~~ Persistent, serious misconduct where other means of correction have failed to bring about proper conduct.

~~197.~~ Unauthorized preparation, giving, selling, transfer, distribution, or publication of any recording of an academic presentation in a classroom or equivalent site of instruction, including but not limited to written class materials, except as permitted by District policy, or administrative procedure.

2048. Violation of professional ethical code of conduct in classroom or clinical settings as identified by state licensing agencies (Board of Registered Nursing, Emergency Medical Services Authority, Title 22, Peace Officers Standards & Training, California Department of Public Health). Students who engage in any of the above are subject to the procedures outlined in AP 5520.

See Administrative Procedure 5500.

ABP 5500 STANDARDS OF CONDUCT—DRAFT 2013

Book	VCCCD Board Policy Manual <u>Administrative Procedure</u>
Section	Chapter 5 Student Services
Title	BP-AP 5500 STANDARDS OF <u>STUDENT</u> CONDUCT
Number	BP-AP 5500
Status	Active <u>PROPOSED</u>
Legal	Education Code Section 66300; Accreditation Standard II.A.7.b
Adopted	April 13, 2010
Last Reviewed	March 11, 2010

The Chancellor shall establish procedures for the imposition of discipline on students in accordance with the requirements for due process of the federal and state law and regulations.

The following conduct shall constitute good cause for discipline, including but not limited to the removal, suspension or expulsion of a student.

~~The procedures shall clearly define the conduct that is subject to discipline, and shall identify potential disciplinary actions, including but not limited to the removal, suspension or expulsion of a student.~~

~~The Board shall consider any recommendation from the Chancellor for expulsion. The Board shall consider an expulsion recommendation in closed session unless the student requests that the matter be considered in a public meeting. Final action by the Board on the expulsion shall be taken at a public meeting.~~

~~The procedures shall be made widely available to students through the college catalog and other means. Students who violate any of the following standards for student conduct while on the college campus or at on or off-campus college-sponsored activities are subject to the procedures outlined in Administrative Procedures 5520: Student Discipline Procedures:~~

1. Causing, attempting to cause, or threatening to cause physical injury to another person or to one's self.
2. Possession, sale or otherwise furnishing a weapon, including but not limited to, any actual or facsimile of a firearm, knife, explosive or other dangerous object, or any item used to threaten bodily harm without written permission from a district employee, with concurrence of the College President.
3. Use, possession (except as expressly permitted by law), distribution, or offer to sell alcoholic beverages, narcotics, hallucinogenic drugs, marijuana, other controlled substances or dangerous drugs while on campus or while participating in any college-sponsored event.
4. Presence on campus while under the influence of alcoholic beverages, narcotics, hallucinogenic drugs, marijuana, other controlled substances or dangerous drugs except as expressly permitted by law. This includes the use or possession of medically authorized marijuana while on school property.
5. Committing or attempting to commit robbery or extortion.
6. Causing or attempting to cause damage to District property or to private property on campus.
7. Stealing or attempting to steal District property or private property on campus, or knowingly receiving stolen District property or private property on campus.

8. Willful or persistent ~~smoking, usesmoking, use~~ of other tobacco products, or “electronic cigarettes” in any area where smoking has been prohibited by law or by regulation of the college or the District.
9. Engaging in harassing or discriminatory behavior based on disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other status protected by law. The District’s response to instances of sexual harassment will follow the processes identified in Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 3430.
10. Engaging in stalking, intimidating conduct or bullying against another student through words or actions, including direct physical contact; verbal assaults, such as teasing or name-calling; social isolation or manipulation and cyberbullying.
11. Obstruction or disruption of classes, administrative or disciplinary procedures, or authorized college activities.
12. Disruptive behavior, willful disobedience, profanity, vulgarity or other offensive conduct, or the open and persistent defiance of the ~~authority or~~ authority or persistent abuse of District/college personnel in performance of their duties.
13. Academic dishonesty, cheating, or plagiarism.
14. Forgery; alteration or misuse of District/college documents, records or identification; or knowingly furnishing false information to the District/college or any related off-site agency or organization.
15. Unauthorized entry to or use of District/college facilities.
16. Violation of district/college rules and regulations including those concerning student organizations, the use of District/college facilities, or the time, place, and manner of public expression or distribution of materials.
17. Engaging in expression which is obscene, libelous or slanderous, or which so incites students as to create a clear and present danger of the commission of unlawful acts on District premises, or the violation of lawful District regulations, or the substantial disruption of the orderly operation of the District.
18. Persistent, serious misconduct where other means of correction have failed to bring about proper conduct.
19. Unauthorized preparation, giving, selling, transfer, distribution, or publication of any recording of an academic presentation in a classroom or equivalent site of instruction, including but not limited to written class materials, except as permitted by District policy, or administrative procedure.
20. Violation of professional ethical code of conduct in classroom or clinical settings as identified by state licensing agencies (Board of Registered Nursing, Emergency Medical Services Authority, Title 22, Peace Officers Standards & Training, California Department of Public Health). Students who engage in any of the above are subject to the procedures outlined in AP 5520.

See ~~Administrative Procedure~~ [Board Policy 5500](#).

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. j. Action Item

BP/AP 5520 Discipline Procedure

Book	VCCCD Administrative Procedure Manual <u>Board Policy</u>
Section	Chapter 5 Student Services
Title	<u>BAP 5520 STUDENT DISCIPLINE PROCEDURE</u>
Number	<u>BAP 5520</u>
Status	Active
Legal	Reference: Education Code Section 66300, 72122, 76030
Adopted	June 16, 2010
Last Reviewed	June 9, 2010

~~The Chancellor shall assure that a clear and effective Administrative Procedure is in place for the purpose of this procedure is to providing e a prompt and equitable means to address violations of the Student Code of Conduct (See BP 5500), which provides to the student or students involved appropriate due process rights. This procedure will be applied in a fair and equitable manner, and not for purposes of retaliation. It is not intended to substitute for criminal or civil proceedings that may be initiated by other agencies.~~

These Board Policies and Administrative Procedures are not intended to infringe in any way on the rights of students to engage in free expression as protected by the state and federal constitutions, and by Education Code Sections 66301 and 76120, and will not be used to punish expression that is protected.

~~See Administrative Procedure 5520 Student conduct must conform to the Student Code of Conduct established by the Governing Board of the Ventura County Community College District in collaboration with college administrators and students. Violations of such rules are subject to disciplinary actions which are to be administered by appropriate college authorities. The Ventura County Community College District has established procedures for the administration of the penalties enumerated here. College authorities will determine the appropriate penalty(ies).~~

Definitions of key terms:

~~Chief Student Services Officer (CSSO). A college's Executive Vice President or Vice President of Student Services, or designee.~~

~~Day. A calendar day, unless otherwise specified in this procedure. If the final day to take any action required by this procedure falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or other day that the administrative office of the District are closed, the date for such action shall be extended to the next business day. Similarly, if the final day to take any action required by this policy occurs during summer session, or during an intersession, but the basis for discipline arose during an academic term prior to that summer or intersession, the final day to take any required action shall be extended to the first business day of the next academic term.~~

~~District. The Ventura County Community College District.~~

~~Good cause for disciplinary action. As used in this procedure, "good cause" for disciplinary action includes any violation of the VCCCD Student Code of Conduct as set forth in Board Policy 5500 and Education Code section 76033, when the conduct is related to college activity or college attendance, including but not limited to:~~

- ~~1. Causing, attempting to cause, or threatening to cause physical injury to another person or to one's self.~~

DTRW-SS 3.07.13 – original PEwins 3.21.13 post DTRW-SS
DCAA review 3.28.13

- ~~2. Possession, sale or otherwise furnishing a weapon, including but not limited to, any actual or facsimile of a firearm, knife, explosive or other dangerous object, or any item used to threaten bodily harm without written permission from a District employee, with concurrence of the College President.~~
- ~~3. Use, possession (except as expressly permitted by law), distribution, or offer to sell alcoholic beverages, narcotics, hallucinogenic drugs, marijuana, other controlled substances or dangerous drugs while on campus or while participating in any college-sponsored event.~~
- ~~4. Presence on campus while under the influence of alcoholic beverages, narcotics, hallucinogenic drugs, marijuana, other controlled substances or dangerous drugs except as expressly permitted by law.~~
- ~~5. Committing or attempting to commit robbery or extortion.~~
- ~~6. Causing or attempting to cause damage to District property or to private property on campus.~~
- ~~7. Stealing or attempting to steal District property or private property on campus, or knowingly receiving stolen District property or private property on campus.~~
- ~~8. Willful or persistent smoking in any area where smoking has been prohibited by law or by regulation of the college or the District.~~
- ~~9. Engaging in harassing or discriminatory behavior. The District's response to instances of sexual harassment will follow the processes identified in Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 3430.~~
- ~~10. Obstruction or disruption of classes, administrative or disciplinary procedures, or authorized college activities.~~
- ~~11. Disruptive behavior, willful disobedience, profanity, vulgarity or other offensive conduct, or the open and persistent defiance of the authority of, or persistent abuse of, District/college personnel in performance of their duties.~~
- ~~12. Academic dishonesty, cheating, or plagiarism.~~
- ~~13. Forgery; alteration or misuse of District/college documents, records or identification; or knowingly furnishing false information to the District/college or any related off-site agency or organization.~~
- ~~14. Unauthorized entry to or use of District/college facilities.~~
- ~~15. Violation of District/college rules and regulations including those concerning student organizations, the use of District/college facilities, or the time, place, and manner of public expression or distribution of materials.~~
- ~~16. Persistent, serious misconduct where other means of correction have failed to bring about proper conduct.~~
- ~~17. Unauthorized preparation, giving, selling, transfer, distribution, or publication of any recording of an academic presentation in a classroom or equivalent site of instruction, including but not limited to written class materials, except as permitted by District policy, or administrative procedure.~~
- ~~18. Violation of professional ethical code of conduct in classroom or clinical settings as identified by state licensing agencies (Board of Registered Nursing, Emergency Medical Services Authority, Title 22, Peace Officers Standards & Training, California Department of Public Health).~~

~~For purposes of student discipline under this procedure, conduct is related to college activity or college attendance if it occurs during or in conjunction with any program, activity, or event connected with District coursework, sponsored or sanctioned by the District or a college of the District, or funded in whole or in part by the District or college, whether the activity or event occurs on or off campus or during or outside of instructional hours.~~

~~**Instructor.** Any academic employee of the District in whose class a student subject to discipline is enrolled, or counselor who is providing or has provided services to the student, or other academic employee who has responsibility for the student's educational program.~~

~~**Student.** Any person currently enrolled as a student at any college or in any program offered by the District.~~

Time Limit. Any times specified in these procedures may be shortened or lengthened if there is mutual concurrence by all parties in writing.

Definitions of types of discipline listed in order of severity

The following sanctions may be imposed upon any student found to have violated the standards of student conduct. The selection of the degree of severity of sanction to be imposed shall be commensurate with the severity of offense. The availability of a less severe sanction does not preclude imposition of a more severe sanction in any circumstance where the more severe sanction is deemed appropriate.

Warning. Documented written notice by the CSSO to the student that continuation or repetition of specific conduct may be cause for other disciplinary action. A warning is retained in the college discipline files for two complete academic years.

Reprimand. Written notice to the student by the CSSO that the student has violated the Standards of Student Conduct. A reprimand serves as documentation that a student's conduct in a specific instance does not meet the standards expected at the college and as a warning to the student that further violations may result in further disciplinary sanctions. A reprimand is permanently retained in the college discipline files.

Temporary Removal from Class. Exclusion of the student by an instructor for good cause for the day of the removal and the next class meeting. [Education Code Section 76032.]

Short-term Suspension. Exclusion of the student by the CSSO, or designee, for good cause from one or more classes or activities for a period of up to ten (10) consecutive school days. [Education Code Sections 76030 and 76031.]

Disciplinary Probation and/or Temporary Ineligibility to Participate in Extracurricular Activities and/or Temporary Denial of Other Privileges. Placement of the student on probation by the College President or designee, for good cause, for a specified period of time not to exceed one academic year during which a student's fitness to continue to attend school, in light of the student's disciplinary offenses, is tested; and/or temporary exclusion of the student by the College President or designee, for good cause, from extracurricular activities for a specified period of time; and/or temporary denial of other specified privileges, by the College President or designee for good cause.

Immediate Interim Suspension. The College President or designee may order immediate suspension of a student where he or she concludes that immediate suspension is required to protect lives or property and to ensure the maintenance of order. In cases where an interim suspension has been ordered, the time limits contained in these procedures shall not apply, and all hearing rights, including the right to a formal hearing where a long-term suspension or expulsion is recommended, will be afforded to the student within ten (10) days. A suspended student shall be prohibited from being enrolled in any community college within the District for the period of the suspension. [Education Code Sections 66017 and 76031; cf. Penal Code Section 626.2.]

Long-term Suspension. Exclusion of the student by the College President for good cause from one or more classes and/or activities, or from all classes and/or activities of the college for up to the remainder of the semester and the following semester. A student suspended from all classes and/or activities shall be prohibited from being enrolled in any community college within the District for the period of the suspension. [Education Code Sections 76030 and 76031.]

Expulsion. Exclusion of the student by the Board of Trustees from all colleges in the District for one or more terms when other means of correction fail to bring about proper conduct, or when the presence of the student causes a continuing danger to the physical safety of the student or others. [Education Code Section 76030.]

In addition to the above sanctions, the sanction of restitution may be imposed upon a student, where appropriate, to compensate for loss, damage, or injury. Furthermore, the sanction of administrative hold, to prevent a student from enrolling, may be placed on a student's records by the District if a long-term suspension from all classes and/or activities, or expulsion has been imposed following the formal hearing described below, or the student has failed to meet with the CSSO, or designee, regarding a pending disciplinary matter.

Procedures for Disciplinary Actions (listed in order of severity)

Any times specified in these procedures may be shortened or lengthened if there is mutual written concurrence by all parties.

[DTRW-SS 3.07.13 – original PEwins 3.21.13 post DTRW-SS
DCAA review 3.28.13](#)

Warning

The CSSO or designee, upon recommendation from an instructor or other District or college employee, shall review the report of alleged misconduct. If it is determined that there has been a violation of the Student Code of Conduct or the Education Code, the CSSO or designee will notify the student that the continuation and/or repetition of misconduct may result in more serious disciplinary action. This notification may be delivered orally or in writing. Documentation of the misconduct and/or the notice given to the student shall be retained in the District discipline files for two complete academic years. Warnings may be appealed directly to the College President. Students may not request a student conduct hearing to appeal a warning. [Cf. Education Code Section 76232—challenging content of student records.]

Reprimand

The CSSO or designee, upon recommendation from an instructor or other District or college employee, shall review the report of alleged misconduct. If it is determined that there has been a serious violation of the Student Code of Conduct or the Education Code, the CSSO or designee will notify the student that the continuation and/or repetition of misconduct may result in even more serious disciplinary action. This notification will be delivered in writing. Documentation of the misconduct and the written notice given to the student shall be permanently retained in the District discipline files. Reprimands may be appealed directly to the College President. Students may not request a hearing to appeal a reprimand.

Temporary Removal from Class

Any instructor may remove a student from his or her class for good cause for the day of the removal and the next class meeting. The instructor shall immediately report the removal to his/her supervising administrator and the CSSO or designee. A meeting shall be arranged between the student and the instructor regarding the removal prior to the day that the student is eligible to return to class. If the instructor or the student makes the request, the CSSO or designee shall attend the meeting. The student is not allowed to return to the class for the day of removal and the next class meeting without the concurrence of the instructor. Nothing herein will prevent the CSSO or designee from recommending further disciplinary action in accordance with these procedures based on the facts that led to the removal. [Education Code Section 76032.]

Suspensions and Expulsions

Before any disciplinary action to suspend or expel is taken against a student, the following procedures will apply:

Notice. The CSSO or designee will provide the student with written notice of the conduct warranting the discipline, stating the facts on which the proposed discipline is based, and providing any evidence on which the college may rely in the imposition of discipline. Evidence which may identify other students or which would result in the revelation of test questions or answers need not be provided in advance, and if feasible may be presented under circumstances which maintain the anonymity of other students, or assures the security of test questions or answers. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. The notice will include the following:

- the specific section of the Standards of Student Conduct or Education Code that the student is accused of violating;
- a specific statement of the facts supporting the proposed discipline;
- any evidence on which the college may rely in the imposition of discipline. Evidence that may identify other students or which would result in the revelation of test questions or answers need not be provided in advance. Testimony relating to students not subject to discipline may be presented in a manner that protects the anonymity or safety of the third party student. If such testimony is needed, it may be presented under circumstances that protect the safety of such students or maintains the anonymity of other students, as the hearing officer may determine to be in the interests of justice. Similarly, evidence relating to test questions or answers may be presented, if possible, only in a manner that maintains the security of test questions or answers;

- the right of the student to meet with the CSSO or designee to discuss the accusation, or to respond in writing, or both; and
- the level of the discipline that is being proposed.

Time limits. The notice described above must be provided to the student as soon as possible and no later than 14 days from the date on which the conduct took place or became known to the CSSO or designee;

Meeting. If the student chooses to meet with the CSSO or designee, the meeting must be requested within 7 days and must occur within 14 days after the notice is provided. At the meeting, the student must again be told the facts leading to the accusation, and must be given an opportunity to respond orally or in writing to the accusation, or both, in order to state why the proposed disciplinary action should not be taken.

Short-term Suspension. Within 10 days after the delivery of the notice, or within 10 days of a meeting if the student requests a meeting, or within 10 days of receiving the student's statement as to why the proposed disciplinary action should not be implemented, the CSSO shall decide whether to impose a short-term suspension, whether to impose some lesser disciplinary action, or whether to end the matter. Written notice of the CSSO's decision shall be provided to the student and, if the student is a minor, to the student's parent or guardian. The notice will include the length of time of the suspension, or the nature of the lesser disciplinary action, as well as any conditions or limitations placed on the student during the short-term suspension. The notice will include the right of the student to request a meeting with the College President or designee within 7 days of notification of the recommended disciplinary action. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. Such meeting shall be held within 14 days after receipt of the student's written request for a meeting. Failure of the student to appear at the meeting will constitute a waiver of the student's right to a meeting. The meeting shall be conducted in any manner deemed appropriate by the College President, provided that the student is offered the opportunity to provide his or her version of events, and any evidence that supports his or her version of the events. The CSSO, or designee, may also provide evidence contradicting the student's version of the facts. If either the student or the CSSO, or designee, is offered the opportunity to present evidence or the testimony of witnesses, the other party must be given the opportunity to cross-examine such witnesses. The meeting shall be closed and confidential, and all witnesses shall be excluded from the meeting except when testifying. Neither the student nor the CSSO, or designee, shall be entitled to representation by an attorney in this proceeding; however if the student is a minor, the student may be accompanied by his/her parent or guardian. After the conclusion of the meeting, the College President or designee shall determine whether a preponderance of evidence supports the charges against the student, and shall provide the student with written notice of his/her decision, and the factual basis therefor, within 7 days of the conclusion of the hearing. The College President's decision on a short-term suspension shall be final and shall be reported to the District's Chancellor.

Long-term Suspension. Within 7 days after the delivery of the notice, or within 7 days of a meeting with the CSSO, or designee, if the student requested a meeting, the College President shall, based on the recommendation from the CSSO, or designee, decide whether to impose a long-term suspension. Written notice of the College President's decision shall be provided to the student and, if the student is a minor, to the student's parent or guardian. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. The notice will include the length of time of the proposed suspension, as well as a statement that the student will be prohibited from being enrolled in any college within the District for the period of the suspension. The notice will include the factual allegations on which the proposed suspension is based, any evidence in the possession of the District on which it will rely in support of the recommended suspension, the right of the student to request a formal hearing before a long-term suspension is imposed, and a copy of the procedures for the hearing.

Expulsion. Within 7 days after the delivery of the notice, or within 7 days of a meeting if the student requests a meeting, the College President shall, pursuant to a recommendation from the CSSO, decide whether to recommend expulsion to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees. Written notice of the College President's decision shall be provided to the student and, if the student is a minor, to the student's parent or guardian. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. The notice will include the right of the student to request a formal hearing before expulsion is imposed, the factual allegations on which the proposed

expulsion is based, any evidence in the possession of the District on which it will rely in support of the recommended suspension, and a copy of the procedures for the hearing.

Hearing Procedures for Long-term Suspension and Expulsion

Request for Hearing. Within 7 days after receipt of the College President's decision regarding a long term suspension or expulsion, the student may request a formal hearing before a hearing panel. The request must be made in writing to the College President and must include a date and the signature of the student or, if the student is a minor, the student's parent or guardian. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. If the request for hearing is not received within 7 days after the student's receipt of the College President's decision or recommendation in the case of expulsion, the student's right to a hearing shall be deemed waived.

Schedule of Hearing. The formal hearing shall be held within 21 days after a formal request for hearing is received. The parties involved will be asked to attend the hearing and will be given sufficient notice in writing as to the time and place at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. Notice of the date of the hearing shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college.

Hearing Panel. The hearing panel for any disciplinary action shall be composed of one administrator, one faculty member, and one student. At the beginning of the academic year, and no later than October 1st, the College President, the president of the Academic Senate, and the Associated Students president shall each provide the names of at least two persons willing to serve on Student Disciplinary Hearing Panels. The College President shall appoint the Hearing Panel from the names in this pool; however, no administrator, faculty member or student who has any personal involvement in the matter to be decided, who is a necessary witness, who is a relative of any party or witness, or who could not otherwise act in a neutral manner shall serve on a Hearing Panel. Upon notification of the Hearing Panel's composition, the student and the District shall each be allowed one peremptory challenge. The College President shall substitute the challenged member or members and replace them with another member of the panel pool to achieve the appropriate Hearing Panel composition. In the event the pool names are exhausted in any one category, further designees shall be submitted by the College President (for administrators), the President of the Academic Senate (for faculty), or the Associated Student President (for students). The chairperson may, by giving written notice to both parties, reschedule the hearing as necessary pending the submission of alternate designees.

A quorum shall consist of all three members of the committee.

Hearing Panel Chair. The College President shall appoint one member of the Hearing Panel to serve as the chair. The decision of the Hearing Panel Chair shall be final on all matters relating to the conduct of the hearing unless there is a vote by both other members of the Hearing Panel to the contrary.

Hearing Process. Prior to commencement of the hearing, the members of the hearing panel shall be provided with a copy of the accusation against the student and any written response provided by the student, and all applicable student due process policies and administrative procedures. The facts supporting the accusation shall be presented by a college representative who shall be the CSSO or designee.

After consultations with the parties, in the interests of justice, a time limit on the amount of time provided for each party to present its case, or any rebuttal, may be set by the hearing panel. Formal rules of evidence shall not apply. All members of the campus community shall be bound by the student code of conduct or code of professional ethics to provide only true testimony. Witnesses who are not members of the campus community will testify under oath subject to the penalty of perjury. Any relevant evidence may be admitted at the discretion of the Hearing Panel Chair, in consultation with the Hearing Panel. Hearsay evidence will be admissible, but will be insufficient, alone, to establish a charge against the student. The Hearing Panel Chair, in consultation with the Hearing Panel, shall be responsible for determining the relevancy of presented evidence and testimony, the number of witnesses permitted to testify, and the time allocated for testimony and questioning. The Hearing Panel Chair, in consultation with the Hearing Panel, shall further be responsible for instructing and questioning witnesses on behalf of the Hearing Panel, and for dismissing any persons who are disruptive or who fail to follow instructions. The Hearing Panel Chair shall have the final decision on all procedural questions concerning the hearing.

Unless the Hearing Panel determines to proceed otherwise, the college representative and the student shall each be permitted to make an opening statement. Thereafter, the college representative shall make the first presentation, followed by the student. The college representative may present rebuttal evidence after the student completes his or her evidence. The burden shall be on the college representative to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the facts alleged are true. The Hearing Panel may request legal assistance for the Panel itself through the College President. Any legal advisor provided to the Hearing Panel may be present during the hearing and in any deliberations in an advisory capacity to provide legal counsel but shall not be a member of the panel or vote with it.

Both parties shall have the right to present statements, testimony, evidence, and witnesses. Each party shall have the right to be represented by a single advisor but not a licensed attorney. The student shall, in consultation with the Hearing Panel, have the right to be served by a translator or qualified interpreter to ensure the student's full participation in the proceedings.

Hearings shall be closed and confidential. No other persons except the student and, the college representative and their non-attorney representatives and/or translators/interpreters, if any, a court reporter, if any, individual witnesses, the Hearing Panel members, and the Hearing Panel's legal counsel, if any, shall be present. Witnesses shall not be present at the hearing when not testifying, unless all parties and the Hearing Panel agree to the contrary. The rule of confidentiality shall prevail at all stages of the hearing. Moreover, the Hearing Panel members shall ensure that all hearings, deliberations, and records remain confidential in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), California Education Code Section 76200 et seq., and District Board Policies and Administrative Procedures related to the privacy of student and employee records.

The hearing shall be recorded by the District by electronic means such as audiotape, videotape, or by court reporting service and shall be the only recording made. No other recording devices shall be permitted to be used at the hearing. Any witness who refuses to be recorded shall not be permitted to give testimony. A witness who refuses to be recorded shall not be considered to be unavailable within the meaning of the rules of evidence, and therefore no exception to the hearsay rule for unavailability shall apply to such witness. The Hearing Panel Chair shall, on the record, at the beginning of the hearing, ask all persons present to identify themselves by name, and thereafter shall ask witnesses to identify themselves by name. The recording shall remain the property of the District and shall remain in the custody of the District at all times, unless released to a professional transcribing service. The student may request a copy of the recording; however, any transcript of the recording requested by the student shall be provided at the student's own expense.

Following the close of the hearing, the Hearing Panel shall deliberate in closed session. These deliberations shall not be electronically recorded and the proceedings shall be confidential. Within 7 days following the close of the hearing, the hearing panel shall prepare and send to the College President a written decision. The decision shall include specific factual findings regarding the accusation, and shall include specific conclusions regarding whether any specific section of the Student Code of Conduct was violated. The decision shall also include a specific recommendation regarding the disciplinary action to be imposed, if any. The decision shall be based only on the record of the hearing, and not on any matters outside of that record. The record consists of the original accusation, the written response, if any, of the student, and the oral and written evidence produced at the hearing. The District shall maintain records of all Disciplinary Hearings in a secure location on District premises for a period of 7 years.

College President's Decision

- Long-term suspension. Within 14 days following receipt of the hearing panel's recommended decision, the College President shall render a final written decision. The College President may accept, modify or reject the findings, decisions and recommendations of the hearing panel. If the College President modifies or rejects the hearing panel's decision, the College President shall review the record of the hearing, and shall prepare a new written decision that contains specific factual findings and conclusions. The decision of the College President shall be final, and shall be reported to the District Chancellor.
- Expulsion. Within 14 days following receipt of the hearing panel's recommended decision, the College President shall render a written recommended decision to the Chancellor. The College President may accept, modify or reject the findings, decisions and recommendations of the hearing panel. If the College President modifies or rejects the hearing panel's decision, he or she shall review the record of the

hearing, and shall prepare a new written decision which contains specific factual findings and conclusions. The College President's decision shall be forwarded to the Chancellor as a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Board of Trustees Decision

The Board of Trustees shall consider any recommendation from the Chancellor for expulsion at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board after receipt of the recommended decision.

The Board shall consider an expulsion recommendation in closed session, unless the student has requested that the matter be considered in a public meeting in accordance with these procedures. [Education Code Section 72122.]

The student (and the parent or guardian if the student is a minor) shall be notified in writing, by certified mail, by personal service, or by such method of delivery as will establish receipt, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting, of the date, time, and place of the Board's meeting.

The student may, within 48 hours after receipt of the notice, request that the hearing be held as a public meeting.

Even if a student has requested that the Board consider an expulsion recommendation in a public meeting, the Board will hold in closed session any discussion that might be in conflict with the right to privacy of any student other than the student requesting the public meeting.

The Board may accept, modify or reject the findings, decisions and recommendations of the Chancellor. If the Board modifies or rejects the Chancellor's recommendation, the Board shall review the record of the hearing, and shall, within 30 days or by the next regular meeting of the Board, whichever is later, prepare a new written decision which contains its specific factual findings and conclusions. The decision of the Board shall be final.

The final action of the Board on the expulsion shall be taken at a public meeting, and the result of the action shall be a public record of the District.

Book VCCCD Administrative Procedure Manual
Section Chapter 5 Student Services
Title AP 5520 STUDENT DISCIPLINE PROCEDURE
Number AP 5520

Formatted: Bottom: 0.69", Footer distance from edge: 0.19"

Status Active ~~—~~ THERE IS NO BP IN VCCCD BOARDDOCS

Legal ~~Reference: Education Code Section 66300, 66301, 72122, 76030, 76102, 76003, 66017, 76031, 76032, 76232, 76200~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 1"

~~Education Code Section 66300, 72122, 76030~~

Adopted June 16, 2010

Last Reviewed June 9, 2010

The purpose of this procedure is to provide a prompt and equitable means to address violations of the Student Code of Conduct, which provides to the student or students involved appropriate due process rights. This procedure will be applied in a fair and equitable manner, and not for purposes of retaliation. It is not intended to substitute for criminal or civil proceedings that may be initiated by other agencies.

These Administrative Procedures are not intended to infringe in any way on the rights of students to engage in free expression as protected by the state and federal constitutions, and by Education Code Sections 66301 and 76120, and will not be used to punish expression that is protected.

Student conduct must conform to the Student Code of Conduct established by the Governing Board of the Ventura County Community College District in collaboration with college administrators and students. Violations of such rules are subject to disciplinary actions which are to be administered by appropriate college authorities. The Ventura County Community College District has established procedures for the administration of the penalties enumerated here. College authorities will determine the appropriate penalty(ies).

Definitions of key terms:

Chief Student Services Officer (CSSO). A college's Executive Vice President or Vice President of Student Services, or designee.

Day. A calendar day, unless otherwise specified in this procedure. If the final day to take any action required by this procedure falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or other day that the ~~administrative office of the District are~~ college is closed, the date for such action shall be extended to the next business day. Similarly, ~~if if the final day to take any action required by this policy occurs any action is required while the faculty or staff member involved is "off contract" or otherwise unavailable, the timeline will commence when the faculty member returns to active contract status.~~

Formatted: Font: 9 pt

~~during summer session, or during an intersession, but the basis for discipline arose during an academic term prior to that summer or intersession, the final day to take any required action shall be extended to the first business day of the next academic term.~~

District. The Ventura County Community College District.

Good cause for disciplinary action. As used in this procedure, "good cause" for disciplinary action includes any violation of the VCCCD Student Code of Conduct as set forth in Board Policy 5500 and Education Code section 76033, when the conduct is related to college activity or college attendance, including but not limited to:

1. Causing, attempting to cause, or threatening to cause physical injury to another person or to one's self.

Comment [p1]: This will need to be updated to match the conduct code.

Original draft from P. Ewins received 3.05.13

DTRW-SS 3.07.13 first reading

DCAA review 3.28.13

2. Possession, sale or otherwise furnishing a weapon, including but not limited to, any actual or facsimile of a firearm, knife, explosive or other dangerous object, or any item used to threaten bodily harm without written permission from a District employee, with concurrence of the College President.
3. Use, possession (except as expressly permitted by law), distribution, or offer to sell alcoholic beverages, narcotics, hallucinogenic drugs, marijuana, other controlled substances or dangerous drugs while on campus or while participating in any college-sponsored event.
4. Presence on campus while under the influence of alcoholic beverages, narcotics, hallucinogenic drugs, marijuana, other controlled substances or dangerous drugs except as expressly permitted by law.
5. Committing or attempting to commit robbery or extortion.
6. Causing or attempting to cause damage to District property or to private property on campus.
7. Stealing or attempting to steal District property or private property on campus, or knowingly receiving stolen District property or private property on campus.
8. Willful or persistent smoking in any area where smoking has been prohibited by law or by regulation of the college or the District.
9. Engaging in harassing or discriminatory behavior. The District's response to instances of sexual harassment will follow the processes identified in Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 3430.
10. Obstruction or disruption of classes, administrative or disciplinary procedures, or authorized college activities.
11. Disruptive behavior, willful disobedience, profanity, vulgarity or other offensive conduct, or the open and persistent defiance of the authority of, or persistent abuse of, District/college personnel in performance of their duties.
12. Academic dishonesty, cheating, or plagiarism.
13. Forgery, alteration or misuse of District/college documents, records or identification; or knowingly furnishing false information to the District/college or any related off-site agency or organization.
14. Unauthorized entry to or use of District/college facilities.
15. Violation of District/college rules and regulations including those concerning student organizations, the use of District/college facilities, or the time, place, and manner of public expression or distribution of materials.
16. Persistent, serious misconduct where other means of correction have failed to bring about proper conduct.
17. Unauthorized preparation, giving, selling, transfer, distribution, or publication of any recording of an academic presentation in a classroom or equivalent site of instruction, including but not limited to written class materials, except as permitted by District policy, or administrative procedure.
18. Violation of professional ethical code of conduct in classroom or clinical settings as identified by state licensing agencies (Board of Registered Nursing, Emergency Medical Services Authority, Title 22, Peace Officers Standards & Training, California Department of Public Health).

For purposes of student discipline under this procedure, conduct is related to college activity or college attendance if it occurs during or in conjunction with any program, activity, or event connected with District coursework, sponsored or sanctioned by the District or a college of the District, or funded in whole or in part by the District or college, whether the activity or event occurs on or off campus or during or outside of instructional hours.

Instructor/Faculty. Any academic employee of the District in whose class a student subject to discipline is enrolled, or counselor who is providing or has provided services to the student, or other academic employee who has responsibility for the student's educational program.

Student. Any person currently enrolled as a student at any college or in any program offered by the District.

[Original draft from P. Ewins received 3.05.13](#)

[DTRW-SS 3.07.13 first reading](#)

[DCAA review 3.28.13](#)

Time Limit. Any times specified in these procedures may be shortened or lengthened if there is mutual concurrence by all parties in writing.

Definitions of types of discipline listed in order of severity

The following sanctions may be imposed upon any student found to have violated the standards of student conduct. The selection of the degree of severity of sanction to be imposed shall be commensurate with the severity of offense. The availability of a less severe sanction does not preclude imposition of a more severe sanction in any circumstance where the more severe sanction is deemed appropriate.

Warning. Documented written notice by the CSSO or designee to the student that continuation or repetition of specific conduct may be cause for other disciplinary action. A warning is retained in the college discipline files for two complete academic years.

Reprimand. Written notice to the student by the CSSO or designee that the student has violated the Standards of Student Conduct. A reprimand serves as documentation that a student's conduct in a specific instance does not meet the standards expected at the college and as a warning to the student that further violations may result in further disciplinary sanctions. A reprimand is permanently retained in the college discipline files.

Temporary Removal from Class. Exclusion of the student by an instructor~~an instructor~~ for good cause for the day of the removal and the next class meeting. [Education Code Section 76032.]

Short-term Suspension. Exclusion of the student by the CSSO, or designee, for good cause from one or more classes or activities for a period of up to ten (10) consecutive school days. [Education Code Sections 76030 and 76031.]

Disciplinary Probation and/or Temporary Ineligibility to Participate in Extracurricular Activities and/or Temporary Denial of Other Privileges. Placement of the student on probation by the College President or designee, for good cause, for a specified period of time, not to exceed one academic year, during which a student's fitness to continue to attend school, in light of the student's disciplinary offenses, is tested~~evaluated~~; and/or temporary exclusion of the student by the College President or designee, for good cause, from extracurricular activities for a specified period of time; and/or temporary denial of other specified privileges, by the College President or designee for good cause.

Immediate Interim Suspension. The College President or designee may order immediate interim suspension of a student where he or she concludes that immediate suspension is required to protect lives or property and to ensure the maintenance of order. In cases where an interim suspension has been ordered, the time limits contained in these procedures shall not apply, and all hearing rights, including the right to a formal hearing where a long-term suspension or expulsion is recommended, will be afforded to the student within ten (10) days. A suspended student shall be prohibited from being enrolled in any community college within the District for the period of the suspension. [Education Code Sections 66017 and 76031; cf. Penal Code Section 626.2.]

Long-term Suspension. Exclusion of the student by the College President for good cause from one or more classes and/or activities, or from all classes and/or activities of the college for up to the remainder of the semester and the following semester. A student suspended from all classes and/or activities shall be prohibited from being enrolled in any community college within the District for the period of the suspension. [Education Code Sections 76030 and 76031.]

Expulsion. Exclusion of the student by the Board of Trustees from all colleges in the District for one or more terms when other means of correction fail to bring about proper conduct, or when the presence of the student causes a continuing danger to the physical safety of the student or others. [Education Code Section 76030.]

In addition to the above sanctions, the sanction of restitution may be imposed upon a student, where appropriate, to compensate for loss, damage, or injury. Furthermore, the sanction of administrative hold, to prevent a student from enrolling, may be placed on a student's records by the District if a long-term suspension from all classes and/or activities, or expulsion has been imposed following the formal hearing described below, or the student has failed to meet with the CSSO, or designee, regarding a pending disciplinary matter.

Procedures for Disciplinary Actions (listed in order of severity)

[Original draft from P. Ewins received 3.05.13](#)

[DTRW-SS 3.07.13 first reading](#)

[DCAA review 3.28.13](#)

Any times specified in these procedures may be shortened or lengthened if there is mutual written concurrence by all parties.

Warning

The CSSO or designee, upon recommendation from ~~an instructor~~Faculty or other District or college employee, shall review the report of alleged misconduct. If it is determined that there has been a violation of the Student Code of Conduct or the Education Code, the CSSO or designee will notify the student that the continuation and/or repetition of misconduct may result in more serious disciplinary action. This notification may be delivered orally or in writing. Documentation of the misconduct and/or the notice given to the student shall be retained in the District discipline files for two complete academic years. Warnings may be appealed directly to the College President. Students may not request a student conduct hearing to appeal a warning. [Cf. Education Code Section 76232 - challenging content of student records.]

Reprimand

The CSSO or designee, upon recommendation from ~~an instructor~~Faculty or other District or college employee, shall review the report of alleged misconduct. If it is determined that there has been a serious violation of the Student Code of Conduct or the Education Code, the CSSO or designee will notify the student that the continuation and/or repetition of misconduct may result in even more serious disciplinary action. This notification will be delivered in writing. Documentation of the misconduct and the written notice given to the student shall be permanently retained in the District discipline files. Reprimands may be appealed directly to the College President. Students may not request a hearing to appeal a reprimand.

Temporary Removal from Class

Any ~~instructor~~Instructor may remove a student from his or her class for good cause for the day of the removal and the next class meeting. The ~~instructor~~Instructor shall immediately report the removal to his/her supervising administrator and the CSSO or designee. A meeting shall be arranged between the student and the ~~instructor~~Instructor regarding the removal prior to the day that the student is eligible to return to class. If the ~~instructor~~Instructor or the student makes the request, the CSSO or designee shall attend the meeting. The student is not allowed to return to the class for the day of removal and the next class meeting without the concurrence of the ~~instructor~~Instructor. Nothing herein will prevent the CSSO or designee from recommending further disciplinary action in accordance with these procedures based on the facts that led to the removal. [Education Code Section 76032.]

Suspensions and Expulsions

Before any disciplinary action to suspend or expel is taken against a student, the following procedures will apply:

Notice. The CSSO or designee will provide the student with written notice of the conduct warranting the discipline, stating the facts on which the proposed discipline is based, and providing any evidence on which the college may rely in the imposition of discipline. Evidence which may identify other students or which would result in the revelation of test questions or answers need not be provided in advance, and if feasible may be presented under circumstances which maintain the anonymity of other students, or assures the security of test questions or answers. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. The notice will include the following:

- the specific section of the Standards of Student Conduct or Education Code that the student is accused of violating;
- a specific statement of the facts supporting the proposed discipline;
- any evidence on which the college may rely in the imposition of discipline. Evidence that may identify other students or which would result in the revelation of test questions or answers need not be provided in advance. Testimony relating to students not subject to discipline may be presented in a manner that

[Original draft from P. Ewins received 3.05.13](#)

[DTRW-SS 3.07.13 first reading](#)

[DCAA review 3.28.13](#)

protects the anonymity or safety of the third party student. If such testimony is needed, it may be presented under circumstances that protect the safety of such students or maintains the anonymity of other students, as the hearing officer may determine to be in the interests of justice. Similarly, evidence relating to test questions or answers may be presented, if possible, only in a manner that maintains the security of test questions or answers;

- the right of the student to meet with the CSSO or designee to discuss the accusation, or to respond in writing, or both; and
- the level of the discipline that is being proposed.

Time limits. The notice described above must be provided to the student as soon as possible and no later than 14 days from the date on which the conduct took place or became known to the CSSO or designee;

Meeting. If the student chooses to meet with the CSSO or designee, the meeting must be requested within 7 days and must occur within 14 days after the notice is provided. At the meeting, the student must again be told the facts leading to the accusation, and must be given an opportunity to respond orally or in writing to the accusation, or both, in order to state why the proposed disciplinary action should not be taken.

Short-term Suspension. Within 10 days after the delivery of the notice, or within 10 days of a meeting if the student requests a meeting, or within 10 days of receiving the student's statement as to why the proposed disciplinary action should not be implemented, the CSSO, or designee, shall decide whether to impose a short-term suspension, whether to impose some lesser disciplinary action, or whether to end the matter. Written notice of the CSSO ~~s~~ or designee's decision shall be provided to the student and, if the student is a minor, to the student's parent or guardian. The notice will include the length of time of the suspension, or the nature of the lesser disciplinary action, as well as any conditions or limitations placed on the student during the short-term suspension. The notice will include the right of the student to request a meeting with the College President or designee within 7 days of notification of the recommended disciplinary action. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. Such meeting with the college President or designee shall be held within 14 days after receipt of the student's written request for a meeting. Failure of the student to appear at the meeting will constitute a waiver of the student's right to a meeting. The meeting shall be conducted in any manner deemed appropriate by the College President, provided that the student is offered the opportunity to provide his or her version of events, and any evidence that supports his or her version of the events. The CSSO, or designee, may also provide evidence contradicting the student's version of the facts. If either the student or the CSSO, or designee, is offered the opportunity to present evidence or the testimony of witnesses, the other party must be given the opportunity to cross-examine such witnesses. The meeting shall be closed and confidential, and all witnesses shall be excluded from the meeting except when testifying. Neither the student nor the CSSO, or designee, shall be entitled to representation by an attorney in this proceeding; however if the student is a minor, the student may be accompanied by his/her parent or guardian. After the conclusion of the meeting, the College President or designee shall determine whether a preponderance of evidence supports the charges against the student, and shall provide the student with written notice of his/her decision, and the factual basis therefor for this decision, within 7 days of the conclusion of the hearing. The College President's decision on a short-term suspension shall be final and shall be reported to the District's Chancellor.

Long-term Suspension. Within 7-10 days after the delivery of the notice, or within 7-10 days of a meeting with the CSSO, or designee, if the student requested a meeting, the College President shall, based on the recommendation from the CSSO, or designee, decide whether to impose a long-term suspension. Written notice of the College President's decision shall be provided to the student and, if the student is a minor, to the student's parent or guardian. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. The notice will include the length of time of the proposed suspension, as well as a statement that the student will be prohibited from being enrolled in any college within the District for the period of the suspension. The notice will include the factual allegations on which the proposed suspension is based, any evidence in the possession of the

Original draft from P. Ewins received 3.05.13

DTRW-SS 3.07.13 first reading

DCAA review 3.28.13

District on which it will rely in support of the recommended suspension, the right of the student to request a formal hearing before a long-term suspension is imposed, and a copy of the procedures for the hearing. The College President or designee may invoke immediate, and if necessary, consecutive interim suspension(s) of a student awaiting a formal hearing where he or she concludes that immediate suspension is required to protect lives or property and to ensure the maintenance of order.

Comment [p2]: This is problematic because it allows the student to return to class while awaiting the decision.

Expulsion. Within 7-10 days after the delivery of the notice, or within 7-10 days of a meeting if the student requests a meeting, the College President shall, pursuant to a recommendation from the CSSO, or designee, decide whether to recommend expulsion to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees. Written notice of the College President's decision shall be provided to the student and, if the student is a minor, to the student's parent or guardian. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. The notice will include the right of the student to request a formal hearing before expulsion is imposed, the factual allegations on which the proposed expulsion is based, any evidence in the possession of the District on which it will rely in support of the recommended suspension, and a copy of the procedures for the hearing. The College President or designee may invoke immediate and if necessary, consecutive, interim suspension(s) of a student awaiting a formal hearing where he or she concludes that immediate, suspension is required to protect lives or property and to ensure the maintenance of order.

Hearing Procedures for Long-term Suspension and Expulsion

Request for Hearing. Within 7-10 days after receipt of the College President's decision regarding a long-term suspension or expulsion, the student may request a formal hearing before a hearing panel. The request must be made in writing to the College President and must include a date and the signature of the student or, if the student is a minor, the student's parent or guardian. The notice shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college. If the request for hearing is not received within 7-10 days after the student's receipt of the College President's decision or recommendation in the case of expulsion, the student's right to a hearing shall be deemed waived.

Schedule of Hearing. The formal hearing shall be held within 21 days after a formal request for hearing is received. The parties involved will be asked to attend the hearing and will be given sufficient notice in writing as to the time and place at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. Notice of the date of the hearing shall be deemed delivered if it is personally served on the student, or the student's parent or guardian if the student is a minor, or deposited in U.S. mail to the student's most recent address on file with the college.

Hearing Panel. The hearing panel for any disciplinary action shall be composed of one administrator, one faculty member, and one student. At the beginning of the academic year, and no later than October 1st, the College President, the president of the Academic Senate, and the Associated Students president shall each provide the names of at least two persons willing to serve on Student Disciplinary Hearing Panels. The College President shall appoint the Hearing Panel from the names in this pool; however, no administrator, faculty member or student who has any personal involvement in the matter to be decided, who is a necessary witness, who is a relative of any party or witness, or who could not otherwise act in a neutral manner shall serve on a Hearing Panel. Upon notification of the Hearing Panel's composition, the student and the District shall each be allowed one peremptory challenge. The College President shall substitute the challenged member or members and replace them with another member of the panel pool to achieve the appropriate Hearing Panel composition. In the event the pool names are exhausted in any one category, further designees shall be submitted by the College President (for administrators), the President of the Academic Senate (for faculty), or the Associated Student President (for students). The chairperson may, by giving written notice to both parties, reschedule the hearing as necessary pending the submission of alternate designees.

Comment [p3]: Student grievance hearing stipulates it cannot be the chair. Should they be the same? I have no strong feelings which way it should be ...but same would be nice.

A quorum shall consist of all three members of the committee.

Hearing Panel Chair. The College President shall appoint one member of the Hearing Panel to serve as the chair. The decision of the Hearing Panel Chair shall be final on all matters relating to the conduct of the hearing unless there is a vote by both other members of the Hearing Panel to the contrary.

Original draft from P. Ewins received 3.05.13

DTRW-SS 3.07.13 first reading

DCAA review 3.28.13

Hearing Process. Prior to commencement of the hearing, the members of the hearing panel shall be provided with a copy of the accusation against the student and any written response provided by the student, and all applicable student due process policies and administrative procedures. ~~The facts supporting the accusation shall be presented by a college representative who shall be the CSSO or designee. A college representative who shall be the CSSO or designee shall present the facts supporting the accusation.~~

After consultations with the parties, in the interests of justice, a time limit on the amount of time provided for each party to present its case, or any rebuttal, may be set by the hearing panel. Formal rules of evidence shall not apply. All members of the campus community shall be bound by the student code of conduct or code of professional ethics to provide only true testimony. Witnesses who are not members of the campus community will testify under oath subject to the penalty of perjury. Any relevant evidence may be admitted at the discretion of the Hearing Panel Chair, in consultation with the Hearing Panel. Hearsay evidence and written statements will be admissible, but will be insufficient, alone, to establish a charge against the student. The Hearing Panel Chair, in consultation with the Hearing Panel, shall be responsible for determining the relevancy of presented evidence and testimony, the number of witnesses permitted to testify, and the time allocated for testimony and questioning. The Hearing Panel Chair, in consultation with the Hearing Panel, shall further be responsible for instructing and questioning witnesses on behalf of the Hearing Panel, and for dismissing any persons who are disruptive or who fail to follow instructions. The Hearing Panel Chair shall have the final decision on all procedural questions concerning the hearing.

Comment [p4]: How and where would this be enforced?

Unless the Hearing Panel determines to proceed otherwise, the college representative and the student shall each be permitted to make an opening statement. Thereafter, the college representative shall make the first presentation, followed by the student. The college representative may present rebuttal evidence after the student completes his or her evidence. The burden shall be on the college representative to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the facts alleged are true. The Hearing Panel may request legal assistance for the Panel itself through the College President. Any legal advisor provided to the Hearing Panel may be present during the hearing and in any deliberations in an advisory capacity to provide legal counsel but shall not be a member of the panel or vote with it.

Both parties shall have the right to present statements, testimony, evidence, and witnesses. Each party shall have the right to be represented by a single advisor but not a licensed attorney. The student shall, in consultation with the Hearing Panel, have the right to be served by a translator or qualified interpreter to ensure the student's full participation in the proceedings.

Hearings shall be closed and confidential. No other persons except the student and, the college representative and their non-attorney representatives and/or translators/interpreters, if any, a college appointed court reporter, if any, individual witnesses, the Hearing Panel members, and the Hearing Panel's legal counsel, if any, shall be present. Witnesses shall not be present at the hearing when not testifying, unless all parties and the Hearing Panel agree to the contrary. The rule of confidentiality shall prevail at all stages of the hearing. Moreover, the Hearing Panel members shall ensure that all hearings, deliberations, and records remain confidential in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), California Education Code Section 76200 et seq., and District Board Policies and Administrative Procedures related to the privacy of student and employee records.

The hearing shall be recorded by the District by electronic means such as audiotape, videotape, or by court reporting service and shall be the only recording made. No other recording devices shall be permitted to be used at the hearing. Any witness who refuses to be recorded shall not be permitted to give testimony. A witness who refuses to be recorded shall not be considered to be unavailable within the meaning of the rules of evidence, and therefore no exception to the hearsay rule for unavailability shall apply to such witness. The Hearing Panel Chair shall, on the record, at the beginning of the hearing, ask all persons present to identify themselves by name, and thereafter shall ask witnesses to identify themselves by name. The recording shall remain the property of the District and shall remain in the custody of the District at all times, unless released to a professional transcribing service. The student may request a copy of the recording; however, any transcript of the recording requested by the student shall be provided at the student's own expense.

Following the close of the hearing, the Hearing Panel shall deliberate in closed session. These deliberations shall not be electronically recorded and the proceedings shall be confidential. Within 7 days following the close of the hearing, the hearing panel shall prepare and send to the College President a written decision. The decision shall include specific factual findings regarding the accusation, and shall include specific conclusions regarding whether any specific section of the Student Code of Conduct was violated. The decision shall also include a specific recommendation regarding the disciplinary action to be imposed, if any. The decision shall be based only on the record of the hearing, and not on any matters outside of that record. The record consists of the original accusation,

Original draft from P. Ewins received 3.05.13

DTRW-SS 3.07.13 first reading

DCAA review 3.28.13

the written response, if any, of the student, and the oral and written evidence produced at the hearing. The District shall maintain records of all Disciplinary Hearings in a secure location on District premises for a period of 7 years.

College President's Decision

- Long-term suspension. Within 14 days following receipt of the hearing panel's recommended decision, the College President shall render a final written decision. The College President may accept, modify or reject the findings, decisions and recommendations of the hearing panel. If the College President modifies or rejects the hearing panel's decision, the College President shall review the record of the hearing, and shall prepare a new written decision that contains specific factual findings and conclusions. The decision of the College President shall be final, and shall be reported to the District Chancellor.
- Expulsion. Within 14 days following receipt of the hearing panel's recommended decision, the College President shall render a written recommended decision to the Chancellor. The College President may accept, modify or reject the findings, decisions and recommendations of the hearing panel. If the College President modifies or rejects the hearing panel's decision, he or she shall review the record of the hearing, and shall prepare a new written decision which contains specific factual findings and conclusions. The College President's decision shall be forwarded to the Chancellor as a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Board of Trustees Decision

The Board of Trustees shall consider any recommendation from the Chancellor for expulsion at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board after receipt of the recommended decision.

The Board shall consider an expulsion recommendation in closed session, unless the student has requested that the matter be considered in a public meeting in accordance with these procedures. [Education Code Section 72122.]

The student (and the parent or guardian if the student is a minor) shall be notified in writing, by certified mail, by personal service, or by such method of delivery as will establish receipt, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting, of the date, time, and place of the Board's meeting.

The student may, within 48 hours after receipt of the notice, request that the hearing be held as a public meeting.

Even if a student has requested that the Board consider an expulsion recommendation in a public meeting, the Board will hold in closed session any discussion that might be in conflict with the right to privacy of any student other than the student requesting the public meeting.

The Board may accept, modify or reject the findings, decisions and recommendations of the Chancellor. If the Board modifies or rejects the Chancellor's recommendation, the Board shall review the record of the hearing, and shall, within 30 days or by the next regular meeting of the Board, whichever is later, prepare a new written decision which contains its specific factual findings and conclusions. The decision of the Board shall be final.

The final action of the Board on the expulsion shall be taken at a public meeting, and the result of the action shall be a public record of the District.

Formatted: Font Alignment: Top

[Original draft from P. Ewins received 3.05.13](#)

[DTRW-SS 3.07.13 first reading](#)

[DCAA review 3.28.13](#)

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

VI. k. Action Item

BP/AP 5530 Student Rights and Grievances

BP 5530 STUDENT RIGHTS AND GRIEVANCES

Book VCCCD Board Policy
Section Chapter 5 Student Services
Title BP 5530 STUDENT RIGHTS AND GRIEVANCES
Number BP 5530
Status ~~ACTIVE~~ PROPOSED
Legal Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972; Education Code Section 76224(a)
Adopted
Last Reviewed

The Chancellor shall insure the placement of a clear and efficient procedure is to provide a prompt and equitable means of resolving student grievances. These procedures shall be available to any student who reasonably believes the college decision or action has adversely affected his or her status, rights, or privileges as a student.

See AP 5530

AP 5530 STUDENT RIGHTS AND GRIEVANCES

Book VCCCD Administrative Procedure Manual
Section Chapter 5 Student Services
Title AP 5530 STUDENT RIGHTS AND GRIEVANCES
Number AP 5530
Status Active
Legal Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972; Education Code Section 76224(a)
Adopted ~~June 16, 2010~~
Last Reviewed ~~June 9, 2010~~

The purpose of this procedure is to provide a prompt and equitable means of resolving student grievances. These procedures shall be available to any student who reasonably believes the college decision or action has adversely affected his or her status, rights, or privileges as a student.

A grievance is an allegation of a violation of any of the following:

1. Sex discrimination as prohibited by Title IX of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972.
2. Financial aid determinations made at the college or District level.
3. Course grades, to the extent permitted by Education Code Section 76224(a), which provides: "When grades are given for any course of instruction taught in a community college District, the grade given to each student shall be the grade determined by the instructor of the course and the determination of the student's grade by the instructor, in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency, shall be final." "Mistake" may include, but is not limited to, errors made by an instructor in calculating a student's grade and clerical errors.
4. The exercise of rights of free expression protected by the state and federal constitutions, Education Code Sections 66301 and 76120, and District Board Policy and Administrative Procedures concerning the right of free expression.
5. Violation of published District rules, Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures, except as set forth below.

This procedure does not apply to:

1. Challenges to the process for determining satisfaction of prerequisites, corequisites, advisories, and limitations on enrollment. Information on challenges to prerequisites is available from the Office of Academic Affairs.
2. Allegations of harassment or discrimination on the basis of any protected characteristic as set forth in Board Policies 3410 and 3430 and 5 California Code of Regulations Section 53900 et seq. Such complaints may be initiated under the procedures described in the college catalogs.
3. Appeals for residency determination. Residency appeals should be filed with the Admissions and Records Office.
4. Student disciplinary actions, which are covered under separate Board Policies and Administrative Procedures.
5. Police citations (i.e. "tickets"); complaints about citations must be directed to the Campus Police.
6. Evaluation of the professional competence, qualifications, or job performance of a District employee.
7. Claims for money or damages against the District.

Information about other procedures is listed in the college catalogs or may be obtained from the Office of Student Learning.

The alleged wrong must involve an unjust action or denial of a student's rights as defined above. A grievance exists only when such an error or offense has resulted in an injury or harm that may be corrected through this grievance procedure. As noted above there may be other procedures applicable to various other alleged injuries or harms, and this grievance procedure may not be the sole or exclusive remedy, and it may not be necessary to exhaust this process before presenting allegations to other government agencies or the courts. The outcome of a grievance must be susceptible to producing a tangible remedy to the student complaining or an actual redress of the wrong rather than a punishment for the person or persons found in error. For example, a grievance seeking only the dismissal of a District employee is not viable.

Definitions

College President. ~~The institutions Chief Executive Officer~~

Chief Student Services Officer (CSSO). ~~A college's Executive Vice President or Vice President of Student Services, or designee.~~

College Grievance Officer. The administrator in charge of student discipline and/or grievances who shall assist students in seeking resolution by informal means; if informal

Comment [pe1]: The CSSO is not mentioned again in the document. No need to define

Comment [pe2]: The president is referred to throughout the document....not the CSSO.

means are not successful, the College Grievance Officer shall assist students by guiding them through the formal grievance process.

Day. A calendar day unless otherwise specified in this procedure. If the final day to take any action required by this procedure falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or other day that the ~~administrative offices of the District are~~ District College is closed, the date for such action shall be extended to the next business day. Similarly, if ~~any action is required while the faculty or staff member involved is "off contract" or otherwise unavailable, the timeline will commence when the faculty member returns to active contract status. the final day to take any action required by this procedure occurs during summer session or during an intersession, but the basis for the grievance arose prior to that summer or intersession, the final day to take any required action shall be extended to the first business day of the next academic term.~~

Grievant. Any student currently enrolled in the college, a person who has filed an application for admission to the college, or a former student. A grievance by an applicant shall be limited to a complaint regarding denial of admission. Former students shall be limited to grievances relating to course grades to the extent permitted by Education Code Section 76224(a).

Respondent. Any person claimed by a Grievant to be responsible for the alleged grievance.

Informal Resolution

Informal meetings and discussion between persons directly involved in a grievance are essential at the outset of a dispute. A student who has a grievance shall make a reasonable effort to resolve the matter on an informal basis prior to filing a formal grievance, and shall attempt to solve the problem with the person with whom the student has the grievance or dispute. If a student cannot resolve a grievance informally with the Respondent, then the student will request a meeting with the Respondent's administrator, manager, or division chairperson, who shall meet with the student in an attempt to resolve the issue and may meet with the student and Respondent either jointly or separately. An equitable solution should be sought before persons directly involved in the case have stated official or public positions that might tend to polarize the dispute and render a solution more difficult.

At any time, the student may request the assistance of the College Grievance Officer in understanding or arranging the informal resolution process.

At no time shall any of the persons directly or indirectly involved in the case use the fact of such informal discussion, the fact that a grievance has been filed, or the character of

the informal discussion for the purpose of strengthening the case for or against persons directly involved in the dispute or for any purpose other than the settlement of the grievance.

Formal Resolution

In the event an informal resolution is not reached, the grievant shall submit a preliminary written statement of the grievance to the College Grievance Officer within 90 days of the incident on which the grievance is based, or 90 days after the student knew or with reasonable diligence should have known of the basis for the grievance, whichever is later.

Within 10 days following receipt of the preliminary written statement of the grievance, the College Grievance Officer shall advise the student of his or her rights and responsibilities under these procedures, and assist the student, if necessary, in the final preparation of the formal written statement of the grievance.

The submission of this formal signed and dated written description of the complaint signals the beginning of the formal resolution, serves as the request for a hearing, and shall serve as the dated start of the hearing timeline.

The College Grievance Officer will submit a copy of the formal written grievance to the Respondent. The Respondent will be given an opportunity to submit a written response to the allegations to the College Grievance Officer. This response must be received within 10 days. A and a copy of the response -will be sent to the Grievant.

Hearing Procedures

Grievance Hearing Committee. The hearing panel for any grievance shall be composed of one administrator, one faculty member and one student. At the beginning of the academic year, and no later than October 1st, the College President, the President of the Academic Senate, and the Associated Students President shall each establish a list of at least two persons who will serve on student Grievance Hearing Committees. The College President will identify two administrators; the President of the Academic Senate will identify two faculty; and the Associated Students President will identify two students. The College President, or designee, shall appoint the Grievance Hearing Committee from the names in this pool; however, no administrator, faculty member or student who has any personal involvement in the matter to be decided, who is a necessary witness,

who is a relative of any party or witness, or who could not otherwise act in a neutral manner shall serve on the Grievance Hearing Committee.

Upon notification of the Grievance Hearing Committee composition, the Respondent and Grievant shall each be allowed one peremptory challenge, excluding the chairperson. The College President, or designee, shall substitute the challenged member or members from the panel pool to achieve the appropriate Grievance Hearing Committee composition. In the event that the pool names are exhausted in any one category, further designees shall be submitted by the College President (for administrators), the President of the Academic Senate (for faculty), or the Associated Student President (for students).

The Grievance Officer shall sit with the Grievance Hearing Committee but shall not serve as a member or vote. The Grievance Officer shall coordinate all scheduling of hearings, and shall serve to assist all parties and the Grievance Hearing Committee to facilitate a full, fair and efficient resolution of the grievance.

A quorum shall consist of all three members of the Committee.

Grievance Hearing Committee Chair. The College President, or designee, shall appoint one member of the Grievance Hearing Committee to serve as the chair. The decision of the Grievance Hearing Committee Chair shall be final on all matters relating to the conduct of the hearing unless there is a vote by both other members of the Grievance Hearing Committee to the contrary.

Time Limits: Any times specified in these procedures may be shortened or lengthened if there is mutual concurrence by all parties in writing.

Hearing Process. Within 14 days following receipt of the formal written statement of the grievance and request for hearing, the College President or designee shall appoint a specific Grievance Hearing Committee as described above and submit the names to both the Grievant and the RespondantRespondent. The Grievant and the Respondant shall have 7 days to approve or request changes to the hearing committee within the parameters stated above. Within 14 days of the confirmation of the hearing committee
The Grievance Hearing Committee and the Grievance Officer shall meet in private and without the parties present to determine whether the written statement of the grievance presents sufficient grounds for a hearing.

The determination of whether the Statement of Grievance presents sufficient grounds for a hearing shall be based on the following considerations:

- The statement satisfies the definition of a grievance as set forth above;
- The statement contains facts which, if true, would constitute a grievance under these procedures;
- The grievant is a student, which under certain circumstances includes applicants and former students, and meets the definition of “grievant” as set forth in these procedures;
- The grievant is personally and directly affected by the alleged grievance;
- The grievance seeks a remedy which is within the authority of the hearing panel to recommend or the college president to grant:
- The grievance was filed in a timely manner;
- The grievance is not clearly frivolous, clearly without foundation, or clearly filed for purposes of harassment.

If the grievance does not meet all of the above requirements, the Grievance Hearing Committee Chair shall notify the student in writing of the rejection of the request for a grievance hearing, together with the specific reasons for the rejection and the procedures for appeal. This notice will be provided within 7 days of the date the decision is made by the Grievance Hearing Committee.

The student may appeal the Grievance Hearing Committee’s determination that the statement of grievance does not present a grievance as defined in these procedures by presenting his/her appeal in writing to the College President within 7 days of the date the student received that decision. The College President shall review the statement of grievance in accordance with the requirements for a grievance provided in these procedures, but shall not consider any other matters, including any facts alleged in the appeal that were not alleged in the original grievance. The College President’s decision whether or not to grant a grievance hearing shall be final and not subject to further appeal.

If the statement of the grievance satisfies each of the requirements The College Grievance Officer shall schedule a grievance hearing to begin within 30 days following the decision to grant a Grievance Hearing. All parties to the grievance shall be given at least 10 days’ notice of the date, time and place of the hearing.

Before the hearing commences, the members of the Grievance Hearing Committee shall be provided with a copy of the grievance, the written response provided by the Respondent, and all applicable policies and administrative procedures. The Grievance Hearing Committee may request other documents as needed.

A time limit on the amount of time provided for each party to present its case, or any rebuttal, may be set by the Grievance Hearing Committee. Formal rules of evidence shall not apply. All witnesses shall be bound by the student code of conduct and professional codes of ethics to present truthful evidence. Any witnesses not so bound will testify under oath, subject to the penalty of perjury. Any relevant evidence may be admitted at the discretion of the Grievance Hearing Committee Chair, in consultation with the College Grievance Officer and Grievance Hearing Committee. Hearsay evidence will be admissible, but will be insufficient, alone, to establish the allegations.

Written statements of witnesses under penalty of perjury shall not be used unless the witness is unavailable to testify.

Comment [pe3]: NEW

The Grievance Hearing Committee Chair, in consultation with the Grievance Hearing Officer and Grievance Hearing Committee, shall be responsible for determining the relevancy of presented evidence and testimony, the number of witnesses permitted to testify, and the time allocated for testimony and questioning. The Grievance Hearing Committee Chair, in consultation with the Grievance Hearing Committee, shall further be responsible for instructing and questioning witnesses on behalf of the Grievance Hearing Committee, and for dismissing any persons who are disruptive or who fail to follow instructions. The Grievance Hearing Committee Chair, in consultation with the College Grievance Officer, shall have the final decision on all procedural questions concerning the hearing.

The Grievance Hearing Committee shall conduct the hearing in accordance with established standards of administrative procedure. Unless the Grievance Hearing Committee determines to proceed otherwise, each party to the grievance shall be permitted to make an opening statement. Thereafter, the grievant shall make the first presentation, followed by the respondent. The grievant may present rebuttal evidence after the respondent completes presentation of his or her evidence. The burden shall be on the grievant to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the facts alleged are true and that a grievance has been established as presented in the written statement of the complaint.

Both parties shall have the right to present statements, testimony, evidence, and witnesses. Each party to the grievance may represent him or herself, and may be represented by a person of his or her choice, except that neither party shall be represented by an attorney. The Grievance Hearing Committee may request legal assistance for the Committee itself through the College President. Any legal advisor provided to the Grievance Hearing Committee may be present during all testimony and deliberations in an advisory capacity to provide legal counsel but shall not be a member of the panel or vote with it.

The grievant shall, in consultation with the College Grievance Officer, have the right to be served by a translator or qualified interpreter to ensure his/her full participation in the proceedings.

Hearings shall be closed and confidential. No other persons except the Grievant and his/her representative and/or translator/interpreter, the Respondent and his/her representative, scheduled single witnesses, the College Grievance Officer, the Grievance Hearing Committee members, and the Committee's legal advisor, if any, shall be present. Witnesses shall not be present at the hearing when not testifying, unless all parties and the Grievance Hearing Committee agree to the contrary. The rule of confidentiality shall prevail at all stages of the hearing. Moreover, the Grievance Hearing Committee members shall ensure that all hearings, deliberation, and records remain confidential in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), California Education Code Section 76200 et seq., and District Board Policies and Administrative Procedures related to the privacy of student and employee records.

The hearing shall be recorded by the District by electronic means such as audiotape, videotape, or by court reporting service and shall be the only recording made. No other recording devices shall be permitted to be used at the hearing. Any witness who refuses to be recorded shall not be permitted to give testimony. A witness who refuses to be recorded shall not be considered to be unavailable within the meaning of the rules of evidence, and therefore an exception to the hearsay rule for unavailability shall not apply to such witness.

At the beginning of the hearing, on the record, the Grievance Hearing Committee Chair shall ask all persons present to identify themselves by name, and thereafter shall ask witnesses to identify themselves by name. The recording shall remain the property of the District and shall remain in the custody of the District at all times, unless released to a professional transcribing service. Any party to the grievance may request a copy of the recording. Any transcript of the hearing requested by a party shall be produced at the requesting party's expense.

Following the close of the hearing, the Grievance Hearing Committee shall deliberate in closed session. These deliberations shall not be electronically recorded and the proceedings shall be confidential for all purposes. Within 30 days following the close of the hearing, the Grievance Hearing Committee shall prepare and send a written decision to the College Grievance Officer to be forwarded to College President. The decision shall include specific factual findings regarding the grievance, and shall include specific conclusions regarding whether a grievance has been established as defined in these procedures. The decision shall also include a specific recommendation regarding the relief to be afforded the Grievant, if any. The decision shall be based only on the

record of the hearing, and not on any matters outside of that record. The record consists of the original grievance, any written response, and the oral and written evidence produced at the hearing, and additional information or documentation related to the hearing that is requested by the Grievance Hearing Committee. The District shall maintain records of all Grievance Hearings in a secure location on District premises for a period of 7 years.

College President's Decision

The College President, at his/her discretion, may accept, reject, or modify the findings, decision, and recommendations of the Grievance Hearing Committee. The factual findings of the Grievance Hearing Committee shall be accorded great weight. The College President may additionally remand the matter back to the Grievance Hearing Committee for further consideration of issues specified by the College President. Within 21 days following receipt of the Grievance Hearing Committee's decision and recommendation(s), the College President shall send to all parties his or her written decision, together with the Grievance Hearing Committee's decision and recommendations. If the College President elects to reject or modify the Grievance Hearing Committee's decision or a finding or recommendation contained therein, the College President shall review the record of the hearing, and shall prepare a new written decision that contains specific factual findings and conclusions. The decision of the College President shall be final, subject only to appeal as described below.

Any party to the grievance may appeal the decision of the College President after a hearing before a Grievance Hearing Committee by filing an appeal with the Chancellor. The Chancellor may designate a District administrator to review the appeal and make a recommendation.

Any such appeal shall be submitted in writing within 5 days following receipt of the College President's decision and shall state specifically the grounds for appeal.

The written appeal shall be sent to all concerned parties by the Chancellor or designee. All parties may submit written statements, within 5 days of receipt, in response to the appeal.

The Chancellor or designee may review the record of the hearing and the documents submitted in connection with the appeal, but shall not consider any matters outside of the record and the appeal.

If the Chancellor chooses a designee to review the record and appeal statements, that designee shall make a written recommendation to the Chancellor regarding the outcome of the appeal. The Chancellor may decide to sustain, reverse or modify the decision of his/her designee.

The decision on appeal shall be reached within 21 days after receipt of the appeal documents. The Chancellor's decision shall be in writing and shall include a statement of reasons for the decision. Copies of the Chancellor's appeal decision shall be sent to all parties.

The Chancellor's decision shall be final.

Ventura College Academic Senate

April 4, 2013

X. a. Information Item

Senate Faculty Awards Form



Ventura College Academic Senate



Faculty Recognition Ballot

Dear Faculty:

Ventura College Faculty Recognition Awards time is here and once again your Academic Senate Council is searching for faculty who you feel fulfill the following four awards categories. After providing your nominations below, **return this form** to the Academic Senate mailbox or Peter Sezzi's mailbox no later than 5pm on **Monday, April 29th**. Please provide additional supportive data/narrative on the reverse side of this form for your nominations. Listed on the bottom are previous winners. Faculty can be nominated even if their names appear on this list. Awards will be announced at the last Senate meeting of the academic year, Thursday, May 2th.

1. For Outstanding Service to **Students**:

2. For Outstanding Service to **Faculty**:

3. For Outstanding Service to the **College**:

4. For Outstanding Service to the **Community**:

Previous Winners

2008 Lucy Capuano-Brewer Raeann Koerner Becky Hull Bob Lawson
2009 Robert Chaparro Gigi Fiumerodo Bill Budke Ned Mircetic
2010 Steve Turner Ollie D. Powers Jeff Ferguson E. Burns Taft
2011 Bob Arce Ty Gardner & P. Scott Corbett Michael Callahan Simon Waltzer
2012 Ted Prell Cari Lange Casey Mansfield & Mark Pauley