

**Recognition of CMC
Academic Senate's –
10 +1 Title 5
responsibilities
delineated in CMC
Board Policy**

Academic and Professional matters means the following policy development and implementation matters:

1. Curriculum, including establishing pre-requisites and placing courses within disciplines;
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies;
4. Educational program development;
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success;
6. District and College governance structures, as related to faculty roles;
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports;
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities;
9. Processes for program review;
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development; and
11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the Governing Board and Academic Senates.



ACADEMIC SENATE

March 17, 2011

3:00 – 5:00 PM

Room 401

“Our mission is to provide access to educational opportunities to diverse desert communities through a comprehensive curriculum and a passion for the success of every individual student.”

AGENDA

I. Confirmation of the Agenda for 17 March 2011.

II. Approval of the minutes for the 3 March 2011 meeting

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

- a. Recommended progress report for current Sabbatical recipient, Cathy Itnyre.
- b. Required Elements of the Syllabus (15-16)

IV. CONSENT ITEMS

- a. Professional Standards and Ethics Committee Minutes for 12/16/10 (18-19)
- b. AP Chart Update (20-23)

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- a. Participatory Governance Document (Berger, 25-37)
- b. Populating Blackboard for Brick-and-Mortar Courses: Fall 2011 (38)
- c. All Subscribers Email: When? How? Who? What? (39)
- d. BP 4220 Standards of Scholarship (40)
- e. AP 4222 Remedial Coursework (41-42)
- f. AP 4225 Course Repetition (43-44)

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(**bold** denotes chair or co-chair)

A. Senate Committees

1. Curriculum Committee – A. Armstrong, B. Bridenbecker, G. Case, C. Compton, J. Desantis, P. Friedt, G. Gilbert, C. Hopkins, Y. Llort, C. Steenberg, **M. Schiel**, T. Thacker, **M. Walker**
 - i. CTRAC – A. Armstrong, C. Hopkins, C. Itnyre, **M. Schiel**, **M. Walker**
 - ii. Library – J. DeSantis, P. Friedt, **C. Hopkins**, C. Itnyre, D. Morrison, D. Pieper, C. Steenberg, J. White
 - iii. Textbook Review – M. Gallagher, T. Thacker
 - iv. Syllabus Review – **G. Gilbert**, **T. Thacker**
2. Professional Standards and Ethics Committee – E. Baird, G. Chesterman, J. DeSantis, **Y. Llort**
3. Educational Technology – M. Danza, **P. Dutkiewicz**, S. Parkin, **H. Ramsey**, E. Smith, T. Thacker

B. District Committees

1. Academic Calendar – M. Gallagher
2. Basic Skills Initiative – E. Baird, Cheyenne Bonnell, Gregg Chesterman, Jackie Hanselman, Tony Thacker
3. Budget –, **M. Schiel**
4. EEO – G. Case, H. Ramsey
5. Facilities Planning – P. Delaney, P. Friedt, J. Hanselman
6. FLEX – **B. Berger**, **J. DeSantis**, J. Hanselman, H. Ramsey
7. Graduation – E. Baird, C. Blauwkamp
8. College Council – B. Berger, M. Schiel
9. Matriculation – G. Chesterman, P. Friedt
10. Scholarship – E. Baird, C. Bonnell, M. Gallagher, C. Hopkins, Y. Llort, D. Morrison
11. Desert Studies – E. Baird, C. Bonnell, G. Case, P. Delaney, Y. Llort, D. Pieper, J. White
12. Research – B. Berger, S. Parkin, M. Schiel, E. Smith
13. Technology Committee – H. Ramsey
14. Equivalency Committee – A. Armstrong, B. Bridenbecker, P. Dutkiewicz, **G. Gilbert**, C. Hopkins, S. Parkin, H. Ramsey, S. Schiel, M. Walker
15. Recognition Committee – B. Berger
16. Academic Integrity Committee – M. Danza, J. DeSantis, **G. Gilbert**, S. Parkin, D. Pieper, H. Ramsey,

VII. REPORTS:

A. SENATE OFFICERS:

- i. President Berger
- ii. Vice-President Schiel
- iii. Secretary Danza
- iv. State Academic Senate Representative DeSantis

B. SENATE

C. STUDENT SHOWCASE

D. PART-TIME FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE

E. CURRICULUM CO-CHAIRS

F. SLO COORDINATOR

G. AUDIENCE COMMENTS: Comments of three minutes or less per speaker may be made on items not listed on the agenda. Speakers are asked to register with the Senate Secretary. Items on the agenda may be commented on as they appear.

H. BOARD OF TRUSTEES

I. ASCMC

J. Director of Research and Grants

J. MANAGEMENT

XVII. FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES FOR SPRING 2011 SEMESTER

January 20, February 3, February 17, March 3, March 17, April 7, April 21, May 5, May 19



Academic Senate

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Thursday, 3 March 2011

**COPPER MOUNTAIN COLLEGE
ACADEMIC SENATE**

MINUTES

Present (bold denotes those not in attendance): Cathy Allen, Andrea Armstrong, Ellen Baird, Brad Berger, **Christi Blauwkamp**, **Cheyenne Bonnell**, Bruce Bridenbecker, Glenda Case, **Gregg Chesterman**, Robert Compton, Mike Danza, Paul Delaney, Joseph DeSantis, Spelman Downer, Pat Dutkiewicz, Paul Friedt, Marla Gallagher, Greg Gilbert, **Jackie Hanselman**, Carolyn Hopkins, Cathy Itnyre, **Debra Liebreznz**, Yadira Llort, **Doug Morrison**, Steven Parkin, **Rick Penaflo**, Dean Pieper, Heather Ramsey, Melynie Schiel, Ellie Smith, Clayton Steenberg, **Tony Thacker**, **Tally Tinjum**, Kathleen Wahl, Michel Walker, John White, and **Heidi Wilcox-Steins**.

Also in attendance: Andrea Riesgo, VP Brown, Dr. Phan

I. Confirmation of the Agenda for 3 March 2011.

Brad thanked Joe for the food. Dean volunteered to bring snacks to the next meeting.

A motion was made to confirm the agenda (CI/JD). During discussion Carolyn asked to move agenda item F to A. the friendly amendment was accepted and the motion was approved.

II. Approval of the minutes for the 17 February 2011 meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes for 17 February (CH/CI). During discussion, Brad asked for a correction on top of page 10. He asked the Secretary to record the fact that Yadira was the alternate for the hiring committee for VP of Academic Affairs. The motion passed.

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. College Council Minutes for February 11, 2011
- B. Smoking Policy

IV. CONSENT ITEMS

- A. Professional Standards & Ethics Committee Minutes for December
- B. Curriculum Minutes for Jan 27, 2011
- C. Course Outlines of Record for Approval

A motion was made to approve the consent agenda (JD, GC). The motion passed.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Full Time Faculty Seniority List

Carolyn explained that this change has implications for office space. Carolyn explained that the college has the right to count non-tenure years toward seniority and it is easier for the college to count non-tenure years to determine seniority. Carolyn explained that the administration wanted to run it by the Senate. She explained that the Administration wanted the Senate's blessing or know whether there were any objections. Melynie said that if the system sounds fair because technically anyone who had non-tenure years would be perceived as "senior" by newer tenure-track faculty members. Bobby requested creating a formula to capture the subtlety. Carolyn emphasized that the simplest method was selected. To clarify she explained that once a person receives tenure they might need to pick straws with members of their tenure cohort. Paul said he liked Bobby's idea of including other factors (e.g. teaching experience at other institutions or steps). Andrea Riesgo said it was not equitable to include other factors.

Carolyn explained that the district must ask faculty members to draw straws because it has been out of compliance.

Ellen asked for clarification. She asked whether seniority only determined by office space. She asked whether seniority determined class assignments. Cheryl explained that class assignments were determined by common courtesy and past practice. Andrea Riesgo said that seniority was a factor impacting office assignments. She explained that position --like division chair and the ALO-- was another factor impacting office assignments.

Brad asked whether there was a precedent for counting non-tenure years and drawing straws. Carolyn said the college had a history of counting non-tenure years and drawing straws. She said that when it was done this was how the district did it.

A motion was made to endorse the seniority list (JD, BC). The motion passed with one senator voted against endorsing the seniority list and two Senators abstaining.

B. Required Elements of the Syllabus

A motion was made to approve adding SLOs, objectives, and measures to the required elements of the syllabus. A Senator requested to see the new required elements of the syllabus before approving it. The motion was amended: a motion was made to approve adding SLOs, objectives, and measures to the required elements of the syllabus and for the new required elements of the syllabus to be placed on the information item agenda.

The motion passed with four Senators voting against the motion.

C. Independent IT Department review (EDTech, Duktiewicz)

The educational technology committee explained that they wanted the Senate's approval to request a copy of the independent IT department review and an inventory of equipment. Greg Brown and Cheryl Munsey explained that the Educational Technology committee should email the President and request a copy. Brad pointed out that the review was not circulated at College Council because it included personal information. Greg Brown and Cheryl explained that the problem can easily be solved and the committee should simply contact President Wagner since he contracted the job.

D. Teaching During Academic Senate (Bridenbecker)

Bruce said he was surprised to see his name attached to this agenda item. Brad reminded Bruce that he mentioned it at the last meeting and the Senate agreed to put it on the agenda.

Carolyn explained that certain faculty members like nursing have clinical and it was impossible for them to attend Academic Senate.

Bobby asked whether the Senate could strongly encourage our fellow faculty to attend Academic Senate.

Cheryl said that faculty members can be encouraged but a few groups have legitimate reasons for scheduling class during Academic Senate. She explained that nursing and science faculty members need to use certain spaces that are not always available therefore they might need to schedule classes during Academic Senate. She asked whether the Academic Senate wanted to create a resolution. .

Ellen explained that foundational classes are two days a week and stacked therefore faculty members teaching foundational classes might find it difficult to attend Academic Senate too .

Joe recommended requesting to the administration not to schedule full-time faculty members during Senate. Ellen recommended making the proxy voting process better. Carolyn explained that the proxy voting process was already in the Senate constitution.

Brad agreed that voting by proxy was in the constitution but he clarified that, according to the constitution, the proxy vote needed to be in writing. He argued that it was something that needs to be amended because voting by proxy was only for voting on action items not nominating others or self-nominating.

E. Review Process for Faculty Position Announcements (Berger)

Melynne explained to the Senate that the faculty-position announcements were not vetted to the faculty. Paul Delaney agreed that vetting the announcements was ideal.

A motion was made that discipline faculty members be able to vet job announcements (SP, CH).

Andrea Riesgo explained that it was not problem but she asked whether there was a potential conflict if the Academic Senate wanted certain criteria or qualification but the district was looking for something else.

Joe cited the ten +1 (item 6, 10, 11). Paul Delaney explained that in the past the Academic Senate formed a committee with discipline faculty who refine rather than change the criteria or qualification. Pat explained that it was common courtesy.

The motion passed with one abstention.

F. Division Chair Selection and Reorganization of Divisions (Berger)

Melynie reported that she and Michel attended the Curriculum Institute and the Student Learning Institute. Melynie explained that CMC's program reviews are micro-level therefore they are not rolling into anything meaningful. She explained that part of the problem was how CMC defined a program which consequently stops the micro-level program reviews from being built up. Melynie explained that other schools have 3 program reviews: Basic Skills, General Education, and Vocation (CTE). Melynie explained that CMC lacks this meso-level organization found at other schools. . Melynie recommended realigning the divisions at CMC. She argued that vocational/CTE was a sensible division due to Perkins money. .

Tan Phan agreed with Melynie's comments. She affirmed that this made sense from a program review, research, and financial-reporting perspective.

Bobby asked for clarification. He wanted to know whether CMC can move from three divisions to four.

Carolyn explained that it would need to be negotiated.

Cheryl added that CTE was making good progress. Cheryl said a possible solution, which would maintain three divisions, would be : 1) CTE, 2) Math/Science, and 3) Social Science/Communication. Cheryl agreed that CTE could work on Perkins while building CTE. She added that CTE has a lot of special requirements (e.g. COR reviews). Cheryl reported that President Wagner asked her to bring this to the Academic Senate.

Marla asked about basic skills as a division. Brad argued that basic skills spans the entire faculty.

Rick said one of the things the reorganization should support is CMC's mission. He explained that COD had two divisions: VocEd and Transfer. Rick said he was against General Education. He said CMC should help students get a job or transfer.

Melynie responded to Rick's comments about Gen Ed. She argued that the faculty need to assess general education and the faculty need to coordinate what skills the students are getting. Melynie argued that success was not only graduate rate. Instead, she added, the faculty needs to assess communication skills and other areas. Melynie explained that the Senate was the place to dialogue about these issues but we are not doing it. She explained that serving on the BRIC team the biggest problem she has seen at other colleges is finding the time and place to discuss the most important aspects of student

success. She concluded that if an organization's structure is better than the faculty can make meaningful change. She emphasized that CMC was small therefore CMC can make changes and do well.

Carolyn recommended creating a committee to talk about how reconfigured divisions might look

Brad asked Cheryl to discuss the selection process for division chairs. Cheryl reported that CMC has been doing it incorrectly. Cheryl explained that two options were allowed 1) advertise the position outside the college or 2) elected the division chair internally by peers.

Carolyn said that the last time she talked to Andrea they discussed the possibility that division chair selection was not regulate by Title V because division chairs only receive release (20%) time from a teaching faculty position.

Bobby made a formal motion to form a committee to to discuss reconfiguring division and the selection process. Carolyn Hopkins, Steve Parkin, Ellen Bair, and Melynie volunteered.

The motion carried.

G. End date for adding online classes (Bridenbecker)

Cheryl explained that many online students do their work on the weekend. She said that classes started on Tuesday and a number of students were dropped by Friday. Cheryl explained that students can enroll until the first week therefore faculty members should not drop students for non-attendance for one week.

Brad asked who sets this policy. Cheryl said that no policy existed but it was– something the college had to deal with. She explained that the college had a lot of readmissions because students were dropped and it was a mess.

Melynie explained that in the past the college let students add after two weeks. Melynie recommended giving students 7 days to log-on and 14 days to add.

Bruce and Paul Delaney made a motion to accept this practice (7 days to log-in and 14 days to add) for online classes. The motion passed with two abstentions.

H. Waitlists: Problems and Process (Berger & Armstrong)

Andrea asked the Senate two questions about waitlist problems:

- 1) At what point do you tell the student to leave the classroom?
- 2) Who do you allow to stay in the class?

Marla asked about the severity of the problem. She asked whether this was a problem for faculty or students. Marla said that students need momentum. She said she wanted waitlisted students to be able to stay in the classroom because it gives the student momentum but if they were not on the roster by the add/drop day then they would not be allowed to continue attending class.

Bobby explained that fire code dictates how many people are allowed in the room.

Ellen explained that there is a maximum occupancy and they can stay as long as there is space. However, she said she emphasizes that she cannot guarantee them a spot.

Cheryl said she attempted to write memo in a prudent and safe way which gives faculty flexibility. She recommended using the wait-list to identify the top students. Cheryl said she doesn't want to prescribe what to do because she didn't want to take that decision away from faculty members.

Greg Brown said there was a problem with regard to how far down the list we go. He explained that if student services tells students to go to the class, the n faculty members might deal with 30 extra students. He emphasized that staff in student services was trying to protect faculty members. Greg asked whether student services should advise every student to go to class. He added that student services cannot tell a student what number they are on the wait list.

Brad asked how many students get off the wait list. Greg Brown said it depends on class. He said that anatomy does not have a lot of movement whereas an English class does have a lot of movement.

Melynie said she was interested in evidence. She wanted to know how many waitlist and whether the college experienced any classes with 30 additional students showing up. She said that if she were a student she would want to know what number she was on the waitlist.

Greg Brown reiterated that the issue was where do we draw the line.

Brad made an informal motion to approach this issue in a way that maximizes student success. He recommended telling student to go to class, informing them where they are on the waitlist, and asking them to get in contact with the instructor.

The academic Senate conducted a straw poll on Brad's recommendation. Sixteen Senators voted in favor of telling student to go to class, informing them where they are on the waitlist, and asking them to get in contact with the instructor

Heather added that students should go to class but they should be informed that they might be turned away.

Yadira said contacting the faculty member prior to the semester was an excellent idea. She informed the Senate that she was contact by students who wanted to know their chances of adding the class.

Cathy recommended putting faculty email addresses in the schedule of classes so students can contact faculty members prior to the first day of class.

I The Connection between Student Success and Program Review (Berger)

Melynie explained that evaluating student success should take place in program review. She said she would like to see the Senate and District help faculty members do that as opposed to creating an umbrella student success committee. She emphasized that faculty members do not talk about student success in the Senate or program review and that's where it needs to happen.

Tan said she agreed 100%. She emphasized CMC's mission. She said that the faculty need to set goals and measure them. She emphasized that program review does not evaluate instructor instead it was developed to create core indicator of success and assessment of student learning outcomes.

I. Program Review Forms (Berger)

Mel explained that these forms were created to connect data to goals because the forms forces you to tie your goal and evidence. Melynie explained that Cheryl has it out and many faculty members saw it during flex but the Senate has not blessed it and it is the Senate's purview.

A motion was made to approve the forms (JD, SP). Brad asked for any discussion. Paul said it was a great form. He asked the Senate to turn to page 94. He asked to change "Developing program weakness" to "Explaining/addressing program weakness."

The motion passed unanimously.

J. Student Involvement in the hiring process (Berger)

Brad explained that this topic was brought up in college council and it was believed that it might impact current faculty hiring but it was too late.

Joe explained that student government discussed this issues. He said that student government was over-committed with elections and bylaws therefore they decided they would not commit to staffing hiring committees. He explained that the students had had a lot more discussion about the VP position but they decided they do not have enough time. Joe added that they would like a meet-and-greet event.

Paul Delaney explained that many colleges require a teaching demonstration to an already existing class and this would incorporate student feedback into the hiring process.

Cathy said it was not possible for the current hiring process because it was too late. Carolyn added that Andrea discussed doing a reception (meet and greet).

Joe added that the student trustee will be involved in the hiring process.

Pat said she does not think students should be involved in the hiring process.

K. CS Part Time Position (Duktiewicz)

Pat explained that the college needs a pool for Computer Science. She asked whether the college plans to advertise for more qualified CS instructors.

Melynie asked what the process for creating a pool was. She asked whether faculty members should contact Cheryl, Andrea, or a division chair.

Cheryl explained that requests go to the division chair.

L. Board Policy 3820 Gifts (Berger)

Brad asked for discussion on the Board Gift Policy. A motion was made to approve the policy (CH/CI). The motion passed.

M. Board Policy 3825 Art on Campus (Berger)

Carolyn, Brad, and Spelman explained the background behind the Board Policy. Spelman explained that no policy will make everyone happy but it needs to be in place and this is the best possible compromise.

Joe said he had a problem with Section 7: “Violation of campus policy...”

Carolyn explained that the language came from the college’s lawyers and they used the language from a Supreme Court case.

Bobby and Pat made a motion to approve the Board Policy. The motion passed with two Senators voting against it and two abstentions.

The remaining agenda items were tabled until the next meeting.

Committee Reports:

Joe reported for the FLEX committee. He explained that there would not be a wounded warriors session. Instead, FLEX would extend the SLOs session.

Yadira reported for the Professional Standards and Ethics Committee. She said that the next academic senate meeting would feature a recommended progress report by the faculty member on sabbatical.

Marla reported for the BSI committee. She reported that she attended a conference last weekend focusing on basic skills across the curriculum. She said she will bring that stuff back to the college at a FLEX presentation. She explained that the conference focused on activities like teaching students how to read a textbook.

Michel reported for Curriculum/CTRAC committees. She reported that the recommended deactivation list was basically done/ Michel reported that SB 1440 CORs would be given priority in the queue therefore other people are being bumped.

SLO Coordinator Report:

Cheryl explained that she was asked by Greg to deliver this report. She said Greg would report on SLOs and measures at next Wednesday's FLEX day. Cheryl reported that it is the responsibility of instructor to send Measures to Greg as soon as possible. She emphasized that this applied to counselors too. She explained that faculty member should look at measures from the Fall semester and examine how to improve courses and programs.

Motion to adjourn.

Academic Senate

INFORMATION ITEMS

Copper Mountain College

Required Elements of the Syllabus

Your contract with the student, the syllabus, contains information derived from two main sources: the current class schedule and the course outline of record. Every semester, you must give the Office of Instruction a copy of the syllabus you are using for every class you teach. Please note: the COR guarantees that the college is meeting the content standard set by the Chancellor's Office; the syllabus is the document that indicates how the standard will be met by a particular instructor. Thus, two or more instructors teaching the same course will have different syllabi, but there will be only ONE course outline of record for that course.

Required Elements of the Syllabus at CMC

1. Name of the college
2. Course number (code), title, and section number
3. Prerequisites
4. Time of meeting
5. Location of class
6. Name of instructor
7. Office hours/contact information for instructor
8. Phone number of instructor
9. E-mail of instructor
10. Text (author, title, date and edition, publisher; ISBN)
11. Supplementary reading(s) and/or materials
12. Course description: *at a minimum, the description from the college catalog; however, a paragraph or two about the specific content of the course is helpful for students*
- 13. Student Learning Outcomes, Objectives, and Measures**
14. Calendar or schedule of class readings, topics, and assignments
15. Course policies, including the following as appropriate:
 - a) Attendance, lateness
 - b) Class participation: what constitutes good participation specifically, as well as how it will be assessed or graded
 - c) Missed exams or assignments
 - d) Lab safety/health concerns: "Even if detailed materials are handed out early in the course, the syllabus should include a short statement about the importance of these issues and indicate that more detailed information will follow."*
 - e) Academic dishonesty: cheating and plagiarism
 - f) Grading: how students will be evaluated; information about appeals procedures
 - g) Available support services (tutors, writing or math skills labs)
 - h) Classroom etiquette (cell phones, civility expectations)
16. Students with disabilities statement (Suggested wording: *Students with disabilities, whether physical, learning or psychological, who believe that they may need accommodations in this class, are encouraged to contact Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) as soon as possible to ensure that such accommodations are implemented in a timely fashion. Please meet with DSPS Staff to verify your eligibility for any classroom accommodations and for Academic assistance related to your disability. DSPS is located in the Student Services building, in Phase III of the main college campus.*)
17. Equal opportunity statement (Suggested wording: *Copper Mountain College is committed to Equal Employment Opportunity for all persons and to provide educational and employment opportunities free from discrimination on the*

basis of ethnic group identification, national origin, religion, age, veteran status, sex, race, color, ancestry, sexual orientation, or physical or mental disabilities, and other physical or verbal conduct or communication constituting sexual harassment.)

18. Disclaimer: notation that the syllabus is subject to change

Optional Elements of the Syllabus at CMC

1. Information about how students will be notified of grade
2. Information about where student work can be retrieved; how long student work will be held by instructor
3. Important dates for students (withdraw without transcript responsibility; drop dates; filing for intent to graduate; etc.)
4. Suggestions for student success in the course

* Howard B. Altman and William E. Cashin, "Writing a syllabus," handout from Curriculum Institute Summer 2005.

This document was approved by the Curriculum Committee, October 27, 2005 and by the Academic Senate November 17, 2005.



Academic Senate

CONSENT AGENDA

Copper Mountain College
Academic Senate Agenda Packet – March 17, 2011
(ASAP)

Requested by: Yadira Llord

Subject: Minutes, Professional Standards & Ethics Committee. Document attached.

Type of consideration: _____ Information
_____ Consent Agenda
_____ Discussion
XXX Report
_____ Other

Desired outcomes: Recommended progress report for current Sabbatical recipient, Cathy Itnyre.

Background: Recommended report, but not required. See attachment.

Submitted by: Yadira Llord

Professional Standards and Ethics Committee Minutes 12. 16.10

Meeting commences at 2:37 PM

Present: E Baird, G Chestermann, J DeSantis, M Gallagher, and Y Llort

YL calls the meeting to order.

Agenda item is salary advancement candidate #25

JD: was the coursework completed before hire?

YL: JD: was the coursework completed before hire?

YL: Yes but missed by HR. The PSE has been asked to review.

JD: is it an appeal?

YL: Yes. The request is urgent due to the change in CEUS allowed under the new CBA language. If any of the coursework is approved by us, then the advancement will be grandfathered.

This is a grievance.

JD: The PSE doesn't have jurisdiction. The applicant is limited to 5 CEUs per range per the old CBA language.

Current salary range is V 12.

JD: Motion is made that this appeal be referred to HR and the association with a note that this is a misclassification on hire or a grievance issue. The PSE doesn't have a recommendation. This should be taken to the union.

YL: Second.

Unanimously approved.

Meeting adjourned 2:50



DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

Participating Effectively

in

Copper Mountain

Community College District

Governance

(Board Approved: December 14, 2006)
Revised: February 25, 2011

Copper Mountain Community College District
PHILOSOPHY OF PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE

Copper Mountain College embraces the principles of participatory governance embodied in AB1725 and Title 5. As a reflection of that commitment, we strive to include all campus constituencies – students, classified staff, faculty and administration – in the consultation and decision-making discourses.

Embedded in the principle of participatory governance is the importance of all students, staff, faculty and administrators, and the value of their contributions to Copper Mountain College.

Participatory governance is not limited to constituent involvement on committees, but must be part of daily life for all members of each constituency, as we listen to one another and learn from the expertise each brings to the fulfillment of Copper Mountain College’s mission as a community college. Demonstrating respect for one another is a critical part of making this concept work. Participatory governance must be part of all our interactions, and we must make interaction habitual in decision-making.

Definition

Participatory governance, sometimes referred to as “shared governance” or “collegial consultation,” is the commitment to (1) ensuring that all college constituencies have the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and (2) ensuring that the Academic Senate assumes “primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.”
(Education Code 70902[b][7])

Role of Administration in Shared Decision Making

The Copper Mountain College administration consults with and welcomes the advice and judgment of faculty, staff, and students on college issues. The president and administration commit to consulting with the academic senate on college-related “academic and professional matters” as defined in both Board policy and Title 5, Sec. 53200(d)(2).

The Copper Mountain College administration commits to (1) listen to advice in a nonjudgmental manner, (2) consider and be open to all ideas presented, and (3) strive for mutual agreement. In instances when mutual agreement is not reached, and/or academic senate recommendations are not accepted, the administration agrees to explain its perceptions to the Board of Trustees regarding the lack of agreement and the rationale for the action taken [as directed by Title 5, (Sections 53200-53204)].

Role of Faculty in Shared Decision Making

The Academic Senate is seen by the California legislature as a governing body and not a college committee. As such, it has a unique relationship with the Board of Trustees. The Academic Senate is the only constituency specifically authorized by Title 5 to have a formal relationship with the Board of Trustees. Both the Board and the Academic Senate are bound by the Brown Act.

The Board of Trustees of Copper Mountain Community College District has committed to collegial consultation with the Academic Senate regarding matters of curriculum and academic standards. The Board will consult with the Senate through the Board’s designee, the college Superintendent/President. Consultation must occur in eleven areas of academic and professional responsibility specified in Title 5 (Sections 53200-53204). Shared decision making may be accomplished by either relying primarily on the advice of the Academic Senate or through collegial consultation which results in a written, mutual agreement (Title 5, California Code of Regulations).

The following are the eleven areas with the agreed upon designation of either “rely primarily” or “mutually agree:”

1. Rely Primarily – Degree and certificate requirements
2. Rely Primarily – Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
3. Rely Primarily – Grading policies
4. a. Mutual Agreement – Educational program development (existing programs)
b. Rely Primarily – Educational program development (new programs)
5. Mutual Agreement – Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
6. Mutual Agreement – District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
7. Mutual Agreement – Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self study and annual reports
8. Mutual Agreement – Policies for faculty professional development activities
9. Mutual Agreement – Processes for program review
10. Mutual Agreement – Processes for institutional planning and budget development,
11. Mutual Agreement – Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

In keeping with Title 5, Section 53200, Copper Mountain College recognizes that the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate will normally be accepted in matters related to these eleven areas and that, when the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate is not followed, the senate may request and shall receive an explanation in writing. When the Board of Trustees elects to **rely primarily** upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate, the recommendation of the senate will normally be accepted, and only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons will the recommendations not be accepted. When the Board of Trustees elects to provide for **mutual agreement** with the academic senate, and an agreement has not been reached, existing policy shall remain in effect unless such policy exposes the district to legal liability or fiscal hardship. In cases where there is no existing policy, or when legal liability or fiscal hardship requires existing policy to be changed, the board may act, after a good faith effort to reach agreement, only for compelling legal, fiscal, or organizational reasons. Title 5, section 53203(d) Consultation includes all areas which will have a significant effect on faculty, but which exist outside the college bargaining arena.

Role of Classified Staff in Participatory Governance

In the case of the classified staff, Title 5, Section 51023.5 specifically requires that the District’s Board of Trustees “adopt policies and procedures that provide district and college staff the opportunity to participate effectively in district and college governance,” on matters “that the governing board reasonably determines, in consultation with staff, have or will have a significant effect on staff.”

Copper Mountain College complies with Government Code sections 3540, et seq., in that “such procedures for staff participation shall not intrude on matters within the scope of representation under section 3543.2 of the Government Code.” When any college or district task force, committee, or other governance group, is used to consult with staff regarding implementation of participatory governance or to deal with other issues which have been determined to significantly affect staff outside the scope of bargaining, the appointment of staff representatives shall be made according to Title 5, sections 51023.5(7)(A) and 5102.3(7)(B), as follows:

“The exclusive representative shall appoint representatives for the respective bargaining unit employees, unless the exclusive representative and the governing board mutually agree in a memorandum of understanding to an alternative appointment process.”

“Where a group of employees is not represented by an exclusive agent, the appointment of a representative of such employees on any task force, committee or governance group shall be made by, or in consultation with, any other councils, committees, employee organizations, or other staff groups that the governing board has officially recognized in its policies and procedures for staff participation.”

In accordance with law and district policy, Copper Mountain College promotes, supports, and encourages all classified staff to participate in campus and district committees, and provides classified staff with opportunities to participate in the formulation and development of policies and procedures. To that end, Copper Mountain College consults collegially with elected representatives of the classified staff.

Role of Students in Shared Decision Making

Copper Mountain College is also committed to ensuring a role for students in the governance process, in accordance with AB1725, Title 5 (Section 51203.7). The District believes that the recognition of students as full members of the learning community requires their participation in the formulation of district policies that have, or will have, a significant effect on students. The inclusion of students in governance ensures representation of the student constituency, as well as the development and implementation of effective student policy. Copper Mountain College recognizes the Associated Students of Copper Mountain College (ASCMC) as the representative body for students, and seeks the advice and consultation of ASCMC designees in all matters affecting students.

Participatory Governance Committee Structure

The participatory governance process developed at Copper Mountain College is based on a hub and spoke model, with the College Council serving as the hub, and constituency groups serving as the spokes.

Each constituency group appoints its representative(s) to the College Council. The members of College Council both represent their constituency group on the Council, and are responsible for communicating back to their group information and decisions from the council.

District-wide committees that address matters of interest and concern to the entire campus community are participatory governance committees. Committees that have a more narrow scope that are more functional in nature are operational.

Participatory Governance Committees and their chairs are:

- 1) Academic Calendar
Vice President of Academic Affairs and Vice President of Student Services (Co-Chairs)
- 2) Budget Advisory Committee
Chief Business Officer

- 3) College Council (Serves as the Strategic Planning Group)
Superintendent/President
- 4) Equal Employment Opportunity Committee (EEOC)
Human Resources Manager
- 5) Professional Development Committee
Superintendent/President
- 6) Technology Committee
Vice-President of Student Services and Director of Information Systems (Co-Chairs)

Operational and contractual committees include, but may not be limited to, committees such as advisory committees, catastrophic leave, graduation committee, grants committee, professional growth committees, research committee, safety committee, and scholarship committee.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR

Mission

To develop the Academic Calendar in accordance with state regulations and to make recommendations that best meet the needs of the Copper Mountain Community College District students and employees.

Membership

Vice President of Student Services (Co-chair) *
Vice President of Academic Affairs (Co-chair) *
One CMCFA Representative *
One Academic Senate Representative *
One CSEA Representative *
One Classified Senate Representative *
One ASCMC Representative *
One Representative from Admissions & Records
One Representative from Base Programs
One Representative from Counseling
One Representative from Developmental Education
One Representative from the Office of Academic Affairs

Meetings

Meetings shall be held as needed.

Reporting Requirements

The recommended calendar shall be presented to the College Council.

* Denotes voting members

BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mission

The mission of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) is to provide final independent shared governance review of the resource allocation recommendations brought forth by College managers based on the program reviews under their supervision.

The Role

The role of the BAC is to provide independent budgetary advice to the College president and Board of Trustees in an effort to ensure ongoing compliance with the 50% Law. The committee seeks to ensure that College resources are directed to the highest value and best use of available financial resources while ensuring the Colleges' fiscal stability. In addition, during BAC deliberations, voting members are expected to regularly report to and solicit feedback from the shared governance group that appointed them.

Membership

The membership of the committee is based on a collegial process to ensure that all segments of the college community have participation in the process. The Chief Business Officer provides guidance and budget information to the committee.

Chief Business Officer (Chair)
One CMCFA Representative *
One Academic Senate Representative *
One CSEA Representative *
One Classified Senate Representative *
Two Management Representatives*
One ASCMC Representative *
One Foundation Representative
Fiscal Services Accountant

Meetings

A calendar tied to the Budget process is developed each academic year.

* Denotes voting members.

Reporting Requirements

The Budget Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees with prior advising to the Superintendent/President.

Resource Allocation Process

- I. Since the district is currently allocating more than 90% of total expenditures to labor, and since the college is a Union based organization; all resource issues involving wages (benefits), hours and conditions of employment must be negotiated directly with CTA and CSEA. In the interest of identifying incremental or decremental resources for the coming year, Union negotiations

should be completed at the earliest possible time to allow the budgetary cycle to be implemented. In addition, all unavoidable fixed costs (such as utilities, supplies, etc.) should also be identified, prior to moving further into the cycle, and subtracted from projected available resources.

It should be noted that some provision for expediting “emergency” (unanticipated and essential) expenditures should be included in this process. In the past, numerous “emergency” expenditures have circumvented the formal resource allocation process. Therefore, in an effort to create a clear, working definition of “emergency,” the BAC considers “emergency” to mean expenditures that are unusual, infrequent, essential to College operations, and that could not have been reasonably anticipated in advance at the Program and/or Management level. Time-sensitive transactions that comply with this definition should be advanced by management to the Board of Trustees, in a timely manner, with prior notification and documentation to all participants in the budget cycle, and should be funded first out of College Reserves in excess of 5%. Transactions that do not meet this definition should wait for the next Program Review cycle for inclusion in the formal, two-stage resource allocation process.

- II. Only the remaining incremental/decremental resources should go through a shared governance process outlined below, using the 50% Law, WASC compliance, and the three Mission elements as prioritization criteria:
 - (A) program review/management priorities
 - (B) College Council review
 - (C) Budget Advisory Committee review

PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

Increasing the quantity and/or quality of service to diverse desert communities

Providing a more comprehensive curriculum

Improving student success.

It must be clearly understood that the Administration and Board control the release of funds. Therefore, budgetary priorities will be established through due process but will only be funded after Board established minimum levels of financial reserves have been assured.

Annual Budget Calendar

August 15-September 15

All College Programs finalize Work-Plan goals, including measurable outcomes, for the current academic year and begin implementation of those elements not requiring incremental resources.

September 15-October 22

Administrators and Division Chairs, in consultation with the Programs under their supervision and the College Council, will prioritize current year budget requests using an institution-wide set of agreed upon criteria, and forward their analysis and recommendations to the BAC.

October 22-November 30

The BAC will conduct a final, independent, shared governance review of the recommendations submitted by Management, utilizing the same criteria previously employed, and forward their recommendations directly to the College President, who will present all findings to the Board of Trustees. In addition, during BAC deliberations, all voting members are expected to regularly report to and solicit feedback from the shared governance group that appointed them.

December

The Board of Trustees will vote to adopt current year budget priorities and, based on available and anticipated resource availability, expenditures may begin.

February

P(1) (First Principal Apportionment) arrives and discretionary resources may now be fully committed to funding institutional priorities.

April 15-May 15

Program Reviews are updated, the results are shared with Advisory Committees, and a tentative Work-Plan and resource needs for the coming year are developed.

COLLEGE COUNCIL

Mission

The College Council serves as the primary participatory governance committee of the district. The mission of the College Council is to provide leadership and oversight to the accomplishment of educational quality and student success through planning. The Council will develop processes for strategic and comprehensive master planning and will oversee implementation of those processes and the development of the strategic and master plans, and will recommend planning priorities. In addition, the College Council will receive information, hear and share opinions, focus on campus-wide issues, and receive, review and recommend policy to the Superintendent/President.

Membership

Superintendent/President (Chair)

All Vice Presidents
Human Resources Manager
Chief of Campus Facilities
Chief Business Officer
Academic Senate President
CMCFA President
Accreditation Liaison Officer
Classified Senate President or Designee
Confidential Employee Designee
CSEA President
ASCMC President or Designee
Executive Director of the Copper Mountain College Foundation

Voting members

The committee will operate using a consensus-based model.

Meetings

The College Council shall meet twice monthly.

Reporting Requirements

The College Council makes recommendations to the Superintendent/President. The Superintendent/President informs the Board of Trustees.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE (EEOC)

Mission

1. The Equal Employment Opportunity Committee is an advisory committee established in accordance with Title 5, to assist the District in developing and implementing the Equal Employment Opportunity plan as required by Title 5.
2. Recommend polices regarding equal employment opportunity, student equity and non-discrimination polices in accordance in Title 5 and any other laws and regulations.
3. Recommend and review procedures for filing discrimination complaints.
4. Develop communication processes to notify employees of the EEO plan and policies.
5. Develop and participate in training of employees who participate on screening or selection committees.
6. Assist in the development of and participate in the training of employees and students on policies and regulations concerning non-discrimination, equal employment opportunity and student equity.

Membership

In accordance with Title 5, the committee shall include a diverse membership, whenever possible. The Committee Chair will be the Human Resources Manager and membership will include administrators, faculty, classified and student representatives sufficient to ensure a diverse membership. The Superintendent/President may appoint additional members as necessary to achieve this objective.

Members

Human Resources Manager (Chair)

Two faculty members, one each appointed by the Academic Senate and the CMCFA

Two classified members, one each appointed by the Classified Senate and the CSEA

One manager, appointed by the President

One student representative, appointed by the ASCMC President

Meetings

At least once per semester or more often if needed.

Reporting Requirements

All recommendations from this committee go to the Superintendent/President. When

recommendations from this committee affect policy, they will first go to College Council for review.

Annual reports are submitted to the Chancellor's Office validating outcomes and the appropriate use of funds as required by the California Education Code.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mission

The mission of the Professional Development Committee is to consider appropriate professional development activities each fiscal year for all employees and develop a calendar of activities for All Staff Days.

Membership

The membership of the committee is based on a collegial process to ensure that all segments of the college community have participation in the process.

Superintendent/President (Chair)
One CMCFA Representative
One Academic Senate Representative
One CSEA Representative
One Classified Senate Representative
Human Resources Manager
One ASCMC Representative

Voting members

The committee will operate using a consensus-based model.

Meetings

Meetings shall be held as needed.

Reporting Requirements

The recommendations shall be presented to the College Council.

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Mission

The mission of the Technology Committee (TECH COM) is to develop, implement, coordinate, and review the Copper Mountain College (CMC) technology plan (Tech Plan) in both instructional and operational functions. Technology planning will include shared information from appropriate committees and groups, program reviews, and related input to foster a shared vision.

Membership

Director of Information Systems (co-chair) *
Vice-President of Student Services (co-chair) *
Academic Senate Representative *
CMCFA Representative *
Classified Senate Representative *
CSEA Representative *
ASCMC Representative(s) *
Technical Advisor(s)
Academic Affairs Representative
Base Programs Representative
Library Representative
Student Services Representative(s)
Title IX ADA person
Institutional Researcher/Grant Writer

Meeting

Meetings shall be held at least monthly depending on the work load of committee.

Reporting Requirements

The recommendations shall be presented to the College Council.

* Denotes voting members.

**Copper Mountain College
Academic Senate Agenda Packet
(ASAP)**

Date of Senate Meeting: 3/17/2011

Requested by: Mike Danza and Dean Pieper

Subject: Populating Blackboard for Brick and Mortar Courses: Fall 2011

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item**
- Information/Discussion**

Desired Outcome:

All courses (online, hybrid, AND brick and mortar) are populated by the first day of class for the Fall 2011 semester. All faculty members add this issue to their program reviews so that money can be allocated to fix the problem.

Background:

Students need consistency. Faculty members want to start the semester with Blackboard because attempting to integrate a tool like Blackboard 3 weeks into the semester creates an obstacle for instructors and students. If money is needed to resolve the problem then faculty members who believe this is an issue at the college need to include it in their program review.



**Copper Mountain College
Academic Senate Agenda Packet
(ASAP)**

Date of Senate Meeting: 17 March 2011

Requested by: B. Berger

Subject: All-Subscriber Emails

Type of Consideration:

- Action Item**
- Information/Discussion**

Desired Outcome: Give Administration recommendations for a policy on all-subscriber emails.

Background: President Wagner asked College Council members to ask their constituency groups for feedback on what should be included in an all-subscriber email policy. Discussion at CC centered around different kinds of all-subscriber emails: from bake sales to baby announcements, etc. Many were more concerned about the excessive all-subscriber replies to such emails.

BP 4220 Standards of Scholarship

DRAFT (030211)

The Superintendent/President shall establish procedures that establish standards of scholarship consistent with the provisions of Title 5 and Board policy.

These procedures shall address: grading practices, academic record symbols, grade point average, credit by examination, academic and progress probation, academic and progress dismissal, academic renewal, course repetition, limits on remedial coursework, and grade changes.

These procedures shall be described in the college catalog.

AP 4222 Remedial Coursework**Academic Affairs**

Reference: Title 5 Section 55035

Remedial coursework consists of pre-collegiate basic skills courses defined as courses in reading, writing, computation, learning skills and English as a Second Language, which are designated as non-degree credit courses.

A student's need for remedial coursework shall be determined using appropriate assessment instruments, methods, or procedures.

No student shall receive more than 30 semester units for remedial coursework. A student who exhausts this unit limitation shall be referred to appropriate adult noncredit education services.

Students enrolled in one or more courses of English as a Second Language and students identified by *ACCESS (Disabled Student Programs and Services)* as having a learning disability are exempt from the limitations of this procedure.

Students who demonstrate significant, measurable progress toward development of skills appropriate to enrollment in college-level courses may be granted a waiver of the limitations of this procedure by the College President or his/her designee. This waiver of limitation may be granted for a maximum of ten semester units.

NOTE: Replaces current BP 6530.8 below, updated to an AP and re-categorized into the appropriate section, 4200's Academic Affairs.

BP 6530.8 Remedial Coursework Limitation

Remedial coursework refers to pre-collegiate basic skills courses defined as courses in reading, writing, computation, learning skills and English as a Second Language, which are designated as non-degree credit courses. No student shall receive more than thirty (30) semester units of credit for remedial coursework at Copper Mountain College except as noted below:

1. Students currently enrolled in one (1) or more courses of English as a Second Language.
2. Students identified by the College Disabled Student Program as having a learning disability.
3. A student who has had this restriction waved by the College President or his/her designee because the student has shown significant, measurable progress toward the development of college-level skills. This waiver of limitation may be granted for a maximum of ten (10) semester units.

AP 4225 Course Repetition

References:

Title 5 Sections 55040, 55041, 55042, 55253, and 56029; Education Code Section 76224

The District permits a student who has earned grades of "D", "F", and/or "NC" ***to repeat these courses.*** A ***student*** may repeat the course one time and receive a new grade and credits. The previous grade and credits are disregarded in the computation of grade point average and credits and appropriate annotation is made on the student's permanent record in such a manner that both grades remain legible, insuring a true and complete academic history.

Where special circumstances exist, a student may be allowed to repeat a course a second time. Special circumstances include consideration of illness, accident, or other conditions which, being beyond the control of the student, resulted in his or her substandard work.

Under very unusual and documented circumstances, a student who has taken a class twice and received non-passing grades both times may petition for one last opportunity to pass the course. ***The*** student must appeal in writing and with appropriate documentation of the unusual circumstances well in advance of registration. The appeal should be directed to the Vice President of Student Services.

The District permits a student to repeat a course or courses with grade(s) of "C", "B", "A", or "CR" when a ***significant*** lapse in time, change in course content, or need to upgrade skills justifies the repetition. A ***significant lapse in time is defined as three academic years or if an institution of higher education to which a student wishes to transfer has established a recency requirement that the student cannot satisfy without repeating the course.***

A student must demonstrate that special circumstances do exist to justify the repeating of courses for which grade(s) of "C", "B", "A", or "CR" were awarded. These petitions are retained for ***audit purposes.*** ***The previous grade and credits are disregarded in the computation of grade point average and credits and appropriate annotation is made on the student's permanent record in such a manner that both grades remain legible, insuring a true and complete academic history.***

The student must appeal in writing and with appropriate documentation of the unusual circumstances well in advance of registration. The appeal should be directed to the Vice President of Student Services.

BP 6530.2 Course Repetition

The District permits students who have earned grades of "D", "F", and/or "NC" to repeat these courses.

The District permits students to repeat a course or courses with grade(s) of "C", "B", "A", or "CR" when a lapse in time, change in course content, or need to upgrade skills justifies the repetition.

The Board of Trustees authorizes the President/Superintendent to develop procedures to implement this policy. The procedures are to include a student petitioning process that must demonstrate that special circumstances do exist to justify the repeating of courses for which grades of "C", "B", "A", and/or "CR" have been awarded. These petitions are to be retained for FTES audit purposes.

College Catalog language

REPETITION OF COURSES

Board Policy 6530.2

Substandard Grades

A student who receives a grade of D, F, or NC for a course may repeat the course one time and receive a new grade and credits. The previous grade and credits are disregarded in the computation of grade point average and credits and appropriate annotation is made on the student's permanent record in such a manner that both grades remain legible, insuring a true and complete academic history.

Where special circumstances exist, a student may be allowed to repeat a course a second time. Special circumstances include consideration of illness, accident, or other conditions which, being beyond the control of the student, resulted in his or her substandard work.

Under very unusual and documented circumstances, a student who has taken a class twice and received non-passing grades both times may petition for one last opportunity to pass the course. Students must appeal in writing and with appropriate documentation of the unusual circumstances well in advance of registration. The appeal should be directed to the Vice President of Student Services.

Grades of "C" or Better

The District permits students to repeat a course or courses with grade(s) of "C", "B", "A", or "CR" when a lapse in time, change in course content, or need to upgrade skills justifies the repetition.

The student must demonstrate that special circumstances do exist to justify the repeating of courses for which grades of "C", "B", "A", and/or "CR" have been awarded. These petitions are to be retained for FTES (Full-time Equivalent Student) audit purposes.

Grades earned in such cases are not included in the student's grade point average. The credit is not awarded. The courses, grades, and units will be listed on the student's transcript.

Forms to repeat a course with a grade of "C" or better are available in the Office of Student Services. Students must make the request well in advance of registration. The appeal should be directed to the Vice President of Student Services.