



[District Academic Senate Website](#)

Governing Council Officers 2014-2015

Diana Bennett
President

Douglas Hirzel
Cañada College AS President

David Laderman
College San Mateo AS President

Kate Williams Browne
Skyline College AS President

Teresa Morris
Chair District Curriculum Committee

Anne Nichols
Cañada College AS Vice President

Theresa Martin
College San Mateo AS Vice President

Stephen Fredricks
Skyline College AS Vice President

APPROVED	
05/11/15	
	<p>SMCCD District Academic Senate Minutes 4/13/15 2:15 pm – 4:15pm District Board Room</p>
Call to Order	Time: 2:15 Timekeeper: D. Laderman Recorder: D. Hirzel
Introductions	Members present: Anne Nicholls, David Laderman, Diana Bennett, Kate Browne, Stephen Fredricks Members absent: Teresa Morris, Theresa Martin Guests: Jennifer Hughes
Adoption of Agenda: 4/13/15	M: Kate Browne S: David Laderman Unanimous approval
Approval of Minutes: 2/09/15 3/09/15	M: David Laderman S: Kate Browne Unanimous approval of 2/9/15 minutes All approve 3/9/15 minutes except for abstention by Stephen Fredricks

<p>President's Update</p>	<p>President's Update</p> <p>Distance Education & Professional Development Task Force (consists of 3 DE Deans, Instructional Designers, DE Coordinators): will be looking at possible impacts and practices resulting from the Online Education Initiative, e.g. developing consistency between the colleges and among the faculty for certification to teaching online courses. The OEI has developed modules for online readiness and online tutoring. See additional discussion below.</p>
<p>Curriculum</p>	<p>District Curriculum Update - Theresa Morris absent</p>
<p>Faculty Selection Handbook</p>	<p>Diana brought the Faculty Selection Handbook to the DPGC as information. During the review, the AFT expressed concern about section D (p. 12) Procedure within 45 days of assignment. The proposed language requiring emergency hires to re-apply after completing their first semester is in conflict with the current negotiated evaluation protocols. The latter stipulates that all faculty are evaluated during their first semester and, if successful, are added to the seniority list. Teeka James argued that our proposed procedure should not be necessary as long as all faculty (including those hired at the last minute) undergo rigorous evaluation during that first semester.</p> <p>DAS discussed this conflict and decided to delete section D and all references to the 45 day emergency procedures (see part A p. 11). It was decided that ALL hires, including those at the last minute, MUST meet Minimum Qualifications and/or follow the Equivalency process before being hired. It is understood that if MQs are in question and if it is not possible to conduct the equivalency process within the necessary timeframe, then it should be concluded that no qualified faculty can be found and the course will have to be canceled.</p> <p>It was decided to keep the final sentence of section D that requires documentation for any breach of procedure.</p>
<p>Sabbatical Resolution</p>	<p>DAS took a first reading of the proposed Sabbatical Resolution. It was noted that the Article 13 allocation is insufficient to fund a 1-year sabbatical at any of three colleges. Carryover funds at CSM and Skyline might help fund partial year sabbaticals but these are one-time monies. Access to a sabbatical is an equity issue for all district employees.</p> <p>We are to take the Resolution to our local senates for feedback. Diana will begin introducing this draft to the BOT.</p>
<p>Equivalency to Min Quals</p>	<p>Revision Equivalency Process –Board Procedure 3.15.2</p> <p>DAS began to revise the Equivalency Process. DL asked, “When do we invest the time and energy to do the MQ? Before the first interviews or after once they are identified as finalists for a second interview?” Some on DAS feel that a first interview should not be granted if the candidate doesn't meet MQs; it isn't fair to be told afterwards that they aren't progressing to a second interview because they shouldn't have been interviewed in the first place. Others in DAS argued that, since the equivalency process is burdensome, it should only be</p>

	<p>done for finalists.</p> <p>To do:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate the Appendices from the procedure. • Incorporate the Committee Chair procedure into the standard procedure. • Change title to “Equivalency to Minimum Qualifications” delete “Minimum Qualifications and...” <p>All DAS members should review Procedure 3.15.2 and propose changes.</p>
<p>OEI</p>	<p>OEI has developed a Rubric for assessing online course design and implementation. DAS would like us to take the rubric to our local senates for feedback. The objective is to eventually adopt something like this rubric district-wide.</p> <p>Certification of online faculty is required as is recertification. The OEI has not yet finalized modules/requirements for faculty certification. This is an issue that Skyline College must address for its ACCJC follow-up report. So they will be developing a local solution.</p>
<p>FW</p>	<p>FW grade</p> <p>Financial aid staff are responsible for determining if students who receive F grades truly earned the F grade (for academic reasons) or if they simply stopped attending after the last day to receive a W grade (a.k.a. “desertion”) and the faculty member was left with no option other than to issue an F grade. Under the latter case, students may be responsible for paying back federal financial aid if they didn’t attempt to complete the course. This is called a “return to Title 4”. Thus, the Financial Aid Directors have approached the Enrollment Services Committee about the possibility of instituting the “FW” grade , which is allowable under Title 5, that means “Failed through a failure to withdraw” which is distinct from an “earned” F. If the FW designation is adopted, faculty will need to indicate the <i>last date of attendance</i> of any student who receives the FW. The other option is not establish the FW grade, but continue with the F grade. For those students who receive F grades, ITS can provide a default <i>last date of attendance</i> as the last date of the term. Then only for those students who disappear prior to that date (and would receive a FW if it were available) will faculty have to indicate an earlier <i>last date of attendance</i>. This latter approach may be easier as we wouldn’t need to introduce a new grading symbol and provide education to faculty as to when you’d issue an FW vs. an F.</p> <p>How common is this problem? Our financial aid programmer at the District pulled the following data for all three colleges in regards to the number of students who receive all F or a combination of F, W and NP grades (no earned units) that applied for financial aid. While not all of these students received aid, all potentially could based on filing a FAFSA and all</p>

show up in reports we run each term that require review. Below are the data:

Campus	201108	201203	201205	201208	201303	201305
CAN						
F	177	226	74	199	188	103
F + W	615	685	239	703	758	374
CSM						
F	275	280	96	315	252	97
F + W	796	842	313	909	862	305
SKY						
F	314	317	187	396	323	175
F + W	906	883	535	984	985	528

1112 Aid Year
1213 Aid Year

DAS asked if there are other reasons, besides financial aid, why students would not withdraw from a course. It was noted that international students need to remain registered as a condition of their visa.

How does this apply to COOP Ed courses?

How does this apply to online courses? For online courses, the instructor would indicate that last date of communication with the student.

Will faculty comply with posting *last date of attendance*? Faculty already do so for Positive Attendance courses.

Will choosing a FW grade change the calculation for retention rate versus just using the F grade?

For further regulatory guidance, see the 2013-14 Federal Student Aid Handbook, Volume 5, Chapter 1 beginning on page 5-56 that addresses unofficial withdrawals and when students receive all F grades -

<http://www.ifap.ed.gov/fsahandbook/attachments/1314FSAHbkVol5Ch1.pdf>

BP 6.13

Curriculum Development, Program Review, and Program Viability

Revise procedure 6.13.1 - We would like to add in: (a) a procedure regarding collegial consultation between colleges when developing courses and programs, or revising curricula;

	<p>and (b) language specifying that only faculty may create curriculum.</p> <p>David Laderman will propose possible language.</p>
	<p>CSM elections in April – all officers are up for election (every 2 years)</p> <p>CAN elections in April – President and Vice President are up for election (every 2 years)</p>
Next Mtg	DAS Meeting May 11, 2015
Adjourn	<p>M: David Laderman</p> <p>S: Doug Hirzel</p>