

Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee Minutes
February 17, 2011

Present

Terry Bartley (management)
Dave Clausen (Exec Director –Fiscal Services)
Noelle Eckley (Div Chair -faculty)
Phil Horner (classified)

Carol Montgomery (classified)
Sue Mouck (Accreditation Liaison -faculty)
Eric Rulofson (Chair/ Facilities Planning)
Cary Templeton (Dean of Student Services)

Absent

Cheryl Aschenbach (AS-faculty)
Shelly Baxter (management)
Sandy Beckwith (Lead Counselor –faculty)
Dr. Irving Berkowitz (Dean of Instruction)
David Burreis (Exec Director-HR)
Carie Camacho (Div Chair -faculty)
Kayleigh Carabajal (Exec Director-IR)

Monica Cochran (Public Relations)
Toni Gomez (ASB)
Dr. Doug Houston (President)
Logan Merchant (Chair/IT Planning)
Jeff Lang (classified)
Brian Wolf (Div Chair –faculty)

Guest

Matt Levine (management)

Ross Stevenson (faculty)

With a quorum present, the meeting began at 2:50 pm.

Consultation Council:

1. Review of February 22, 2011 Governing Board Planning Retreat Agenda (Information)

Cary Templeton reported that in addition to the discussion of the accreditation midterm report, the board will consider revision to board policy 3120 Budget Reserves (Fund Balance). In the past during times of economic shortfalls, the state has taken budget reserves in excess of policy limits from community colleges. The college does not want to find itself in a similar situation during this period of economic crisis. Ross Stevenson questioned whether or not there had been any faculty input into the evaluations of the Vice-President/Dean of Instruction and the Dean of Student Services being considered during closed session. He also questioned whether the results of the survey on Human Resources conducted as part of the NIIPR or faculty input had been considered during the evaluation of the Executive Director of Human and Support Services. No one in attendance could answer his questions.

2. Update on Fall Student Work Study Accounting including Cougar Works (Information)

Cary Templeton provided a handout, which identified sources of income for funding student workers this academic year. Of the total \$497,707.00 available from all sources, \$57,882.00 was identified as LCC District funded Cougar Works. Originally \$31,500.00 was allocated in the budget for Cougar Works resulting in an over expenditure of approximately \$27,000.00. Further discussion identified that additional district funds (\$18,000.00) located in the Student Services budget were utilized to fund student workers. Student workers are also funded through auxiliary funds (bookstore, dorm, food services, and child development). The source of the over spent \$27,000.00 was questioned. No specific source for those monies was identified. The time and place of the discussion concerning the expenditure of general funds for student workers was questioned. The question as to whether the concept for Cougar Works had been included in Student Services NIPRs was raised. Mr. Templeton responded that he would need to check. Mr. Templeton assured the group that there will be no expenditure of Cougar Works money for the spring semester. He also stated that in light of the economic situation it is unlikely that a line item of district funds for Cougar Works will be available next year. The question of who is setting priorities for expenditure of general funds money was raised. The source of the 25% match for Cal Works funding was also questioned. Mr. Templeton identified that many of the CalWorks recipients work in the community and the employers provide the 25% matching funds. Additional questions of the accounting of those matching funds from the community arose. The end result of the discussion was the concern that over expenditure of available funds must NOT occur in the spring semester.

- 3. Acceptance of AP 4325 Credit by Examination and AP 4325 2+2 Form (Consultation)**
Consultation Council accepted by consensus the AP 4325 Credit by Examination and AP 4325 2+2 Form as forwarded by the Academic Senate. (attached) The question as to whether this procedure would be placed in the Faculty Handbook was asked. In addition the need for faculty training on the process was identified. In the absence of instructional administrators, there was no answer available.

4. Personnel Update (Information)

Dave Clausen provided the personnel update. In light of the current uncertain economic environment:

- a. Distance Education Coordinator – position is moving forward (the job description is being revisited and the current pool will be evaluated to see if the position needs to be re-flown)
- b. Athletic Director – the position will not be filled. The job duties are being redistributed amongst the existing administrative staff.
- c. Associate Dean of Instructional Services – Dr. Carabajal will continue her acting role in this position
- d. Accounting Technician II – the position has been offered and the new individual is expected to begin soon
- e. Executive Assistant in Student Services – on hold
- f. Instructional Support Specialist – Correspondence – on hold
- g. Library Assistant – on hold
- h. Library Director – the position was offered and decline (alternatives are being considered)
- i. Bookstore Manager – on hold
- j. Bookstore Assistant – on hold

It was suggested that the individuals serving on hiring committees are getting “burned out”. They put forth the effort to participate and the positions are not filled. It was suggested that the committee members need to receive feedback as to the status of the process in which they participate (if they forwarded three names and one declined the position, what happened with the other two applicants forwarded).

- 5. Suggestion to change Consultation Council meeting time to 1:30 -2:45 pm on Thursday to avoid the conflict with CSEA on the second Thursday and AS on the first and third Thursday of each month.**

Sue Mouck suggested that the Consultation Council meeting time be changed to 1:30 pm in order to avoid the conflicts with CSEA and AS. Alternate times were suggested. 1:00 pm prior to the beginning of afternoon classes or 4:00 pm after the majority of afternoon classes have ended. It was identified that faculty are not participating in Consultation Council and alternatives to encourage more faculty participation need to be considered. The suggestion of district-funded substitutes was offered. It was reiterated that meetings after 4:00 pm would require overtime for classified participants and that the 4:00 pm meeting time would prevent dinner time for faculty having night classes. It was agreed that the meeting time would change to 1:30 pm in the short term, but further discussion to determine a better alternative is needed.

Strategic Planning:

1. Update on 2011-2012 Budget Planning Proposal (Consultation)

Dave Clausen identified that the administration has been working on the Budget Planning Proposal. He cautioned the campus against over reacting to political posturing positions that are receiving a great deal of press. He identified that there are two areas of discussion that require immediate discussion and subsequent recommendations to the Governing Board (March 8, 2011 meeting). The two areas of immediate concern are the Residence Hall and Food Services. The discussion moved to item #2 below and then returned to discussion of the proposal. The timeline for presentation of other recommendations specifically the staffing plan was questioned. The Business/Mathematics/Science Division Chair was given instructions to provide load for five full-time mathematics instructors in the scheduling of mathematics classes for fall 2011. In light of the positions previously identified as being placed on hold, the institution needs a comprehensive staffing plan (including faculty) identifying which positions are being filled and which will remain on hold. There were several full-time faculty positions ranked last year as more important to the institution’s ability to serve students than an additional mathematics instructor. It was identified that the institution can expect a more complete presentation of the budget proposal for next year at Convocation on March 2, 2011.

2. Schedule Consultation Council Sponsored Open Forums for Spring 2011 (Consultation)

Dave Clausen suggested that Consultation Council host Open Forums on Friday February 25 to provide an opportunity for feedback and information on the recommendations being considered for the Residence Hall and Food Services, similar to what happened last spring. Initially the groups considered two forums one at 9:00 am and on at 1:00 pm. Following further discussion concerning the role of Consultation Council members at the forums it was decided to reschedule the Consultation Council meeting for Thursday, February 24 at 1:30 pm to a larger venue and place the open forum topic onto the agenda. The opportunity for discussion should be advertise to the campus early next week. Additional open forums will be scheduled as warranted.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Information:

Recommendation from the Facilities Planning Committee to modify their charge during the shared governance evaluation process in May.

“Recommend sequencing and priority of large district renovation and construction project” defining large project as “any project that is legally required to be bid by current Public Contract Code (currently \$15K or more), increases the Districts assignable square footage and/or repurposes District space”

Other:

Sue Mouck presented a communiqué received from the Academic Senate concerning the Accreditation Midterm Report. The attached letter from the faculty union was requested to be included with the minutes. The faculty union is not requesting any changes to the midterm report, but wants to go on record as disagreeing with statement under recommendation #4, that the evaluation of faculty includes evaluation of student learning outcomes as an extension of the instructional program review process.

Future Agendas:

1. **Acceptance of Accreditation Midterm-Report due March 15, 2011 - (Consultation) – February 24, 2011- Sue Mouck**
2. **Review of March 8, 2011 Governing Board Agenda (Information) - February 24, 2011- Dr. Houston**
3. **Campus Emergency Notification System (Consultation) - Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal/Eric Rulofson**
4. **BP 3530 and AP 3530 Weapons on Campus (Consultation) –March 3, 2011- Dr. Berkowitz**
5. **Fiscal Operations NIPR (Information) – March 3, 2011- Dave Clausen**
6. **Auxiliary Services (Bookstore) NIPR (Information) – March 3, 2011– Dave Clausen**
7. **Human Resource NIPR (Information) – March 3, 2011- David Burris**
8. **2011-2012 Budget Planning Proposal (Consultation) – March 3, 2011- Dr. Houston**
9. **Institutional Prioritization of Budget Requests (Consultation) – March 3, 2011- Dave Clausen**

**Academic Affairs
Approved by Senate on 11/2/10**

AP 4235 CREDIT BY EXAMINATION

Reference:

Title 5 Section 55050

*Note: This procedure is **optional** but it **legally advised** if the Board has approved a policy to allow credit by examination.*

Credit by Examination may be obtained by the following method:

- Credit by satisfactory completion of an examination administered by the District in lieu of completion of a course listed in the District's catalog.

Determination of Eligibility to Take the Examination

Any student may petition for credit by examination provided the following minimum requirements are met:

- The student must be currently registered in the college and in good standing.
- The course is listed in the District's catalog.
- The petitioner has completed six (6) semester units at Lassen Community College.
- The petitioner is in good standing at Lassen Community College with at least a 2.0 grade point average.
- The student may petition to be examined only in those subjects currently offered in the catalog and supplement, and for which the student has not previously earned a grade.
- The petitioner may earn no more than fifteen (15) semester units by credit by examination while at Lassen Community College.
- The petitioner may not challenge prerequisite courses after completing advanced courses.
- The course must be completed by the end of the semester in which application is made.
- Students with an approved 2 + 2 agreement will follow the procedures designated by the 2 + 2 agreement for the awarding of Credit by Examination and will be awarded the credit upon successful completion of the competencies.
- Students who participate in approved 2 + 2 agreements are exempt from the 15 semester unit maximum for credit by examination.
-

Credits acquired by examination are not applicable to meeting of such unit load requirements as Selective Service deferment, Veteran's, or Social Security benefits.

Credits acquired by examination shall not be counted in determining the 12 semester hours of credit in residence required for an Associate degree.

The student's academic record will clearly indicate that the credit was earned by examination. Unsuccessful credit by exam attempts will be recorded on a student's academic record with the grade NP.

The petition process will be approved by the Lassen Community College Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee and maintained in the Office of Instruction.

Black typeface above is **from current Lassen College Policy 6445 titled Credit By Examination**. Black typeface below is from the original Credit by Exam form.

How to Petition:

For any questions relating to the college's policy on credit by examination, see the Director of Enrollment Services. Students wishing to petition shall observe the following steps:

1. The student obtains the Credit by Exam form from the Admissions & Records Office.

The student is to complete the Credit by Exam form and submit it to the Director of Enrollment Services so that eligibility may be determined.

The student obtains counselor approval (academic review).

The student meets with the full-time instructor that will be the instructor of record of the course for which credit is sought. The instructor will appraise the student's background for such an examination.

The instructor will sign the petition for those students having adequate background and will then arrange with the student a time, date and place for taking the examination. The instructor will decide the nature of the test (i.e. standardized, instructor's own test, or other option).

The student obtains final approval from the Office of Instruction.

Recording of Results:

At the end of the semester the instructor will receive a grade report for the credit-by-exam course offered. The student's academic records shall be clearly annotated to reflect that credit was earned by examination. The student's academic records will also reflect unsuccessful credit by exam attempts with the grade NP.

2+2 Procedures

After completing an articulated 2+2 class with a grade of "B" or better, a high school student can qualify for college credit at Lassen Community College in the articulated course(s) by following these requirements at the college level:

- Must have completed 6 units and hold a 2.0 GPA or better at Lassen Community College

- The student obtains and completes the Lassen College 2+2 forms from the Admissions & Records Office at Lassen Community College or their high school counselor.
- The student attaches a copy of the high school transcript to the Lassen College 2+2 form. The student must have earned a grade of “B” or better in the articulated 2+2 course.
- The student will submit the completed 2+2 form and high school transcripts to the counselor for signature.
- The student will submit the fully completed Lassen College 2+2 form to the Admissions & Records Office. Payment for credit is required at this time. Fees applied will be the current enrollment fee per unit. This fee is nonrefundable. The Admissions & Records Office will then apply the high school grade earned in the 2+2 articulated course to the student’s permanent record.
- Credit will be identified on the students’ transcript as “Credit by Exam.”

Lassen Community College credit is only available up to five years after completing the 2+2 course at the high school level. “Credit by Exam” is granted based on articulated course content and exams or alternate assessments.

Credit By Exam Application

NAME: _____

STUDENT ID: _____

LAST

FIRST

MI

Semester:(circle one)

Spring

Summer

Fall

Year: _____

- | | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| 1. Are you currently enrolled at Lassen Community College | Yes | No |
| 2. Have you completed 6 semester units at Lassen Community College | Yes | No |
| 3. Do you have a G.P.A. of 2.0 or better? | Yes | No |
| 4. Is the course you wish to take credit by exam currently offered in the catalog? | Yes | No |
| 5. Have you taken other Lassen Community College courses credit by exam? | Yes | Yes |
| | No | |

I hereby request permission to attempt to earn credit by exam for the following course:

Course Number and Course Title (i.e. AJ 24 - Community Relations)

Units

Evidence of subject knowledge: _____

The student's academic record will clearly indicate that the credit was earned by examination. Unsuccessful credit by exam attempts will be recorded on a student's academic record with the grade NP.

APPROVED FOR EXAMINATION:

YES NO _____
Director of Enrollment Services Signature Date

YES NO _____
Counselor Signature Date

YES NO _____
Instructor Signature Date

YES NO _____
Office of Instruction Signature Date

Form approved by Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee on _____.

Form approved by Academic Senate on _____.

****Attach 2+2 FORM HERE****

Office of Primary Responsibility: _____

NOTE: The **red type** signifies **legally advised** language recommended from the Community College League and legal counsel (Liebert Cassidy Whitmore). The language in **black ink** is current Lassen College Policy 6445 titled Credit By Examination adopted on 11/18/80 and revised on 5/5/87, 2/25/97, 6/23/98, and 8/12/08. The information in **blue type** is additional language to consider including in this procedure.

Date Approved:
(Replaces current Lassen College Policy
6445)

LASSEN COLLEGE FACULTY ASSOCIATION
Lassen Community College
P.O. Box 3000
Susanville, CA 96130

Executive Board Members

Garrett Taylor, President
Robert Schofield, Vice President
Cindy Howe, Secretary

Ross Stevenson, Chief Negotiator
Michael Giampaoli, FT Negotiator
Jim Barnett, PT Negotiator

Colleen Baker, FT Member-At-Large
Gary Motta, PT Member-At-Large

January 27, 2011

Cheryl Aschenbach
President, Academic Senate

Subject: Accreditation Mid-Term Report

Colleagues:

The Academic Senate is afforded the opportunity, on behalf of the faculty, to comment on the content of the Mid-Term Report. The LCFA is not afforded the same forum for comment on aspects of the report relative to issues subject to bargaining. The LCFA asserts that Recommendation Four contains comments relative to faculty evaluations that is not accurate when compared to current contract provisions (Article 6). To that end, the LCFA requests the Academic Senate present the following LCFA comments regarding Recommendation Four at Consultation Council or any other forum where relevant.

The full text of Recommendation Four is provided for review:

Recommendation Four (Recommendation added 2008): Employee Evaluations

“The college must take steps to assure that evaluation processes of all personnel are current, and the evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Evaluation of faculty members must include, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.a &b)”

All administrators, managers, confidential and staff, with the exception of one, who will be completed next cycle due to collective bargaining agreement restrictions, have current evaluations in their personnel files as of June 2010. Announcements reminding all supervisors of the annual evaluations of confidential, management and administrators during December were distributed November 5, 2010. [4.1 Evaluation Announcement]

The evaluations of the nine (9) full-time faculty scheduled to be evaluated Fall 2010, were all completed by the end of the semester, December 17, 2010. Six part-time faculty have current evaluations effective January 31, 2011. The evaluations of an additional sixty (60) part-time faculty currently instructing for the college are scheduled to be completed prior to May 31, 2011.

Article 7.2.12 of the collective bargaining agreement obligates faculty to participate in and complete instructional program reviews. Student learning outcomes are included in the college's methodology for instructional program review. As the faculty evaluation process addresses participation in program review and assessment of student learning outcomes are embedded in the instructional program reviews, student learning outcomes are a component of faculty evaluations. [4.2 LCFT Contract, 4.3 *Instructional Program Review Policy and Procedures Handbook 9th edition November 2010*]

The Problem

The last paragraph describes a string of relationships that culminates with the affirmative statement that "student learning outcomes are a component of faculty evaluations." While this statement may placate the Accreditation Commission, this statement is in contradiction with various sections of the LCFA contract (e.g., Article 6, Articles 7.2, 7.4, 7.9 and Appendix F).

The Background

The inclusion of SLOs for each course has been considered by the LCFA as an extension of curriculum work (LCFA Contract Article 7); the preparation of SLO Assessment Plans and the preparation of SLO Assessment Plan results remains outside of LCFA contract provisions. In fact, those two issues remain on the bargaining table.

The Requested Remedy

The LCFA is not requesting that the administration change the disputed paragraph or sentence in light of ACCJC pressures and such. However, the LCFA is objecting to the paragraph and sentence in light of past District unilateral actions relative to creation and assignment of additional duties without benefit of the negotiating process. Unfortunately, the LCFA may again be required to file a "Demand to Bargain" relative to the evaluation of faculty members and those items (SLO Assessment Plans and Plan Results) not included in the contract. In summary, any extensions of student learning outcomes are NOT a component of faculty evaluations.

As representatives of the LCFA, the negotiating team thanks the Senate for this representation.

Respectfully,

Garrett Taylor, LCFA President
Ross Stevenson, LCFA Chief Negotiator
Michael Giampaoli, LCFA FT Negotiator
James Barnett, LCFA PT Negotiator
Robert Schofield, LCFA Vice President