

Educational Policy Committee (EPC) Meeting

Minutes of February 5, 2013

Committee Members: Steve Aurilio (Chair); Nohel Corral; Brian Daniel; Katharine Harer; Imelda Herмосillo; John Mosby; Joe Morello; Rashin Parsa; Cal Robinson; Janet Weber; Linda Whitten.

Members Not Present: Brian Daniel; Imelda Herмосillo; Rashin Parsa; Janet Weber

Guest: Nohel Corral for Dr. Joi Blake
Scribe: Steve Aurilio

Motion/Second/Carried = MSC
Timekeeper: Steve Aurilio

- I. CALL TO ORDER: 2:08 PM by Steve Aurilio
- II. QUORUM? (Quorum is 50% + 1) Yes: (7 of 11 members present)
- III. ADOPTION OF TODAY'S AGENDA: MSC: Linda/John/Carried
- IV. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES: MSC: Joe/John/Carried
Correction to previous minutes noted by Nohel Corral: On page 4, reference "Nohel was concerned about whether the (SP&G) document was complete" to "We discussed the document and determined that it was complete, and that Leigh Anne Shaw was just going to follow-up to make sure that the document wasn't a draft." Amended motion approved.
- V. SCHEDULED PRESENTATIONS: Nohel Corral (for Dr. Joi Blake)
- VI. OLD BUSINESS: Discussion as follows:

The Use of SLOs in Faculty Evaluations: (Cal Robinson)

Cal asked if the issue concerning the use of SLOs had been resolved with respect to their use in faculty evaluations, which would violate work contracts. Steve explained that ACCJC and accreditation language requires that SLOs be incorporated into course syllabi, and will also be included in our Faculty Handbook. However, such use of SLOs would not violate faculty work contract provisions in that SLOs would not be used for faculty evaluation, but faculty themselves could voluntarily choose to mention their work in the SLO process as part of their own self-evaluation within the faculty evaluation process.

Katharine commented that this was consistent with what she had reported at our last meeting, that she had heard through a report made to the Executive Committee of the AFT of a new committee that has been formed to review our

employee evaluation procedures, and that Regina Stanback-Stroud and Harry Joel are members of that new committee. Katharine said that the new review committee was working on a compromise wherein SLOs would not be used to evaluate faculty but might still be used by individual faculty themselves in their own self-assessment. She said that other colleges were already doing this, and that is why it was being considered. She said that the committee is still working on the details, and that it would still run everything by the Educational Policy Committee for input, and at some point it would become policy.

Linda posed a question to Cal as to whether what an employee chooses to bring up about self-involvement in SLOs could later be used against him/her, and Cal said that it most likely could not because of the employee contract. While ACCJC and accreditation require SLOs in syllabi, it would not open the door for SLOs to be used for anything other than as an assessment tool. Steve also raised the resolutions that were established by the SLOAC Committee and adopted by the Academic Senate that supported this, as well.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

Discussion as follows:

Nohel Corral, Interim Dean of Counseling, speaking in place of Dr. Joi Blake, Vice President of Student Services, on the topics of (1) *Certificates of Achievement and A.A. Degrees*; and (2) *An Academic Standards Committee*.

Certificates of Achievement and A.A. Degree at Commencement: Nohel Corral

Nohel said the question has been posed as to whether we want to recognize those students that are awarded transcriptable recognized certificates (18+ units) at commencement. He added that we have received positive feedback from other Skyline groups about the prospect, and wanted to run it by Ed. Policy. A major concern was about logistics, i.e. would the recognition occur at the current graduation ceremony, or would it occur at a different ceremony.

The EPC Committee opened discussion on the proposal. Cal and Katharine asked how many certificates would typically be awarded. Nohel said that in the 2009-10 academic year there were 117 certificates issued. In 2010-11 we had 207 certificates issued. In 2011-12 we had 175 certificates issued.

We also asked about how many graduating students would be receiving both a degree along with a certificate, as well as those receiving a certificate only without graduating. Cal and Nohel commented that graduation ceremonies usually mention what majors students are graduating in, along with special achievements and student involvement, such as Honors, ASTEP, TRIO, etc. However, recognition of earned certificates has not been part of the ceremony.

Katharine was concerned that while students should be given as much recognition as possible, the current ceremonies already have a lot going on and it might be difficult to add anything more to that process, and likewise people are already overloaded with events. Thus, how do we logistically make it work? Nohel noted that there were a number of students who would be seeking to get into the career track and getting a certificate to get a job, without a degree, but wasn't sure of the numbers. Linda suggested that perhaps each division should have a certificate ceremony to recognize earned certificates by students, rather than having it as part of the general graduation ceremony.

The Committee discussed how much longer current commencement exercises might be if we add the certificate recognition process to it. Linda said she believed it would add about 10-15 more minutes, and that those who are receiving a certificate only would probably not attend commencement, while John believed that students receiving only certificates would attend commencement. Linda said that we should print up a nice displayable certificate with a seal printed up at the division level. Joe added like a diploma. Joe was concerned with space. John said that space shouldn't be a problem.

It was agreed that the EPC supported the idea of student recognition of certificates. Transcriptable certificates (18+ units) would be recognized at commencement or separate ceremony, while non-transcriptable certificates would be recognized at the division or department levels.

It was suggested that we table the matter until specific questions could be answered, such as the number of students and certificates expected, logistical space, timeline for the procedure to begin, etc. The matter was then tabled.

Establishing an Academic Standards Committee: Nohel Corral (for Dr. Joi Blake)

Nohel then raised for consideration a proposal for an academic standards committee. He said that, currently, our registrar looks at petitions from students applying to be exempted from district policies (i.e. graduation requirements, return to good academic standing, etc.). The new committee would be the body to make decisions concerning a student's appeal.

Steve asked if the proposed committee would be a recommendation-only committee or one that had execution authority. Nohel said that it would have execution power, as a body of a participatory process, to take the process off of one person having to make decisions on appeals.

The new committee would consist of the deans of matriculation and enrollment services, faculty members from various disciplines so that there would be fair representation from different areas.

John said that currently, all of the petitions are reviewed by our registrar, Sue Lorenzo. John may then give a second review, if need be, and to make the final call. John said that there about 1,200 petitions are received every semester. All petitions are screened for investigation. The new committee would be the end point in the petition appeals decision process. John said that in most situations, appeals usually result in previous decisions being upheld, but that extenuating circumstances can justify overriding policy or earlier decisions.

Cal suggested that the first review should remain with Sue Lorenzo, and that she could then refer for second review to administration (i.e. John and Joi) those that needed deeper consideration, and if need be to the new committee for third review and decision, rather than encumbering the committee with the first review task. He also said that we could benefit from a marketing campaign that basically tells students that if they have a such-and-such situation, they could expect a such-and-such outcome on appeal.

Nohel said if he or Joi got further information or needed to bring the matter back to the EPC they would do so. We tabled further discussion on the matter.

Items of Discussion for next EPC Meeting:

EPC Committee members, along with outside faculty, staff, and administrators, are invited to make suggestions for items of discussion for the Educational Policy Committee. Agendas must be sent out no later than 72 hours before committee meetings. Anyone having an item for the agenda should provide it to the EPC Chair no later than 5 working days prior to next EPC meeting date. Thank you!

None.

Adjournment

No other business was discussed, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Next Meeting

Next EPC meeting: **Tuesday, March 5, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 6-6205.**

Thanks to everyone for attending and participating in the work of this Committee. You are all very much appreciated!

Steve Aurilio, Chair
Educational Policy Committee