

Minutes of the  
MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
November 30, 2009

APPROVED

PRESENT: Bruce Bishop, Monika Brannick, Valerie Chau, Haydn Davis, Ralph Ferges, Marty Furch, Brent Gowen, Lawrence Hahn, Barb Kelber, Teresa Laughlin, Stan Levy, Jackie Martin-Klement, Linda Morrow, Sue Norton, Patrick O'Brien, Kathleen Sheahan, Perry Snyder, Diane Studinka, Fari Towfiq

ABSENT: Roger Morrissette

GUESTS: John Aragon, Theresa Hogan Egkan

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by the president, Monika Brannick, at 2:00 p.m., in Room SU-30.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion 1 MSC Bishop, Chau: Faculty Senate approval of the minutes of November 23, 2009, as amended. The motion carried.

Senator Teresa Laughlin noted that Motion 9, recorded in the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of November 23, 2009, carried unanimously. She requested that the unanimous vote be duly noted: MSC Laughlin, Kelber: The Faculty Senate reaffirms the representative principle that the Faculty Senate vote reflects the voice of The Faculty. In order to better understand the will of The Faculty, the Faculty Senate will designate at least one Faculty Senate meeting per semester as a special meeting of The Faculty, intended for information, feedback, and discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

Monika Brannick referred to discussion reflected in the November 23, 2009 minutes regarding the investigation by Vice President Mark Vernoy relating to accusations made in emails by former students. At last week's meeting, Senate members discussed the possibility of inviting Vernoy to an upcoming Senate meeting to share the report on the investigation, but there was uncertainty about the conclusion of that discussion as it was reflected in the minutes of the meeting. After brief discussion, the Senators present concluded that because the issue is not clearly an Academic and Professional Matter, Vernoy would not be asked to address the Senate at this time.

Brannick also provided follow-up with regard to last week's discussion on the Public Safety Department and their division into two sections: an Academic Department and the Fire and Training Programs. A Director position (100%) and a Coordinator position (45%) will be created for the oversight of the training programs, replacing the two positions currently existing, one at 45% and one at 60%. The restructuring meets POST (Peace Officers Standards and Training) Accreditation requirements. Senators expressed interest in reviewing the specific language outlining those requirements. In addition, they are interested in examples of models utilized in other community colleges in the area.

Senator Ralph Ferges asked specifically about the shared governance process by which a department re-structuring such as this could have taken place. Monika Brannick stated that she would invite Dean Wilma Owens to an upcoming meeting to respond to the Senate's questions.

Public Comments: There were none.

Announcements: Brent Gowen announced the death of faculty member and administrator Gene Jackson. He passed away on Sunday, November 29, 2009. Senators reflected on his service to the college as President of The Faculty and the Faculty Senate, and as a faculty member and administrator.

Barb Kelber added that Dean Jackson was a much-beloved member of the English Department; he was teaching an early-morning English 100 class this semester.

Monika Brannick announced that the State Academic Senate is again sponsoring the Hayward Award for "Excellence in Education." Each college may nominate one faculty member to receive this prestigious honor, which includes a cash award of \$1,250. All faculty, both inside and outside of the classroom, are eligible for consideration, including previous nominees who did not receive the award. Four recipients, one from each area of the state, will be chosen and honored at the Board of Governors meeting in Sacramento. Each recipient is also eligible to be forwarded as a nominee for the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) Professor of the Year Award.

More information can be obtained at the State Academic Senate website: [www.asccc.org](http://www.asccc.org). Completed applications must be received in the Academic Senate office by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, December 14, 2009.

Summer Bridge Program:

Theresa Hogan Egkan provided an update on the Summer Bridge Program, commencing summer, 2010, at Escondido High School. The pilot program will identify 35 or 40 students whose Compass scores place them in Math 15. Those students will be part of an intervention program during the summer session, working in the lab with a faculty member, two tutors, and a counselor, focusing on the Math 15 curriculum. Students will participate in various activities and study groups every week, and on Fridays will be invited to participate in a particular activity with a counselor. At the end of the session, a post-test will determine the appropriate course for the students in the fall semester.

Egkan outlined the plan for Learning Communities which will be scheduled for the fall semester as a follow-up to the Summer Bridge Program.

A question and answer period followed, and Egkan noted that the federal grant program will require evaluation of statistical information provided each semester on the learning outcomes of students who participate in these Learning Communities.

Egkan also distributed "Now You're In College" brochures, which outline the differences between high school and college and provide students and their parents with useful tips on a successful transition. The brochures are available online through the Counseling Department.

Committee Appointments: There were no committee appointments.

Curriculum:

Motion 2 MSC Levy, Chau: Faculty Senate ratification of the Curriculum items dated November 18, 2009. The motion carried.

Regular Effective  
Student Contact:

At last week's meeting, Senators were given copies of recommendations of the Curriculum Committee's Distance Learning Subcommittee regarding a proposed Palomar College Instructor/Student Contact Policy for Distance Learning Courses. The proposed policy responds to one element of Accreditation Recommendation #3. Based on the policies adopted by Mt. San Jacinto College, the recommendations focus on ensuring regular effective contact between students and their online instructors.

Title 5 regulations do not make a distinction between regular and online instruction beyond the need to have a separate curriculum approval process and the need to ensure regular effective contact. Therefore, it is assumed that those qualities of regular effective contact for the face-to-face environment should also be applied, wherever possible, to the distance education situation. The distance education guidelines require colleges to develop a policy regarding regular effective contact that addresses "the type and frequency of interaction appropriate to each distance education course/section or session."

Monika Brannick outlined the recommendations which were included for review in the Curriculum Consent Calendar. These recommendations can be found in the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of November 23.

Senator Bruce Bishop expressed concern regarding the potential implications of this policy. He noted that the faculty generally resists prescriptive direction as it might relate to our teaching methods and our approaches to "effective contact" in our face-to-face classes. A policy like this one could open the door for broader policies which we might reasonably resist. Discussion followed.

Senator Barb Kelber acknowledged that the Senate's concerns are well founded. As the college designs and implements policies in response to the Accreditation Recommendations, extra vigilance will be necessary to maintain the boundaries between these policies and the formal evaluation process conducted through the Tenure and Evaluation Review Board (TERB). In addition, these policies will be reviewed by the PFF (Palomar Faculty Federation).

Senate members discussed the document and made some minor suggestions for change.

Motion 3

MSC Gowen, Chau: Faculty Senate ratification of the Recommendations of the Distance Learning Subcommittee for the Palomar College Instructor/Student Contact Policy for Distance Learning Courses. The motion carried.

Academic Technology  
Committee Report:

Kathleen Sheahan provided an updated version of a draft report from the Academic Technology Committee on Validation of Preparedness to Teach Online.

V A L I D A T I O N O F P R E P A R E D N E S S T O T E A C H O N L I N E

---

PALOMAR COLLEGE  
Fall 2009

---

DRAFT REPORT

ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

P A L O M A R C O L L E G E  
A C A D E M I C T E C H N O L O G Y C O M M I T T E E

The Senate Academic Technology Committee (ATC) developed a rating instrument that would identify the necessary and desirable attributes and resources that an effective online course would have. When this instrument is deemed acceptable by the ATC and the Academic Senate, it may serve as a series of benchmarks that new or experienced online instructors can use to evaluate their own online course. The rating instrument could be used in formative and summative evaluations of online courses. A rating of "Accomplished Online Course" will document the online instructor's preparedness to teach an online class at Palomar College. A rating of "Incomplete Online Course" will indicate areas that require revision.

<b>Category 1: Online Organization and Design</b>		
<b>A. Course Navigability and Organization</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Syllabus is easily located		
Organization of course content is consistent throughout the course (e.g. organized by weeks, units, chapters)		
Navigability is clear, simple and user friendly		
Links to other parts of the course or external sources such as web sites are accurate and up-to-date		
Required instructional materials are easily located		
<b>Comments regarding navigability and organization</b>		
<b>B. Syllabus</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Course objectives and Student Learning Outcomes are stated		
Course grading is clearly explained		
Course schedule is summarized in one place and clearly identifies overall plan of the course.		
Due dates for course requirements (tests, assignments, discussion board posts) are clearly identified		
Syllabus is available in a printer-friendly format (e.g. PDF)		
Contact information/availability of instructor is available		
<b>Comments regarding syllabus:</b>		
<b>C. Aesthetic design</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Attention is paid to effective aesthetics principles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typeface is easy to read</li> <li>• Sufficient contrast between text and background makes information easy to read</li> <li>• Design keeps course pages to a comfortable length with white space</li> <li>• Appropriate images support course content</li> <li>• Layout of course is visually and functionally consistent</li> </ul>		
Language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spelling and grammar are consistent and accurate</li> <li>• Clear directions are given for each task or assignment</li> </ul>		
<b>Comments regarding aesthetic design:</b>		
<b>D. Student Support and Resources</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Link(s) to Virtual Resource Center is provided or an individual customized support site is available.		
Links to course specific web sites are provided		
A student orientation for the course is offered, online or on campus		
<b>Comments student support and resources</b>		
<b>Category 1: Overall Comments</b>		

<b>Category 2: Instructional Design Promotes Interaction</b>		
<b>A. Instructor-Student Interaction</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Instructor initiates contact with students in a variety of ways (such as) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Website announcements</li> <li>• Participation in a discussion board</li> <li>• Chat sessions or virtual meetings</li> <li>• Email</li> <li>• Participation in online group collaboration projects</li> <li>• Face-to-face meetings (review sessions, scheduled meetings)</li> <li>• Response to student work in progress</li> </ul> Podcasts or voice-enabled messages		
Instructor establishes his/her availability for students		
Instructor engages students in active learning activities		
Regular and prompt feedback is provided (such as) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sample assignments illustrate instructor expectations</li> <li>• detailed instructions and tips for completing assignments are provided</li> <li>• practice tests or quizzes are provided when appropriate</li> <li>• course promotes an active discussion area which encourages students to reply to each other</li> </ul> peer review opportunities are available where appropriate		
All students are treated with respect		
<b>Comments regarding instructor-student interaction:</b>		
<b>B. Student Support Interaction</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Students introduce themselves (e.g. develop student homepages) and are encouraged to respond to others		
Appropriate online conduct is described (i.e. netiquette in email and discussion board)		
"Ice-breaker" activity to get acquainted (online activity or during on-campus orientation)		
Student participation is tracked and an effort is made to contact non-participators (e.g. email, phone)		
<b>Comments regarding student-student interaction:</b>		
<b>C. Instructional Organization</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Pace of delivery of course content is well thought-out and managed (as revealed in posted schedules, calendars, etc)		
Course content is organized for more manageable learning		
<b>Comments regarding instructional organization:</b>		
<b>Category 2: Overall Comments</b>		

<b>Category 3: Appropriate Use of Technology</b>		
<b>A. Multimedia</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Use of audio are used where appropriate (such as)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• audio clips of famous speeches</li> <li>• voice emails/other voice tools (e.g. Blackboard tools)</li> <li>• ESL and other language classes</li> </ul>		
Video clips are used where appropriate (such as)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• historical video clips</li> <li>• clips of movies/videos</li> <li>• links to streaming video</li> <li>• Screencast video of PowerPoint presentations and other computer screen demonstrations</li> </ul>		
Other Uses of Technology		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screen animations for instructional exercises are provided</li> <li>• Webquests/Web Expeditions are provided</li> <li>• Crossword or word search puzzles are provided</li> <li>• Matching and game-show-style games are provided</li> <li>• PowerPoint presentations are used (instructor-developed and/or student-developed)</li> <li>• Computer simulated demonstrations are used</li> <li>• Collaborative exercises/activities are used</li> </ul>		
Portfolios to share/peer review used		
<b>Category 3: Overall Comments</b>		

<b>Category 4: Universal Access</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Course design ensures access for all students by meeting Section 508 standards ( <a href="http://www.webaim.org/intro/#principles">http://www.webaim.org/intro/#principles</a> )		
Alternative formats of materials provided, when possible (e.g., optional print packet of extensive reading materials, CD of audio clips used in course, etc.)		
Audio, video and graphic material are available with closed captions, descriptions, transcripts		
<b>Category 4: Overall Comments</b>		

<b>Category 5: Assessment/Evaluation</b>		
<b>A. Assessment Measures</b>		
	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Assessment measures are consistent with stated learning objectives		
Grading of student work is done in a timely manner and feedback is provided to students		
Criteria used to evaluate participation in online discussions are clearly explained		
Link to the testing center is provided if on-campus testing is required (i.e. <a href="http://www.palomar.edu/tutoring/">http://www.palomar.edu/tutoring/</a> )		
<b>Comments regarding assessment/evaluation:</b>		
<b>B. Security Measures and Academic Integrity</b>		
	<b>Accomplished</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>
Appropriate security measures are enabled to conduct testing (such as)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test limitations are placed on exams (time limits, randomization, etc.)</li> <li>• Exams are password protected</li> <li>• Exams will be proctored in a supervised environment</li> <li>• Exams will be taken in the presence of an instructor</li> <li>• Timed tests are used, if the Blackboard system is employed</li> <li>• Tests are composed of question pools where possible to ensure online students have equivalent, but different online tests</li> </ul>		
Several measures of learning are used in the assessment process such as writing, web assignments, discussion board posting, and collaboration projects		
Academic Integrity is ensured (such as)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Palomar College academic integrity standards are provided.</li> <li>• Students are required to sign academic integrity forms.</li> </ul>		
Anti-plagiarism software will be used.		
<b>Comments regarding security and academic integrity:</b>		
<b>Category 5: Overall Comments</b>		

Principle Resources Consulted

Blackboard, Inc. (2009). "2010 blackboard exemplary course program rubric." Retrieved October 29, 2009 from

<http://www.blackboard.com/Communities/Exemplary-Courses.aspx> .

Graham, C., Cagitay, K., Lim, B., Craner, J., and Duffy, T. (March/April 2001). "Seven principles of effective teaching: a practical lens for evaluating online courses," The Technology Source.

MarylandOnline. (2006). "Quality matters: inter-institutional quality assurance in online learning." Retrieved August 15, 2008 from

<http://www.qualitymatters.org/Rubric.htm> .

North American Council for Online Learning. (2006). National standards for quality online teaching. Retrieved October 3, 2009

from <http://www.inacol.org/research/nationalstandards/NACOL%20Standards%20Quality%20Online%20Teaching.pdf> .

Rubric for online instruction. "What does a high quality online course look like?" California State University, Chico. Retrieved

September 22, 2009 from <http://www.csuchico.edu/celt/roi/> .



### **Validation of Preparedness Process for Online Instruction**

*For Faculty Currently Teaching Online or Hybrid classes...*

#### **Online Preparedness Checklist**

In order to validate the preparedness of faculty who currently teach online or hybrid classes, the following process will be used:

**How?** Using the "Preparedness Checklist" designed by the Academic Technology Committee.

**Who will conduct the validation?** A subgroup of the ATC and a department designee will validate the online/hybrid course of the faculty member.

**When?** The subgroup will begin the process in Spring 2010. The goal is to validate 10% of the faculty currently teaching online in Spring 2010. Members of the ATC will volunteer to be among the first faculty to receive the validation.

**Validation Process & Mentors.** After a faculty member has completed the Validation of Preparedness process, he/she will be invited to volunteer as a mentor to a faculty member who is preparing to teach online for the first time.

**If additional training is required.** If it is determined through this process that a faculty member is underprepared in some way, the ATC will recommend that he/she participate in all or part of the Preparedness Training Program. The faculty member will be scheduled for a follow-up validation in that area during an upcoming semester.

**Concerns of Confidentiality.** The ATC subgroup will maintain a master list of the faculty who have participated in the Validation of Preparedness Process. Once the validation is completed, the checklist documents used by the subgroup will be returned to the faculty member or will be destroyed. In no way shall this validation checklist be used in connection with the evaluations of the Tenure and Evaluations Review Board.

Note: In Spring 2010, a new ATC workgroup will gather to work in conjunction with the ATG to create a "Virtual Resource Center" for use within all online/hybrid/blackboard classes.

*For Faculty Interested in Teaching Online or Hybrid classes for the First Time...*

#### **Online Preparedness Training Program**

A 5-part Professional Development training program will be offered to include both pedagogical and technical preparation for online instruction.

**Training Program** to include courses in the following 5 areas:

1. Online Organization and Design
  - a. Course Navigability and Organization
  - b. Syllabus
  - c. Aesthetic Design
  - d. Student Support and Resources
  - e. Orientation for Students
2. Instructional Design that Promotes Interaction
  - a. Instructor-Student Interaction
  - b. Student-Student Interaction
  - c. Instructional Organization
3. Appropriate Use of Technology
  - a. Multimedia: Audio, Video, other
4. Universal Access
5. Assessment/Evaluation
  - a. Assessment Measures
  - b. Security Measures and Academic Integrity

**When?** Training to begin in Spring 2010. The 5 training courses can be completed individually or during an intensive "boot camp" session. The intensive program is to begin in summer 2010.

**PD Facilitators.** Faculty who are experienced with online methodologies will be asked to work in conjunction with the ATC to offer these training courses.

Kathleen Sheahan reminded Senate members that the Academic Technology Committee (ATC) currently has six Work Groups focused on different components of online instruction. Sheahan outlined the categories listed in the document.

Discussion followed, and Senate members provided several comments and suggestions:

- Is participation in the process voluntary or mandatory? If the process is outside of the Tenure & Evaluations Review process, how will it be overseen or enforced?
- How will part-time faculty be affected, and will completion of the training be included in requirements before they are hired?
- Can more than one faculty member from a specific department be included in the review committee validating the instructor's course?

Senators noted that Department Chairs would be informed of faculty who could be scheduled to teach online based on their successful participation in this process.

Senators expressed concern that this might present specific problems for part-time faculty members, as they do not have the job security or the rights to participation that full-time faculty might expect in the same situation.

Senator Barb Kelber noted that the Tenure and Evaluations Review Board would be scrutinizing the policy and working to maintain the boundary between formal evaluations and new policies designed to validate preparedness to teach online.

Senator Kathleen Sheahan assured the Senate that the PFF representative to the Academic Technology Committee has agreed to present the proposed policy for review by the collective bargaining unit.

Senators were reminded that the process was created in direct response to the Accreditation Recommendation requiring that the district create a process for Validation of Preparedness to Teach Online. One Senator also pointed out that members of the ATC have seen this as an opportunity for Palomar to provide additional and beneficial training to faculty teaching online classes. ASG representative John Aragon agreed, emphasizing the opportunity to improve programs and services for students.

Motion 4

MSC Sheahan, Laughlin: Faculty Senate approval of a Pilot Program for Validation of Preparedness to Teach Online as outlined in the Academic Technology Committee's proposal; implicit in the Senate's approval is the expectation of review by the Palomar Faculty Federation, as well as refinement of the proposed protocols based on the outcomes of the pilot program. The motion carried.

Senate members expressed their gratitude to the members of the ATC for all of their work on the document.

Policies & Procedures:

At last week's meeting, Senate members were provided with copies of BP/AP 4400, Community Services, which have been discussed and finalized by the Workforce Development Workgroup. Senators are asked to review the document for discussion and/or action at next week's meeting.

Faculty Senate Goals:

Senate members have discussed the Faculty Senate Goals for 2009-10 over the past several weeks. An updated copy was provided with minor punctuation and grammatical changes.

**FACULTY SENATE GOALS FOR 2009-10**

<b>GOAL</b>	<b>ACCOMPLISHED IN 2009-10</b>	<b>IN PROGRESS</b>	<b>ONGOING IN 2010-11</b>
1	Develop a process for administrative retreat rights		
2	Develop a procedure for addressing a faculty member's charge that a student has engaged in academic dishonesty.		
3	Participate in the follow-up accreditation report; prepare for and facilitate the commission's follow-up site visit.		
4	Maintain oversight and reporting relationships in the following areas: a. Basic Skills/Title V HSI Committee b. Academic Technology Committee c. Workforce and Community Development Advisory Group d. Academic Technology Resources Center.		
5	Increase faculty service on committees and councils by a. Ensuring that membership calls are sent out regularly b. Reminding faculty of the importance of service on councils and committees.		
6	Monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Trac-Dat data-collection system in Student Learning Outcomes Assessment.		
7	Participate in the design and implementation of the Strategic Plan 2013.		
8	Participate in the design and implementation of an integrated planning and resource allocation model.		
9	Participate in the review and revision of the college's Policies and Procedures		
10	Review proposed guidelines related to the academic and professional elements of online courses and instruction.		
11	Begin work toward a formal document delineating roles and jurisdictions of the Faculty Senate and the Palomar Faculty Federation.		

Motion 5

MSC Gowen, Chau: Faculty Senate approval of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Goals. The motion carried.

Review/Revision of Forms:

Monika Brannick followed up on an inquiry made by Senators regarding the wording on the Application for Audit: "The fee to audit a class is \$15.00 per unit. Students enrolled in 10 or more units may audit 3 units free (may be 3 one-unit classes) The \$15 per unit audit fee will automatically be charged if the student drops below 10 units."

Brannick stated that the wording in the Administrative Procedure is in line with current Ed Code.

Barb Kelber shared a suggestion she received from a Senator regarding the Application for Audit form discussed at the November 16<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting. The suggestion states that "During tough fiscal times, the Faculty Senate directs the faculty to temporarily eliminate the student permission of class audits and enrollment into overlapping classes."

Senators discussed the statement and agreed that the Faculty Senate does not traditionally "direct" the faculty. A Senator stated that he has received comments from several colleagues emphasizing that the "audit" option is often essential for students involved in performance activities.

This matter will be discussed further at next week's meeting.

Learning Outcomes  
Council:

Marty Furch encouraged all faculty to participate in the discussion of GE Institutional Student Learning Outcomes, described in an email recently distributed to all faculty. To date, Furch has received only one response. Further discussion will occur at the LOC meeting later this week.

During a TracDat presentation to the Faculty Senate several weeks ago, some Senate members questioned how TracDat data is reported. Marty Furch shared a portion of an email exchange she initiated with Scott Johnson, the Nuventive Sales Rep:

Question from Marty Furch, SLO Coordinator

I'm getting some feedback about reporting issues and how flexible TracDat is with its configuration. Specifically, ...there is concern that the departments/disciplines be able to control how the data is reported out. As I think you and I have talked, faculty across the country have a concern that student achievement will be tied to faculty evaluation; suppose, for example, that you are the only person teaching a course. The results of an assessment may indicate (to someone) that you are not doing a good job. Given the situations we have at our community college, in particular, with the immense diversity of our student populations, institutions are greatly challenged by trying to set the bar and then successfully teach it. (Hope you're following me here.) So, the question that I need to answer is: Can we configure the program so that the assessment results can be aggregated and not linked to a specific instructor – if the department so chooses?

Reply from: Scott Johnson, Nuventive Sales Rep, October 14, 2009

With TracDat, the departments can control completely the information that gets reported out. Since they are the ones that attach the evidence (not administrators) and document the result of an outcome (not administrators) for example, they can strip out any identifiers such as sections of courses and of course any student information.

Nothing in TracDat gets reported up automatically without the department allowing it to happen.

If you have a course that has only one instructor and you are doing course level assessment you would need to document the result (again within the department) in a way that points to the course outcomes not the instructor. But again this is in the hands of the department.

Or the department may only summarize their findings at the program level and not attach data that might be "incriminating" to an individual. Then even if the assessment results are flowing upward to a summary reporting unit, the only information that the summary reporting unit would see are those results that the department documented in aggregate. Does that make sense?

The real purpose of TracDat is to help an institution determine whether or not the outcomes at any level are being achieved and has nothing to do with faculty/staff performance. For example that is why we have decided to not build in course evaluation functionality in Trac Dat as some of our competitors have since you could easily tie in the course evaluation results to a specific instructor.

Hopefully this answers their concerns, maybe you could give me a specific example of something that TracDat does that would concern some of the faculty there. I could show you how this could be handled in TracDat.

Student Services  
Planning Council:

Valerie Chau provided a written report of the Student Services Planning Council meeting held on Wednesday, November 25, 2009:

1. Mark Vernoy: SPC directed that a PFF member will be added to the SSPC. But a new person didn't show up today.
2. Herman Lee: Drops for Non Payment of Fees: Summarized other local colleges' drop for non-payment of fees policies. Mentioned it will require some software enhancements to provide Palomar with a system to automatically drop students for non payments. Discussed setting max units for enrollment so that students cannot fill up classes they don't intend to take. Suggested cap is 19 units after some discussion. Students affected most might be engineering majors if the cap is lower. Mark Vernoy passed around a suggested fee payment schedule for August 2010, showing students

enrolling Aug 1 – 13 having 5 days to pay, and starting on Aug 14, the days to pay get fewer until on Aug 19 and afterward students must pay fees at time of registration. This allows students on wait lists to be auto-enrolled when students are dropped for non-payment of fees. Discussion took place about best way to communicate these changes to students.

3. Tony Cruz: Suggested fundraising changes to support Campus Police: Provided a handout with these suggestions:  
Increase citation fines from \$3 to \$5,  
Enforce parking in student lots during intercessions and make new intercession parking permit available for \$10  
Charge a fee to non District entities for parking  
Charge a fee for District functions if they require extra security staffing  
Charge \$5 fee for 'fix it' tickets  
Charge a fee for copies of police reports  
Charge a fee for implement tows and use tow or parking boot for 5 or more unpaid citations
4. Jayne Conway: H1N1 update: Palomar has no vaccine; might get some by spring semester. Currently Mesa College and SDSU have some on hand.
5. Mark Vernoy: Pacific Coast Athletic Conference Program Review of Palomar Athletic Dept. went well but Scott is not present to discuss.
6. Events mentioned during sharing time:
  - a. Dec 1 students will have an alcohol awareness event
  - b. Campus Police Toy Drive is continuing
  - c. Grant Funded Student Programs still collecting for teens, but EOPS did get enough contributions for their Thanksgiving Drive.
  - d. There was an excellent high school counselors event last week
  - e. Phi Theta Kappa collected more than 1600 canned food items for our Food Bank
  - f. So far spring semester enrollment is up 11% but there are 400 fewer class sections being offered for Spring 2010. And 50% of the sections are now closed.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Neault Kelber, Secretary