



Minutes of the
MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
May 7, 2012

APPROVED

PRESENT: Monika Brannick, Melinda Carrillo, Jenny Fererro, Katy French, Lori Graham, Barb Kelber, Greg Larson, Teresa Laughlin, Pam McDonough, Christina Moore, Linda Morrow, Wendy Nelson, Patrick O'Brien, Lillian Payn, Perry Snyder, Diane Studinka, Fari Towfiq

ABSENT: Bruce Bishop, Haydn Davis, Jackie Martin

GUESTS: Dillon Emerick, Katie Townsend-Merino

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 Laughlin, Towfiq: Faculty Senate approval of the minutes of April 30, 2012, as amended. The motion carried.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

Announcements: Patrick O'Brien welcomed Katie Townsend-Merino, one of the new Senators who will officially be seated at next week's meeting.

Agenda Changes: Due to guests being present, Senators agreed to suspend the agenda to discuss Information Item A, Enrollment Management Policy.

Enrollment Management Policy: Members of the Senate received the following correspondence from faculty in the Behavioral Sciences department:

Faculty Senate,

As you are aware, the administration added the equivalent of 100 3-unit courses to the Spring 2012 schedule on a one-time basis as a result of a 22 million dollar Palomar College ending fund balance. A total of 71 class sections were added campus-wide. While we in the Behavioral Sciences department welcome any course additions, we have concerns about the way in which those courses were distributed.

In inquiring about why, in a multi-disciplinary department, all seven of Behavioral Science's added courses were slated only for psychology, we were told they were added "strictly by the objective criteria of student demand."i Just as is most likely the case in any of our departments, after so many course cuts, almost any course offered by a Behavioral Science discipline on the main campus would fill to capacity quickly. Hence, there is apparent "student demand" for all courses. When we asked how "student demand" was determined, we were told that it was based on the number of students on a wait-list that were not admitted to a class. There are several problems with the administration's use of the measure of "Student Demand". Let us just list a few here:

1. The measure is **unreliable**. This measures only the number of students on a wait list, but not student demand.

- Many (perhaps most) students do not attempt to add a class simply because it is full.

- If it is full with a full wait list, students cannot get on the wait list to be counted in this measure. So if a class has a wait list of 5 students and there are 40 additional students wanting to add, that class will still have a student demand number of 5.
- All of us have experience with students needing to add a closed class. Often many students attempt to crash the course, come to an instructor's office hours pleading to be added, or (at least has been our experience in Behavioral Science) *refuse* to leave a classroom. However, these students are **not** counted in this measure.
- Wait lists are different sizes for different sections. Some classes have large wait lists, some have small ones.
- The measure used by the administration used the **total** number of students remaining on the wait list from **all** the sections of a course without dividing by the number of sections. This means that larger disciplines will grow at the expense of smaller disciplines.
- An instructor who manages her wait lists such that she adjusts the wait list to meet the number of students she can reasonably add will, by this measure, ensure that there is "zero student demand" measured for her course. Thus she will not be able to add any more of this course in the future, despite there being strong student demand.
- This measure also conflates several student populations (CSU transfer, UC transfer, basic skills, certificate, technical/vocational, etc.), treating them as one homogenous population. This measure will ensure that the largest population's demands will be met at the expense of the smaller population.

2. The measure was applied **arbitrarily**.

- Even if we assume that this measure for student demand is valid (and we have good reasons for thinking that it is not), the administration did not consistently apply it.
- Below are the numbers given to us by the administration when we requested them. The numbers on the right are the number of students that remained on the wait list for a particular course this Fall semester. The numbers for English were given to us verbally and are close approximations and we are not sure if they represent one course (e.g., all sections of ENG 100) or multiple English courses.

English	600 (Approximate)
Psych/Soc 105 Marriage and Family: student demand number:	544
Psych/Soc 125 Human Sexuality	259
Psych/Soc 120 Social Psychology	251
Psych/Soc 205 Statistics	145
Psych 100 Intro	144

- In our meeting with an administrator, it was stated that based on the numbers above, English was given the equivalent of 20 3-unit sections to add. It was then revealed, "that **if we had gone strictly by numbers** Psychology would have received 17 or so sections based solely on its Psych 105 numbers." In fact, Psychology received only seven sections.
- Psychology was, moreover, given the **discretion** to offer courses other than the ones that were in the greatest demand according to the official measure. Psychology ended up adding **NO** Marriage and Family sections even though its "student demand number" was two times greater than any other psychology course. This is because Psychology, rightly, recognized the fact that this course had both lower student demand and need (see below) despite what the administration's numbers indicated.
- Given the fact that that the administration did not distribute courses based on their own numbers (they did not go "strictly by the numbers"), nor did they ask that those courses which their numbers indicated as the greatest-in-demand in fact be offered, **it appears that there was a different decision process actually guiding course distribution other than the process described to the inquiring faculty.**

We are not suggesting any maliciousness on the part of the administration. In fact, we suspect that when they started selecting which disciplines and departments would get courses, they made an implicit recognition that "Student Need" was a much better means of course distribution than "Student Demand". Thus they attempted to adjust their criterion *ex tempore*, as it were, to fit this implicit recognition.

3. Student Need is a more appropriate way to distribute courses than Student Demand.

- When we are asked to schedule classes, we are requested to do so based on "student need".
- We are urged to meet student need by focusing "on our primary mission of GE/ Transfer, Career/Technical, and Basic Skills, ensuring that the courses scheduled fulfill certificate, degree, or transfer requirements."
- Scheduling and adding courses based on student need is aligned with the mission of Palomar College. Adding courses based solely on "student demand" is not.

The faulty measure and use of student demand, however, reveals the more serious issue: There was **no faculty input** in this decision making process. We firmly believe that if faculty had been involved from beginning, the

problem of the measure and the problems associated with using “student demand” as the primary criteria to add courses would have been recognized.

- When faculty are asked to schedule, add, or cut courses offerings we are trusted to do so keeping in mind student need and the mission of the College.
- Course offerings have always been based on student need and have been the prerogative and professional responsibility of the disciplines.
- When course cuts were made in our department they were done equitably, with each discipline making cuts in the same proportion to their course offerings.
- We were under the impression, apparently false, that if courses were restored they would be done in a similarly equitable way (using, perhaps, the same process used to cut courses in reverse). At the very least, there was an expectation that course additions would be made by transparent, inclusive, accurate, and mindful procedures.

In summary, the administration’s measure of student demand to determine course distribution used an inappropriate criterion (student demand) and measured that inappropriate criterion using an unreliable measure (the total number on a wait list). In turn, the data yielded on this measure was also inconsistently applied. Our deepest concern, though, is that the administration has replaced student need with student demand as the primary criterion by which courses are added, a move we feel runs counter to the primary mission of the college. Without faculty input, without a discussion of the core values of the college, the administration risks a procedure which is uncritical, arbitrary, and inconsistent with our primary mission.

At our department meeting, we decided that since this not just a Behavioral Science issue, but a matter that affects the whole college, it would be best to bring it to the attention the Faculty Senate. Hence, this letter.

In seeking guidance on this issue, we have consulted a policy paper written by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.ⁱⁱ For your reference, we have included that paper with this letter. Indeed, that paper nicely highlights the critical issues here. To wit, the authors urge caution that “enrollment management decisions are not made in haste or for the wrong reasons.”ⁱⁱⁱ Their overall recommendation is that faculty take the lead in course distribution decisions:

The Academic Senate is committed to multiple missions for California community colleges (Resolution 6.03 Fall 2004), and in order to preserve the multiple missions, colleges must provide a range of courses, although local colleges determine the balance of offerings that is appropriate for them and their community. And while periodically some people argue against the necessity of certain courses in the schedule, **it is the local faculty who know best what the students need in order to complete their various goals:** occupational preparation, basic skills, general education, degree requirements, enrichment and transfer preparation.^{iv}

To make these decisions, many principles must be met. These principles include, but are not limited to:

- A recognition of the multiple missions of the college system and a commitment to the local balance as determined through participatory governance
- A commitment to using **good qualitative and quantitative data** to inform decisions

As the paper, and this recent decision process, makes abundantly clear:

... colleges must have clear policies in place, or decisions will be made outside formal systems and usually without faculty participation. Not only is it essential to have an enrollment management policy in place; the procedures for scheduling also should be clarified.”^{vi}

In closing, we want to stress also that this isn’t just a Behavioral Science issue. It’s not just a faculty issue. Nor is it just an administrative issue. This is a college issue that needs clear, open, explicit, and thoughtful procedures in order to best meet the mission of our college and, ultimately, the needs of our many student populations. Solving this problem should be a collaborative endeavor, with many voices, and out in the sunlight.

We do not think that course distribution decisions will ever be easy or without controversy, as these decisions are not merely about the objective counting of students. Rather, decisions about course offerings and distribution are also largely value decisions about how the many missions of a college should be put into action. However, **faculty involvement should be at the center of these discussions.** As the paper emphasizes, and we agree as a department, the academic senate, as the official voice of the faculty, should take the lead in enrollment policy discussions. ^{vii}

ⁱ The claim that course additions were made “strictly by ‘the objective criteria (sic) of student demand’” was written in an email to Michael Lockett by Haydn Davis. In the email Haydn was quoting our Dean, Judy Cater. In meeting with Michael Lockett, Dillon Emerick and Haydn Davis, Judy Cater made the same claim verbatim.

ⁱⁱ Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, “Enrollment Management Revisited”.

ⁱⁱⁱ pg. 4

iv pg. 6. Title 5 and Education Code both provide a rationale for faculty participation *vis a vis* the academic senate in identifying and prioritizing course offerings. At the core, the curriculum that is offered is an academic and professional matter, which falls to the faculty senate. Education code §70902 states, 'The governing board shall ... ensure ... the right of the Academic Senate to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.' Determining which courses to offer ... is certainly part of what is meant by the term "curriculum", because curriculum must be more than a course outline. Emphasis ours.

v pg. 6

vi pg. 21

vii pg. 26

["The Role of Academic Senate's in Enrollment Management"](#) document.

Dillon Emerick and Katie Townsend-Merino distributed copies of an Enrollment Management Resolution that will be brought forward for Action at next week's meeting.

Lengthy discussion followed on recommendation to establish a new or existing group/committee to be tasked with developing enrollment management policy, and faculty's role and input in the process. It was suggested that the Faculty Senate should charge the Instructional Planning Council with the development of an enrollment management policy because the council already has structure, duties, and efficient processes in place.

This item will be brought forward next week for action.

Committee
Appointments:

Motion 2

MSC O'Brien, Larson: Faculty Senate approval of the following committee appointments:

Academic Technology Committee

(12-14) Arts, Business, Media, and Computing Systems

Erin Hiro/Communications

Curriculum Committee

(12-15) Mathematics and the Natural & Health Sciences

Debra (Folz) Browne/Nursing Education

Finance & Administrative Services Planning Council

(12-14)

Marilee Nebelsick-Tagg/Nursing Education/MNHS.

International Education Advisory Committee

(12-14) One faculty member from ESL

Nimoli Madan/ESL

Learning Outcomes Council

(12-14) Library

Linda Morrow/Library

Professional Procedures Committee

(12-14)

Maryellen Shultz/Nursing Education/MNHS

Curriculum Committee
(12-15) Social and Behavioral Sciences
Linda Locklear/American Indian Studies

The motion carried.

Motion 3 MSC O'Brien, Laughlin: Faculty Senate acceptance of the results of the ballot for the following committee appointments:

NCHEA (North County Higher Education Alliance)
(12-14) faculty member, one from Counseling (if possible)
Frank Puchi/Multicultural Studies/Social and Behavioral Sciences

The motion carried.

Emeritus: At last week's meeting, Senators discussed Constitutional guidelines for granting Emeritus Status after a faculty member in the Communications department who is retiring this year with less than 20 years of service submitted his name for consideration of the status. Three Senators agreed to review letters of support received on his behalf and bring that information to the Senate this week. Those Senators completed that task and reported that the necessary qualifications were met to grant Emeritus Status.

Motion 4 MSC O'Brien, Snyder: Faculty Senate ratification of the granting of Emeritus Status to the following faculty member, effective May, 2012:

Paul W. Stachelek, Associate Professor, Communications, effective May 19, 2012. He has served Palomar College for 15 years from August 22, 1997, to May 18, 2012.

Motion 5 MSC Laughlin, Nelson: Faculty Senate ratification of the granting of Emeritus Status to the following faculty member, effective May, 2012:

Anthony Lugo, Professor, Art Department, effective May 19, 2012. He has served Palomar College for 38 years from September 4, 1974, to May 18, 2012.

The motion carried.

Curriculum: Copies of the following Curriculum items were provided to Senate members electronically:

PALOMAR COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS
Wednesday, May 2, 2012

I. ACTION ITEMS

Details of all program and course proposals can be viewed at: <http://www.curricunet.com/palomar>

- Select "track,"
- From the list of pending proposals, select the Check Status button for the program or course you wish to view.
- Select the Pencil icon in order to navigate through the various pages of the proposal, or
- Select the "COR" or "WR" icon to view the Course Outline of Record or Program Report, or
- Select the "CC" icon to view a report that displays proposed changes for the course outline of record or program
- Select the "CR" icon to view a report that displays ALL proposed changes for the course

To View Packages

Select Packages under Create/Edit Proposals, select the Pencil icon to see individual proposals included in the Package. Various icons will be accessible for creating Reports or viewing the pages of each proposal.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Curriculum Committee member or guest requests that a particular item be removed from the Consent Calendar. Items so removed will be considered separately. All matters remaining under Consent Calendar are considered to be **routine** and will be approved by **one motion**. The following curricular changes, pending appropriate approvals, will be effective FALL 2012:

A. Credit Course/Program Packages

1. Package Title: ASL Lab Classes

Discipline: American Sign Language (ASL)

Description: Adding computer assisted instruction.

Melissa B. Smith

a. American Sign Language Credit Course Changes

i. Course Number and Title: ASL 100L American Sign Language I (Lab)

Discipline: American Sign Language (ASL)

Prerequisite: Completion of, or concurrent enrollment in ASL 100

IGETC Area 6: Language other than English (101 level only) - 6A: Language other than English

Transfer Acceptability: CSU

Distance Learning Offering(s): Computer Assisted, Telecourse

Grading Basis: Pass/No Pass Only

Repeatability: May be taken 2 times.

Added Computer Assisted to Distance Learning, updated assignments, methods of assessment, textbooks and repeatability justification.

Melissa B. Smith

ii. Course Number and Title: ASL 101L American Sign Language II (Lab)

Short Title: American Sign Language II Lab

Discipline: American Sign Language (ASL)

Prerequisite: Completion of, or concurrent enrollment in ASL 101

Transfer Acceptability: CSU

Distance Learning Offering(s): Computer Assisted

Grading Basis: Pass/No Pass Only

Repeatability: May be taken 2 times.

Added Computer Assisted Distance Learning, updated assignments, methods of instruction and methods of assessment, textbooks and repeatability justification.

Melissa B. Smith

iii. Course Number and Title: ASL 205L American Sign Language III (Lab)

Short Title: American Sign Language III Lab

Discipline: American Sign Language (ASL)

Prerequisite: Completion of, or concurrent enrollment in ASL 205

Transfer Acceptability: CSU

Distance Learning Offering(s): Computer Assisted

Grading Basis: Pass/No Pass Only

Repeatability: May be taken 2 times.

Added Computer Assisted Distance Learning, updated assignments, textbooks and repeatability justification.

Melissa B. Smith

iv. Course Number and Title: ASL 206L American Sign Language IV (Lab)

Short Title: American Sign Language IV Lab

Discipline: American Sign Language (ASL)

Prerequisite: Completion of, or concurrent enrollment in ASL 206

Transfer Acceptability: CSU

Distance Learning Offering(s): Computer Assisted

Grading Basis: Pass/No Pass Only

Repeatability: May be taken 2 times.

Added Computer Assisted Distance Learning, updated assignments, textbooks and repeatability justification.

Melissa B. Smith

B. Non-Credit Course/Program Packages

1. There are no Non-Credit Course/Program Packages for this agenda.

C. New Vocational Programs

1. There are no new Vocational Programs for this agenda.

D. Program Reactivations

1. There are no Program Reactivations for this agenda.

E. Program Changes

1. There are no new Program Changes for this agenda.

F. Vocational Program Changes

1. There are no new Vocational Program Changes for this agenda.

G. Vocational Program Deactivations

1. There are no new Vocational Program Deactivations for this agenda.

H. Credit Courses – New

1. There are no New Credit Courses for this agenda.

I. Credit Course – Change

1. Course Number and Title: DA 57 Dental Sciences and Anatomy
Short Title: Dental Sciences and Anatomy
Discipline: Dental Assisting (DA)
Removed admission to Registered Dental Assisting Program as prerequisite, updated textbook.
Denise E. Rudy

2. Course Number and Title: GEOG 105 Introduction to Human Geography
Short Title: Intro to Human Geography
Discipline: Geography (GEOG)
Associate Degree General Education - D: Social and Behavioral Sciences
Associate Degree Multicultural Requirement - Yes
CSU GE Area D: Social Sciences - D5: Geography
IGETC Area 4: Social and Behavioral Sciences - 4E: Geography
Transfer Acceptability: UC, CSU
Updated outline, textbook, added multicultural requirement designation.
Wing H. Cheung

3. Course Number and Title: MCS 124 / RS 124 Islamic Cultures and Traditions
Short Title: Islamic Cultures & Traditions
Discipline: Multicultural Studies (MCS) / Religious Studies (RS)
Associate Degree General Education - C: Humanities
Associate Degree Multicultural Requirement - No
CSU GE Area C: Arts and Humanities - C2: Humanities
IGETC Area 3: Arts and Humanities - 3B: Humanities
Transfer Acceptability: UC, CSU
Distance Learning Offering(s): Computer Assisted, Telecourse, Online
Submitted to include distance learning and multicultural requirement designation.
Multicultural requirement designation was not approved.
John E. Valdez

J. Credit Courses – Reactivations

1. There are no Credit Course Reactivations for this agenda.

K. Credit Courses - Deactivations

1. There are no Credit Course Deactivations for this agenda.

L. Non Credit Course – New

1. There are no New Noncredit Courses for this agenda.

M. Non Credit Course - Change

1. There are no Non Credit Course Changes for this agenda.

N. Non Credit Course - Deactivation

1. There are no Non Credit Course Deactivations for this agenda.

O. Distance Learning*

The following courses may be offered as distance learning and meet Title 5 Regulations 55200-55210, effective Fall 2012.

Catalog/Subject Number	Distance Learning Offerings (s)
ASL 100L	<u>Computer Assisted</u> , Telecourse
ASL 101L	<u>Computer Assisted</u>
ASL 205L	<u>Computer Assisted</u>
ASL 206L	<u>Computer Assisted</u>
MCS/RS 124	<u>Computer Assisted</u> , Telecourse, Online

**underline indicates new, ~~strikethrough~~ indicates deletion, plain text indicates no change*

P. Requisites and Advisories*

The establishment of the following advisories meets Title 5 Regulations 55003, effective Fall 2012.

Catalog Number	Type	Description	Proposal Type
ASL 100L	Prerequisite/concurrent enrollment	Completion of or concurrent enrollment in ASL 100	Change
ASL 101L	Prerequisite/concurrent enrollment	Completion of or concurrent enrollment in ASL 101	Change
ASL 205	Prerequisite/concurrent enrollment	Completion of or concurrent enrollment of ASL 205	Change
ASL 206	Prerequisite/concurrent enrollment	Completion of or concurrent enrollment in ASL 206	Change
DA 57	Prerequisite	Admission to Registered Dental Assisting Program	Change

**underline indicates new, ~~strikethrough~~ indicates deletion, plain text indicates no change*

VII. RESUMPTION OF REGULAR AGENDA

A. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

The following programs were approved for deactivation at the March 14 Curriculum Committee meeting. In order to maintain catalog presence, the department has decided to retain these programs for the time being.

1. Program Title: Information Technology

Discipline: Computer Science and Information Systems - Information Technology (CSIT)
Award Type: A.A. Degree Major or Certificate of Achievement
Total Units: 36.50 - 39.00
Reason for Deactivation: Department Re-Work.
Stephen R. Perry

2. Program Title: Web Developer with Emphasis in Java/Open Source

Discipline: Computer Science and Information Systems - Web Technology (CSWB)
Award Type: Certificate of Proficiency
Total Units: 17.50
Reason for Deactivation: Department Re-Work.
Stephen R. Perry

3. Program Title: Web Developer with Emphasis in Windows

Discipline: Computer Science and Information Systems - Web Technology (CSWB)
Award Type: Certificate of Proficiency
Total Units: 15
Reason for Deactivation: Department Re-Work.
Stephen R. Perry

4. Program Title: Web Server Administrator with Emphasis in Windows

Discipline: Computer Science and Information Systems - Web Technology (CSWB)
Award Type: Certificate of Proficiency
Total Units: 15.00 - 16.00
Reason for Deactivation: Department Re-Work.
Stephen R. Perry

5. Program Title: Web Server Administrator with Emphasis in Linux

Discipline: Computer Science and Information Systems - Web Technology (CSWB)
Award Type: Certificate of Proficiency
Total Units: 17.00

Reason for Deactivation: Department Re-Work.
Stephen R. Perry

6. Program Title: Visual Basic
Discipline: Computer Science and Information Systems – Information Technology
Award Type: Certificate of Proficiency
Total Units: 15
Reason for Deactivation: Department re-work
Stephen R. Perry

7. KINE 102 was submitted as a review in order to update the course for articulation. After it was submitted, the CSU asked that the sentence “Specific attention will also be given to drugs/narcotics, alcohol, and tobacco and the physiological and sociological effects of each.” be added to the course description. This sentence is necessary to maintain articulation. Therefore, this review is being changed to a course change proposal so that the sentence may be added.

Course Number and Title: KINE 102 Physical Education in Elementary Schools, Movement and Theory
Short Title: PE in Elementary Schools
Discipline: Kinesiology (KINE)
Transfer Acceptability: CSU
Updated course description.
Ronald C. Mancao

B. INFORMATION

- a. RTV to Digital Broadcast Arts - (Attachment B)
- b. Status of Course Outline Reviews

The following courses have completed the course outline review process between March 30, 2012 and April 24, 2012 and are effective Fall 2012.

MATH 140 Calculus with Analytic Geometry, First Course

- c. Technical Updates

Program Technical Updates

DISC.	PROGRAM NAME	DESCRIPTION OF UPDATE
BUS	Advertising, Marketing and Merchandising	Added BUS 173 and Bus 189 to elective category; no impact on total units
CSWB	Web Server Administrator with Emphasis in Windows CP	Remove deactivated CSDB 220; GCMW 217 becomes a required course; total units becomes 16, rather than 15-16
CSIT	Information Technology AA and CA	Remove deactivated courses CSIT 290, CSDB 150, CSIT 271, and CSIT 70; total units becomes 32.5 -34, rather than 35.5 - 39.
CSIT	Visual Basic CP	Remove deactivated CSIT 271; reduce total units from 15 to 11

Course Technical Updates

COURSE	DESCRIPTION OF UPDATE
FREN 102	Remove deactivated FREN 101B as prerequisite, effective Fall 2011
FREN 201	Remove deactivated FREN 102B as prerequisite, effective Fall 2011
JAPN 102	Remove deactivated JAPN 101A and 101B as prerequisites, effective Fall 2011

- d. 2011-2012 Curriculum Activity Summary

	Current Agenda	2012 Cumulative
New Courses	0	32
Course Revisions	8	106
Course Reactivations	0	1
Course Deactivations	0	62
Course Reviews (3/30/2012– 4/24/2012)	1	14
New Programs	0	7
Program Revisions	0	34
Program Deactivations	0	16

about the numbers and the student success in psychology classes based on their preparation levels in English.

Monika Brannick pointed out that discussions on Content Review have been taking place for approximately two semesters, both in the Senate and the Curriculum Committee. She pointed out that a member of the English Department is also a member of the Curriculum Committee and of the newly formed Prerequisite Group which will now discuss Content Review and all its implication. Brannick invited Pam McDonough to join this group.

Health Fee Trailer Bill: At the April 9, Faculty Senate meeting, Jayne Conway distributed information on a Health Fee Trailer Bill being brought forward by Governor Brown's office with a proposed change to Ed Code that would un-mandate health services. Current law states that districts are responsible to maintain the level of service that was in existence in 1986.

Some of the smaller schools may then be required to provide support from their general fund, but Palomar's current Health Fee of \$18 per student in the spring and fall covers these expenses. Conway has asked that the Senate pass a motion in opposition to the Health Fee Trailer Bill due to the effect on students as well as Palomar's current Health Services department. Monika Brannick indicated that she attended the May 2, meeting of the ASG to hear input from students on this issue. The group expressed their opposition to the Trailer Bill as well, expressing the need for health services for students at only a cost of \$19 per student. Some ASG members noted that they have heard of instances where students enroll at Palomar strictly to have access to health care offered to students.

Motion 6 MSC O'Brien, Snyder: The Faculty Senate of Palomar College opposes the Health Fee Trailer Bill, which proposes changes to Ed Code that would un-mandate health Services. The motion carried.

Distance Education Policy: Over the past few weeks, Senators have reviewed and provided input on AP 4105, Distance Education. Copies of the most recent version were provided, and Monika Brannick briefly noted the additional changes.

Motion 7 MSC Payn, O'Brien: Faculty support of forwarding AP 4105, Distance Education, to the Policies & Procedures Task Force. The motion carried.

Equivalency Committee Recommendations: Fari Towfiq distributed copies of the revised forms for Part-time Faculty Equivalency and the Application for Equivalency. She stated that the changes made to the documents provide clarity for the applicants as well as the members of the Equivalency Committee, adding that they were also distributed at the May 4 Department Chairs and Directors meeting. Discussion followed on the documents, and some minor revisions to the wording were suggested.

Motion 8 MSC Towfiq, McDonough: Faculty Senate approval of the revised forms used by the applicants for Equivalency, and to adopt the new Part-time Faculty Equivalency form, to be completed by department chairs. The motion carried.

Following up on discussion at last week's meeting, Towfiq stated that members of the committee have also completed the task of investigating new and current policies related

to equivalency at the state level and has learned that the district can no longer approve single course equivalency.

Motion 9

MSC Towfiq, Kelber: The Faculty Senate will discontinue the granting of single course equivalencies, effective Summer 2012. The motion carried.

Learning Outcomes
Council Workgroup
Request:

Katy French reported that members of the Learning Outcomes Council (LOC) are finishing up with data collection for the GE Assessment Project. As discussed last week, members of LOC are putting together a group of faculty who will work over the summer to analyze the results and are requesting that the Faculty Senate appoint two faculty members from the Senate to provide an outside perspective. French asked for volunteers to participate. She outlined the duties of the group and the time period in which they will meet. Senators Jenny Fererro and Perry Snyder volunteered to participate.

Governance Structure
Group Request: Faculty
Advisory Board on
Student Success Task

Force Recommendations: Copies of the Governance Structure Group Request for the Faculty Advisory Board on Student Success Task Force Recommendations were provided, and Monika Brannick placed the document on the overhead.

Request submitted by: Gregory Larson							
Proposed Name of Requested Group: Faculty Advisory Board on Student Success Task Force Recommendations							
	Council	X	Committee		Subcommittee		Task Force
Action Requested:		Add		Delete			Change
<p>ROLE, PRODUCTS, REPORTING RELATIONSHIPS:</p> <p>1. The Faculty Advisory Board on Student Success Task Force Recommendations will advise the Faculty Senate on implementation strategies for the Student Success Task Force Recommendations at Palomar College.</p> <p>DUTIES:</p> <p>1. Promote dialogue, understanding, and oversee the consequent changes to Palomar College.</p> <p>PRODUCTS:</p>							
REPORTING RELATIONSHIPS: Faculty Senate							
MEETING SCHEDULE:							

CHAIR: Two Faculty Senators: Co-Chairs

Members:

One faculty representative from each of the following:

Basic Skills Committee

Curriculum Committee

Learning Outcomes Council

Student Services Planning Council

Other members

VP of Instruction

Invited as needed:

Faculty at large

Representation of constituencies such as

Matriculation

Articulation

Counseling

Student Services

Financial Services

Research and Planning

Motion 10

MSC Ferrero, O'Brien: Faculty Senate approval of the Governance Structure Group Request for the Faculty Advisory Board on Student Success Task Force Recommendations. The motion carried.

Student Success

Task Force

Recommendations:

Monika Brannick shared information from the recent Strategic Planning Council meeting and their review of the Strategic Plan 2013. SPC members were asked to fill out cards providing information on which topics, objectives, or goals, should be moved forward to next year, which were complete, and so on.

Senators were provided with electronic copies of the Strategic Plan 2013 – Year 3 Objectives (2012-13). With respect to the implementation of the Student Success Task Force Recommendations (SSTF), Brannick noted the requirement of the district to act to be in-line with any Title 5 or legislative changes and expressed the need for members of the newly formed SSTF Advisory Group to participate in the process of reviewing and implementing the SSTF recommendations. Brannick indicated that she and incoming Senate President Greg Larson would be meeting with the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, and the director of Institutional Research and Planning to discuss how to move forward.

Policies & Procedures:

Over the past few weeks, Senators have discussed BP 7360, Academic Due Process. In the document, references to disputes between other constituency groups have been removed and a new policy would need to be created to address these dispositions. There has been discussion on whether the policy should remain as is for utilization for faculty only, or whether changes should be made concerning all employee groups. Senators again discussed the policy, and it was agreed that because it refers to *Academic Due Process* it should be applicable to faculty only and members of other employee groups should create a separate policy appropriate for their members. This policy will be forwarded to the task force.

Copies of AP 4231, Grade Changes, and BP 3900 Speech: Time, Place, and Manner, were also placed on the overhead.

Discussion occurred on AP 4231, and Monika Brannick outlined the proposed changes. After brief discussion, the document will be brought back for further discussion at next week's meeting or in the fall semester.

Senators agreed that BP 3900, Speech: Time, Place, and Manner, should be forwarded on to the Palomar Faculty Federation.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melinda Carrillo, Secretary