Officers & Executive Committee

President	**Christina Gold**	Co-VPs Faculty Development	**Claudia Striepe & Moon Ichinaga**
VP Compton Educ'l Center	**Michael Odanaka**	VP Finance & Special Projects	**Lance Widman**
Curriculum Chair	**Jenny Simon**	VP Academic Technology	**Pete Marcoux**
VP Educational Policies	**Merriel Winfree**	Secretary	**Chris Jeffries**
		VP Instructional Effectiveness	**Janet Young**

Adjunct (1 yr term)
Nicholas Sean Bonness 12
Kathryn Hall 12

Behavior & Social Sciences
Janet Young 12/13
Christina Gold 13/14
Michelle Moen 11/12
Lance Widman* 13/14
Michael Wynne 14/15

Business
Phillip Lau 11/12
Jay Siddiqui* 11/12
Gabriella Fernandez 14/15

Compton Educational Center
Darwin Smith 12/13
Chris Halligan 12/13
Eddie French-Preston 12/13
Michael Odanaka 13/14
Estina Pratt 12/13

Counseling
Griselda Castro 14/15
Chris Jeffries* 14/15
Dexter Vaughn 13/14

Fine Arts
Ali Ahmadpour 14/15
Chris Wells* 14/15
Russell McMillin 14/15
Vince Palacios 14/15
vacant

Health Sci & Athletics/Nursing
Tom Hazell* 13/14
Tom Hicks 13/14
Mina Colunga 12/13
Kim Baily 13/14
vacant

Humanities
Brent Isaacs 11/12
Peter Marcoux* 11/12
Kate McLaughlin 11/12
Barbara Jaffe 14/15
Jenny Simon 11/12

Industry & Technology
Patty Gebert 12/13
Harold Hofmann 12/13
Lee Macpherson 12/13
Douglas Marston* 12/13
Merriel Winfree 12/13

Learning Resource Unit
Moon Ichinaga 13/14
Claudia Striepe* 13/14

Mathematical Sciences
Michael Bateman 12/13
Hamza Hamza 13/14
Arkadiy Sheynshteyn 13/14
Alice Martinez 14/15
Eduardo Barajas 13/14

Natural Sciences
Sara Di Fiori 13/14
Miguel Jimenez* 11/12
Pete Doucette 12/13
vacant
vacant

Academic Affairs & SCA
Francisco Arce
Karen Lam
Jeanie Nishime

Associated Students Org.
Simone Jackson
Brooke Matson

President/Superintendent
Thomas Fallo

The Union   Editor

Division Personnel
Jean Shankweiler
Don Goldberg
Tom Lew
Counseling   **Ken Key**

Ex-officio positions
ECCFT President
Sean Donnell
Nina Velasquez
Curriculum Chair
Jenny Simon

Institutional Research
Irene Graff
Carolyn Pineda

Dates after names indicate the last academic year of the senator's three year term, for example 11/12 = 2011-2012.
*denotes senator from the division who has served on Senate the longest (i.e. the "senior senator")

SENATE'S PURPOSE (from the Senate Constitution)

A. To provide an organization through which the faculty will have the means for full participation in the formulation of policy on academic and professional matters relating to the college including those in Title 5, Subchapter 2, Sections 53200-53206. *California Code of Regulations.* Specifically, as provided for in Board Policy 2510, and listed below, the "Board of Trustees will normally accept the recommendations of the Academic Senate on academic and professional matters of:

   1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
   2. Degree and certificate requirements
   3. Grading policies
   4. Educational program development
   5. Standards and policies regarding student preparation and success
   6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
   7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process, including self-study and annual reports
   8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
   9. Processes for program review
   10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development, and
   11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate."

B. To facilitate communication among faculty, administration, employee organizations, bargaining agents and the El Camino College Board of Trustees.

ECC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS (1st and 3rd Tuesdays)

FALL 2012		**SPRING 2013**	
September 6	Alondra Room (Canceled)	February 19	Alondra Room
September 18	Alondra Room	March 5	Alondra Room
October 2	Alondra Room	March 19	Alondra Room
October 16	Alondra Room	April 2	Alondra Room
November 6	Alondra Room	April 16	Alondra Room
November 20	Alondra Room	May 7	Compton Educational Center
December 4	Alondra Room	May 21	Alondra Room
		June 4	Alondra Room

CEC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS (Thursday after ECC Senate, usually)

FALL 2012		**SPRING 2013**	
September 6	Board Room	Feb. 21	Board Room
September 20	Board Room	March 7	Board Room
October 4	Board Room	March 21	Board Room
October 18	Board Room	April 4	Board Room
November 1	Board Room	April 18	Board Room
November 15	Board Room	May 2	Board Room
December 6	Board Room	May 16	Board Room
		May 30	Board Room

AGENDA & TABLE OF CONTENTS

Academic Senate of El Camino College 2012-2013
16007 Crenshaw Blvd., Torrance CA 90506-0002   (310)532-3670 x3254

Committees

SENATE COMMITTEES	Chair / President	Day	Time	Location
Academic Technology Comm.	Pete Marcoux, Virginia Rapp			
Assessment of Learning Comm.	Kaysa Laureano-Ribas, Chris Mello, Janet Young	2nd & 4th Mon.	2:30-4:00	Admin 131
Academic Program Review Comm.	Janet Young, Co-Chair Francisco Arce, Co-Chair			
Compton Academic Senate	Michael Odanaka	1st & 3rd Thurs	1:00-2:00	CEC Board Room
Compton Faculty Council	Michael Odanaka	1st & 3rd Thurs	1:00-2:00	CEC Board Room
Curriculum Committee	Jenny Simon, Chair Mark Lipe, Chair Elect	2nd & 4th Tues	2:30-4:30	Admin 131
Educational Policies Comm.	Merriel Winfree	2nd & 4th Tues	12:30-2:00	SSC 106
Faculty Development Comm.	Moon Ichinaga, Claudia Striepe	2nd & 4th Tues	1:00-2:00	West. Library Basement

CAMPUS COMMITTEES	Chair	Senate / Faculty Representative/s	Day	Time	Location
Accreditation	Jean Shankweiler	Matt Cheung			
Basic Skills Advisory Group	Elise Geraghty, Arturo Martinez	Jason Suarez			
Board of Trustees	Bill Beverly	Christina Gold	3rd Mon.	4:00	Board Room
Calendar Committee	Jeanie Nishime	Chris Jeffries Vacant			
Campus Technology Comm	John Wagstaff	Pete Marcoux	March 14 & May 28	12:30-2;00	Stadium Room
College Council	Tom Fallo	Christina Gold Estina Pratt	Mondays	1-2:00	Admin 127
Dean's Council	Francisco Arce	Christina Gold	Thursdays	8:30-10:00	Library 202
Distance Education Advisory Committee	Alice Grigsby				
Enrollment Management Comm.	Francisco Arce	Christina Gold Chris Wells Sara Blake Cynthia Mosqueda	2nd Thurs	2-3:30	Library 202
Facilities Steering Comm.	Tom Fallo	Christina Gold			
Insurance Benefits Comm.			4th Tues	1-2:30	
Planning & Budgeting Comm.	Rory Natividad	Lance Widman Emily Rader (alt)	1st & 3rd Thurs.	1-2:30	Library 202

All of these Senate and campus committee meetings are open, public meetings. Please feel free to attend any meetings that address issues of interest or concern to you.

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE
19th, March 2013

Name: Initials

Adjunct (1year)

Bonness, Nicholas Sean	
Hall, Kathryn	X

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Gold, Christina	X
Moen, Michelle	X
Widman, Lance	X
Wynne, Michael	X
Young, Janet	X

Business

Fernandez, Gabriella	X
Philip, S. Lau	
Siddiqui, Jay	X

Counseling

Castro, Griselda	X
Jeffries, Chris	X
Vaughn, Dexter	X

Fine Arts

Ahmadphour, Ali	X
McMillin, Russell	X
Palacios, Vince	X
Wells, Chris	X
VACANT	

Health Sciences & Athletics

Baily, Kim	X
Colunga, Mina	EXC
Hazell, Tom	
Hicks, Tom	
VACANT	

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent	
Jaffe, Barbara	EXC
Marcoux, Pete	
McLaughlin, Kate	X
Simon, Jenny	X

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Patty	X
Hoffmann, Ed	
MacPherson, Lee	X
Marston, Doug	
Winfree, Merriel	

Name: Initials

Learning Resources Unit

Ichinaga, Moon	X
Striepe, Claudia	X

Mathematical Sciences

Barajas, Eduardo	
Bateman, Michael	X
Hamza, Hamza	X
Martinez, Alice	X
Sheynshteyn, Arkadiy	X

Natural Sciences

Doucette, Pete	X
DiFiori, Sara	X
Jimenez, Miguel	X
VACANT	
VACANT	

Academic Affairs & SCA

Arce, Francisco	X
Nishime, Jeanie	X
Lam, Karen	

Assoc. Students Org.

Matson, Brooke	
Montague-Jackson, Simone	X

Compton Education Center

French-Preston, Essie	
Halligan, Chris	
Odanak, Michael	X
Pratt, Estina	
Smith, Darwin	

Ex-officio Positions

Shadish, Elizabeth (ECCFT)	
Velasquez, Nina (ECCFT)	
VACANT (CEC-VP)	
Simon, Jenny (CCC Chair	X

Deans' Reps.; Guests/Other Officers:

Graff, Irene	X
Pineda, Carolyn	X

Unless noted otherwise, all page numbers refer to the packet used during the meeting, not the current packet you are reading now.

Academic Senate President Gold called the third Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2013 semester to order on March 19, 2013 at 12:37pm. The meeting was held in the Alondra Room.

Approval of last Minutes:
[See pgs. 6-12 of packet] for minutes of the March 5, 2013 meeting. As there were no corrections to the minutes they were approved as written.

OFFICER REPORTS

Academic Senate President's report – Christina Gold (CG)
CG talked about the importance of collegial consultation to accreditation especially now that we have been put on warning. The ACCJC is moving towards cycles for accreditation and faculty must be involved. If we consult on these accreditation issues, it avoids the perception that Administration is making us do things that we do not want to do. Areas where faculty involvement is critical is with the Assessment of Learning and SLO's along with program review and curriculum. The Institutional Academic Standards is another area where we are utilizing the consultation process which makes it easier for us to understand why we even have to create these standards. A prime example of where the collegial consultation process is happening on campus is with the creation of the Distance Education Task Force. The Task Force is working on implementing the new accreditation standards which includes student authentication and regular, effective contact. Originally decisions were made without going thru the collegial consultation process, but by using this process of cross-campus collegial consultation, it creates more buy-in with the decision and further embeds accreditation into our campus conversations and processes.

VP – Compton Educational Center report – Michael Odanaka (MO)
The revisions to the Council By-laws have been pulled because they did not get the needed 2/3 vote from the faculty to ratify them.
Pg. 15 is a resolution for The Proposed Reorganization of Departments and Disciplines at the Center. The resolution has been passed by the Faculty Council. In addition, about 25 faculty met with Barb Perez to talk about the reorganization of departments and disciplines. She appeared to listen and seemed receptive towards the dialogue.
Pgs. 16-20 can be found a document titled "Programs at the Compton Center" that was authored by MO along with the help of David Vakil and other faculty. The purpose of the document is to help clarify the definition, role and list of academic programs at El Camino Compton Center. One of the questions that came from the document is to whether or not we should have programs when there are only 2-3 classes in those areas.
There will be a public forum on Monday, March 25, 2013 at 1pm in the Student Lounge to discuss the finalists for the CEO position.

Curriculum Committee report – Jenny Simon (JS)
No report.

VP – Educational Policies – Merriel Winfree (MW)
Merriel was not able to be there today, but CG said the committee is working on policies and procedures for Academic Freedom and Credit by Exam.

Co-VPs – Faculty Development – Moon Ichinaga and Claudia Striepe (MI and CS)
The "Getting the Job" workshop was very successful and attended by over 40 part-time faculty.

VP- Finance – Lance Widman (LW)
No report.

VP – Academic Technology – Pete Marcoux (PM)
Since PM was not in attendance at the meeting, no report was given.

VP – Instructional Effectiveness – Janet Young (JY)
JY passed out a handout titled "Information Item – Student Learning Outcomes Report." The report included the status of student learning outcome assessments by division and courses. It appears that more courses were assessed than reported to the Accrediting Commission in October 2012 due to a malfunction in the CurricUNET database. The actual assessment completion rate is 76 percent rather than the 55 percent reported by the database. We are working with Governet, the software company, to correct the problem. The report includes grids from each division which summarizes all courses that will be assessed in Spring and Fall 13 to get us to 100% assessment. The division SLO websites will also be kept up-to-date. They can be found either on the division's website or the SLO website. The ACCJC also dinged us on the alignment grids for institution to program to course SLO's, but that has been all completed now. It is hoped that by another week all eight divisions will be updated. Faculty are asked to use the template and then cut and paste them into CurricUNET. Claudia Striepe asked if there is a template for student services and the answer is no since they report differently. F. Arce asked that faculty make sure their divisions are talking about SLO assessments and that everyone is getting on board. It was noted that this is sometimes hard to do when only part-timers are teaching the class. Kathryn Hall wants to know if at the start of the semester she can know what will be assessed so that she can make sure she teaches to that assessment. J. Nishime has heard that we really should have more than one SLO per course and JY said this is true and suggested that maybe three can be a realistic number. Simone Jackson, ASO representative, asked what English 50RR and 50WW were and was told those are the combined remedial and developmental English courses that are being piloted. She also wondered if for the inactivated courses if the faculty worked with the deans to see if there is a need for that class. JY assured her that they did and that if a class needs to be reactivated, there is a streamline process thru the Curriculum Committee to bring those classes back. A. Ahmadpour was concerned that if the course is inactivated and not in the catalog then how will students even know about the class. JY said Title 5 doesn't allow for courses to be in the catalog if they are not being taught. C. Wells asked where the process is if a course is being asked to be deactivated even though it is currently being offered, i.e. the Leadership class. L. Kjeseth replied that it has to come from faculty. Chris Mello from Fine Arts and Kaysa Laureano-Ribas from Math were both publicly thanked for helping JY with the collection of all this data.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Jeanie Nishime – Accreditation Report (JN)
JN reported that the first draft of the accreditation report is due this Thursday, March 21st.

Irene Graff, Institutional Research and Planning – ACCJC Institutional Student Achievement Data (IG)
IG handed out the "El Camino College Proposed Methodology for ACCJC Institution-Set Standards." She explained that the ACCJC is monitoring this and it is called "Institution-Set Standards" to differentiate between "Accreditation Standards." These are due to the ACCJC by the end of the month. We are required to combine El Camino Torrance and the Compton Center together since we are considered one district, but Institutional Research (IR) also recorded separate standards for each location. These standards will still be looked at later by the faculty and administration, but for now we are required to set a floor for each standard which is a number we will not go below. Later we will also be asked to set a goal that we hope to achieve. The successful course completion rate institution-set standard was set at

64% and for Fall 2012 we achieved 68.2%. The set standard is a weighted average between both locations and looked at over the past 10 years. J. Nishime noted that the accrediting team will be asking us how we set these standards, so we will have to have the data to show them. The student retention rate is basically what percent of students are enrolled from one semester to the next. This is more know as persistence rates in California terms, but the federal reporting looks at retention and we reported the numbers from Fall 11 to Fall 12. The institution-set standard is 45% and the actual retained students were 46.1%. The degree/certificate completion and transfer rates are based on a three-year average, The degree completion number was set at 1,662, but we achieved 1,916 in 2011-12 with the higher numbers mostly attributed to the Graduation Initiative. The set certificate completion number was 511 and we awarded 591 certificates. The transfer rate used the numbers received from the National Clearinghouse which sometimes are lower since not all students are reported there, but the institution-set number was 1,408 and we transferred 1,923 students. Carolyn Pineda was given credit for heading this project. A. Ahmadpour asked what it is we can do to actually control a student's retention and persistence since there are so many outside factors that affect this and F. Arce feels a good, honest assessment will tell us if we are doing the best that we can. S. Jackson asked why Compton rates have to be included with ours and the answer was because they are not fully accredited yet. C. Gold announced that a working group will be looking at these numbers tomorrow and finalizing the report due at the end of the month.

C. Gold asked at this time if she could reorder the agenda to make sure we have a quorum and since there were no objections, she moved up Mark Lipe and the repeatability issue.

Mark Lipe, Chair-Elect, College Curriculum committee – Repeatability (ML)
ML referred to pages 28-33 in the packet that includes the tables used by the Chancellor's Office to give preliminary guidance on repeatability regulations. He also provided a handout titled "El Camino College – College Curriculum Committee Repeatability Task Force Committee Report.'' This document had previously been looked at by the Senate. ML reminded us that basically districts are allowed course repeatability based on four reasons: 1) Repetition necessary for Major requirements for CSU or UC for a bachelor's degree; 2) Intercollegiate athletic competition courses; 3) Intercollegiate athletic specific conditioning courses; 4) Intercollegiate academic or vocational competition courses. Vince Palacios voiced his concerns for Art students who are not able to repeat courses to hone skills for their portfolios and therefore may not be admitted to the four-year universities. C. Gold suggests that possibly when the AA-T degree in Art has been developed and approved that maybe this will help this issue. ML said that districts must validate that courses are intercollegiate in nature. There must be competition involved for academic and vocational courses to allow repeatability. C. Jeffries asked why Number 1 from the four reasons cannot be applied to art courses and it was answered that it must be determined by the CSU/UC campuses. It was suggested that V. Palacios talk to CSULB about moving in that direction. L. Kjeseth said that repeatability rules do not apply to non-credit courses and that could be a possible solution. He also things intercollegiate athletic courses should have to justify levels like other areas do. F. Arce responded that legislature is really trying to reduce the FTES for athletics and visual arts courses and put more emphasis on academic courses.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

BP/AP 4260 Prerequisites and Co-requisites
This item was tabled since there was no longer a quorum in the room.

ADJOURN
The meeting adjourned at 1:57pm.
CJ/ECCSpring13

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT MEETING
DATE: March 7, 2013

Present: W. Garcia, A. Garten, I. Graff, B. Mulrooney, J. Nishime, J. Shankweiler, J. Wagstaff, C. Wells

Other Guests: Richette Bell, Marci Meyers, Cheryl Shenefield, Will Warren, Steve Waterhouse

The meeting began at 2:35 p.m.

I. INFORMATION
   A. <u>Notes of February 14, 2013</u>: Distributed and reviewed – no changes made.

II. DISCUSSION/ACTION
   A. <u>Review of Second Draft of AP 5055, Enrollment Priorities</u>
      1. Some areas reiterate what is in Ed Code or Title 5 (i.e. limitations). Discussed whether or not limitations should be placed elsewhere to be referenced.
      2. Added Student Forfeiture or Exclusion of Enrollment Priority to reinforce to students reasons they can be forfeited or excluded from priority enrollment. The committee decided to move this section to the end and move Registration Priorities to I.
      3. In-District New Students (Tier Four) placed before Continuing Students (Tier Five) should boost enrollment when continuing students are affected by financial aid's life-time limit for federal Pell grants and possible passing of law restricting BOG students that do not meet satisfactory academic progress. Are we forcing continuing students to go elsewhere to complete their courses? During the first year of implementing registration priority, may need to look at increasing the number of English, math, and reading classes for both new students and continuing students who could not get those classes during their first year.
      4. Page 3, IVB 1&2 – is it redundant to have both? Will define eligibility in the definitions section at the end.
      5. May move date to accept applications for summer/fall back to November 1st to give students enough time to complete the required activities for priority registration (orientation, assessment, and education plan) by March.
      6. Enrollment is down 300 FTES this year. Many districts' enrollment is down 10%-15%.
      7. Challenge for ITS is to capture priority requirements for each student. J. Wagstaff and W. Garcia will attend CISOA-Ellucian technology conference this weekend and will report back to the committee. Whatever is used should interface with MyEdu with easy access for students. MyEdu is a long way away from being used for official education plans. The number of semesters required for an education plan is set by the institution. Orientations can be online or in-person.
      8. There is pending legislation that would give DSPS & EOPS (Title 5) same priority as Veterans and Foster Youth (Ed Code) - Tier Two students would move to Tier One. Right now cannot combine groups legally but can't they have the same registration period?
      9. Priority changes and its impact in terms of planning should be examined at the division level. Will this strictly apply to Fall 2014 or will we continue to co-mingle the registration cycle? Implementing by fall will affect summer registration – may need to separate registration dates and times for summer and fall and delay fall registration until June/July.
      10. Tier Seven and Eight may be combined if bill passes.
      11. Committee agreed to combine Tiers Eleven, Twelve and Thirteen. Cannot co-mingle Tier

Fourteen – K-12 must be stand alone.

12. Correction on page 5, D1 – change Tier *Eight* to Tier *Ten*.

13. Can eligible in-district new students be part of Tier Three? The numbers would be high (5,000-8,000) and it would be difficult to determine which group within the tier gets priority over others. Counting the student's highest cohort is one way to capture students in multiple cohorts.

14. Discussion on education plans. Not everyone uses the electronic Ed plan (i.e. at high schools). There should be manual way to populate field in student records indicating Ed plan and orientations were completed (J. Wagstaff was asked if he could find out at the CISOA-Ellucian technology conference). Online orientations and online Ed plans may be an issue. Assessment data is uploaded and captured for MIS.

15. B. Mulrooney will send AP 5055 to committee members electronically and will compress some tiers.

B. Registration Timeframe for Summer/Fall 2014
1. Continue to co-mingle registration cycles or separate them? Declining enrollment was one reason co-mingle. Fall timeline remains the same. Will move beginning of registration from May to April – Spring will end earlier. In-district priority students would have submitted their applications between November-February and completed orientation, assessment and Ed plan.

2. Suggestion was made to set one registration date for each cohort instead of individual dates and times. Students within the cohort could register any time after their registration date. Will discuss the registration grid in a few weeks.

3. Review registration timeframe before the next meeting. Suggestion was made to bring examples of what other districts are considering for their application and registration cycles for Fall 2014 (include Compton's competitors). This was a factor when doing research in the past.

4. Need to come up with timeline schedule for all items and when to implement, test, etc. Can't start working on timeframe until decision made whether or not to co-mingle Summer/Fall 2014.

5. When running forecast grades, do we take into consideration units expected to be completed that term as part of the total?

III. NEXT MEETING
The next Enrollment Management meeting will be held on March 21, 2013 at 2:30 p.m. in Lib 202. Increasing the number of meetings through May 2013.

Need to review the Enrollment Management plan – concerned about declining enrollment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

2

Faculty Development Committee Meeting

Minutes of Meeting of Tuesday, March 26, 2013.

Committee Members

Fazal Aasi (FA)	Compton Center	Moon Ichinaga (MI)	Learning Res.**
Florence Baker (FB)	BSS	Donna Manno (DM)	Staff Dev.
Rose Cerofeci (RC)	Humanities (Absent)	Margaret Steinberg (MS)	Natural Sci.
Kristie Daniel-DiGregorio (KD)	BSS (EXC)	Claudia Striepe (CS)	Learning Res.**
Ross Durand (RD)	Ind/Tech	Evelyn Uyemura (EU)	Humanities
Briita Halonen (BH)	Humanities (EXC)	Sue Ellen Warren (SW)	Ind/Tech (EXC)

**Committee Co-Chairs

Mission Statement: The El Camino College Faculty Development Committee provides opportunities and support to promote instructional excellence and innovation through faculty collaboration.
Spring 2013 Meetings (1-2 p.m. in West Library Basement)
Feb. 26, March 12, March 26, April 23, May 14, May 28 (Tentative)

AGENDA

I) **Report on "Getting the Job Part II Workshop: The Faculty Interview"**
MI reported that the Workshop was a success, hosting between 40 to 50 enthusiastic job seekers.

II) **Discussion: Re-Application for "Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award" Parking Space?**
MI reported, after investigation of some leads, that attitudes to parking spaces have not changed. The feeling of the Committee was therefore not to re-apply for an "Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award " parking space.

III) **Fall Flex Day Planning**
– **Some Tie-in to "Completion by Design" Project? (S. Blake's Presentation on Programs for Faculty to Help Students Successfully Complete Their Academic Goals at 3/12 FDC Meeting)**
Professor Blake had attended a #CSN conference on "Completion By Design", a 5 year project dealing with developing strong completion pathways for college students, and strategies to accomplish this at several key points – Entry, Progression – Completion - - to reduce the loss points that occur at each level. DM asked whether we should host a workshop/presentation on this on Fall Flex Day. DM noted that the Fall Flex Day traditionally has a full program, introducing new hires, hosting Division meetings and so on. Perhaps we could ask Prof. Blake back to another FDC meeting to talk about specifics of a presentation. Discussion followed on the advisability and desirability of presenting this program. Some felt the presentation would be better suited to Student Services areas, especially counseling. Others felt the program should not stand in isolation, but be tied to existing initiatives like the SLO efforts, otherwise there are too many isolated attempts aiming at the same goal of student success and going over the

same ground. Others felt conversations on classroom success strategies might be helpful. FB felt that we were working without a complete set of statistical/factual information on what happens to students who "drop out" – perhaps what is seen as non-completion/failure, is merely transferring to a more suitable college, or finding a job. The current conventional definition of success as completion of an AA degree or transfer is only looking at one aspect of a student. DM noted that community colleges are undergoing a transition and it would be good to be proactive.

The feasibility of the presentation will depend on what else is offered on Flex Day. MI will consult with Prof. Blake again and get more of a feel of her direction, while sharing the Committee's opinions. If we move ahead with the program it would be good to discuss specific issues and questions and involve ALL campus groups, not just faculty.

IV) Upcoming Professional Development Activities

Not discussed

V) Campus Climate Survey Update

MI had spoken to Mr. Rosales of IR. He is working under pressure to meet the deadline of getting the survey out to faculty before the Spring Break. MI will try again to ascertain whether he was able to incorporate any of our suggestions and send the committee members an email update.

Cs/ecc2013

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: March 7, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT

☐ Michael DeSanto –   Campus Police
☐ Sean Donnell – ECCFT
☒ Alice Grigsby – Mgmt./Supervisors
☐ Derrick Moon – ASO
☒ Rory K. Natividad – Chair (non-voting)

☒ Dipte Patel – Academic Affairs
☐ Dawn Reid – Student & Community Adv.
☒ Cheryl Shenefield – Administrative Services
☐ Gary Turner – ECCE
☐ Lance Widman – Academic Senate

Support: Francisco Arce, Janice Ely, William Garcia, Irene Graff, Jo Ann Higdon, Michael Le, Jeanie Nishime, Will Warren, Jan Caldwell (Alternate/Michael DeSanto)
Guests: Emily Rader

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.
It was noted that there was no February 21 meeting.

Approval of February 7, 2013 Minutes
Revisions were made as follows:
1. Page 1, under Budget Updates, number 3, **After:** report, **Delete:** P!.
2. Page 1, under Others Attending, **Delete:** Others Attending, **Add:** Support and Guest: **Add:** Emily Rader (as guest).
3. Page 1, under Program Plan Updates, number 5, **Remove item.** Place at the end of the minutes under notes as a FDF file.
4. Page 2, under Vice-President Priorities, **After:** total, **Add:** of funded items.

Program Plans – I. Graff
1. Concerns were addressed which were raised at a prior meeting regarding the linking of program review with annual plans.
   a. Need to link the longer-term program review (three to five years) with our annual plans.
   b. Almost every program had a number of objectives that had no linkage to program review recommendations. Education was suggest as an answer to solving the linking issue.
2. The 2013/14 plans along with program reviews need to provide a strong linkage and evaluation. Not only for upcoming accreditation but for regular institutional improvement.
.
Accreditation Achievement Standards
1. Every year the accrediting commission needs to be supplied an annual report of the fiscal area and the academic programs. New this year is the institution has to establish a standard set of achievement data. The institutional set is under development by I. Graph, further information and discussion to ensue. The academic senate expressed that faculty should determine what these benchmarks should be. The due date for this new data is March 31.
2. A planning summit will be held on May 10 and members of the PBC will be included.

Planning and Budget Calendar – J. Nishime
1. A planning and budget calendar was distributed for review. Discussion ensued as to some revisions of activities and dates listed. The revisions to the planning calendar will be made and the final format will be brought back to the committee for review with the new timelines created.

1

Budget Update – J. Higdon

1. Two handouts were given to the committee. The 2012-13 first principal apportionment page was reviewed, zeroing in on the projected revenue shortfall, $6,020,058. It is hoped when all RDA money is collected across the state, that it should be sufficient enough to back fill this shortfall, but there still is a distinct possibility that it may not be enough. We are waiting on the explanation memo from the State Chancellor's office to see what the coverage will be.
2. We should be receiving the P2 by June 22.
3. The handout on the CupertinoPatch was reviewed and discussed.
   a. Santa Clara County has filed suit demanding the city turn over nearly $320 million in property, cash and other assets the city withdrew from its former redevelopment agency in 2011.

Comprehensive Master Plan – R. Natividad

1. A link to the master plan was sent out and everyone was asked to look at the first section and review it. The committee was asked to pinpoint things that need attention and send back the information to Rory so he can compile the information. It was also asked of the committee to have other people in their groups to look at this so recommendations could be made for improvement.

Adjournment – R. Natividad

The meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m. Rory announced that he would be at a conference on February 21 and the committee would not be meeting. The next meeting after that will be **Thursday, March 21, at 1:00 p.m**., in Library 202.

RKN/lmo

2

Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC)
PLANNING and BUDGETING CALENDAR

Dates	Activities	Responsible
September – November	1. Review and revise planning priorities. 2. Identify budget development assumptions.	1. PBC 2. Cabinet
November 15th	1. Submit prioritized Program plans for the next fiscal year.	1. Program faculty and managers
January - February	1. Determine preliminary revenue estimates 2. Begin assessment of key budget issues—including the funding of high priority planning initiatives 3. Evaluation of current fiscal year program plan goals and objectives by	1. Vice President of Administrative Services 2. PBC 3. Program faculty and managers
January 31st	1. Evaluation of current fiscal year program plan goals and objectives by	1. Program faculty and managers
February 15th	1. Submit prioritized Unit plans for the next fiscal year.	1. Deans/Directors

March - April	1. Determine enrollment targets, sections to be taught, and full-and part-time FTEF.
	
	2. Vice presidents jointly determine ongoing operational costs including:
	  a. Full-time salaries
	  b. Benefits, Utilities, GASB
	  c. Legal and contract obligations
	
	3. Develop Line Item Budgets for Operational Areas.
		1. VP Academic Affairs with Cabinet approval
		
		2. Vice President of Administrative Services and Cabinet for full-time positions
		
		3. Vice Presidents

March 31st	1. Vice President submittal of prioritized area plans	1. Vice Presidents
April	1. Tentative budget information completed for PBC review.	1. Vice Presidents
April – second meeting	1. Prioritized Area plan recommendations for the next fiscal year presented to	1. Vice Presidents

	PBC and Cabinet.	
April 15th	1. Proposed tentative budget is reviewed and discussed for recommendation. 2. Initial planning and budget assumptions are finalized.	1. PBC 2. Cabinet
May	1. PBC submits recommended funding request to the President. 2. President submits tentative budget to Board of Trustees for first reading. 2.	1. PBC 2. President
June 20th	1. Tentative Budget is presented to the Board.	1. President
July 1st	1. Tentative Budget is rolled into active status (purchasing can begin).	1. Accounting
July 31st	1. Final evaluation of current year goals and objectives are entered into plans.	1. Program faculty, staff, and managers
July/August	1. Final revenue and expenditure adjustments are made to budget.	1. PBC and Cabinet
August	1. Review and discussion of the final budget assumptions by the President with the PBC 2. Final Budget line item review with PBC.	1. President and PBC 2. Vice President Administrative Services
September	1. Final Budget submitted to Board. 2. PBC conducts annual evaluation.	1. President 2. PBC

Revised 03/07/13 rkn

MEMO

TO: Francisco Arce, Vice President of Academic Affairs

FROM: Christina Gold, Academic Senate President

RE: Academic program review template revisions

DATE: March 11, 2013

Attached is a draft of the revisions to the 2013 academic program review template, which is contained within a larger packet of program review materials. As we agreed in our meeting on February 28, 2013, this year the faculty authors of academic program review will not be using the CurricUNET program review module because of technical difficulties and the need for revisions to the module. Also, the Academic Program Review Committee agrees that the paper template used in 2011 yielded higher quality program reviews with more detail and reflection, than those in 2012 submitted through CurricUNET.

The draft revisions to the attached template focus on the following:

1. Returning to the more detailed style of questions used in the paper template of 2011.

2. Requiring programs to set standards and goals in student achievement. This change is recommended in response to the new ACCJC requirement in the annual report for institutions to set similar standards.

3. Enhancing the Assessment and SLO section to elicit more detailed responses regarding the ways in which assessments have impacted instruction, curriculum, and programs.

4. Enhancing the Assessment and SLO section so that programs will show the alignment between course, program and institutional learning outcomes.

5. Incorporating the strategic initiatives into the prioritized list of recommendations for more seamless use of the program review recommendations in Plan Builder.

This current draft of the "Academic Program Review Materials" was compiled by Christina Gold upon the advice and input of Janet Young, the Academic Senate Vice President of Instructional Effectiveness and an SLO Co-ordinator, and Joshua Rosales, of Institutional Research. The draft will now proceed to the Academic Program Review Committee for final comment and approval. The new "Academic Program Review Materials" will be put into effect upon your approval.

Program review orientations are planned for faculty authors and Deans on Thursday, March 14 and Friday, March 15.

Attachment: "Academic Program Review Materials" Draft, 3/10/13

Academic Senate Distance Education Task Force Plan

Meetings
Friday, March 15 – 1:00-2:30
Friday, April 26 – 1:00-2:30
Friday, May 17 – 1:00-2:30

Problems the task force was formed to resolve:
- We are not certain we can demonstrate that we are fully meeting federal and ACCJC requirements in student authentication and regular, effective contact.
- Distance education faculty are confused about what is expected for authentication and contact.

The DE Task Force Objective:
- To meet federal and ACCJC requirements for student authentication and regular, effective contact while assuring that we are maintaining flexibility and an optimal learning environment for students and abiding by the faculty contract and board policies concerning the faculty right to choose instructional materials.

Task Force To Do List and Timeline:

April 22
- The Distance Education Advisory Committee will complete a recommendation that achieves the task force objective and has the agreement of the Director of Learning Resources.

April 26
- The DE Task Force will meet to discuss the recommendation.

April 29-May 13
- The recommendation will pass through consultation with the Deans, Academic Senate, and Vice President of Academic Affairs.

May 17
- The Distance Education Task Force will meet to discuss the consultative feedback.
- If there is general agreement, the guidelines move forward with the agreement of the Director of Learning Resources.
- If there is not general agreement on the guidelines, the task force will then determine how to proceed.

If there is agreement:

May 20-June 7
- Faculty are notified of the new guidelines and have time to ask for clarification and further direction, if necessary.
- Leaders of the Standards II and III Accreditation Committees are notified of the change for inclusion in the 2014 accreditation self study.

Summer 2013
- Francine inserts the guidelines into new on-line Etudes training.
- Faculty make any necessary adjustments to fall on-line courses.

Fall 2013
- **We are confident we are meeting authentication and contact requirements while maintaining instructional flexibility and optimal on-line learning! And, we've done this through a process of cross-campus collegial consultation that creates more buy-in with the decision and further embeds accreditation into our campus conversations and processes.**

Senate Work Group: Institutional Student Achievement Standards, 2013
March 20, 2013

The following attendees met to discuss the tentative institutional student achievement standards required for inclusion on the ACCJC annual report due at the end of March 2013. Because of the late notice that these standards would need to be set, the group was only able to meet one time. The notes provide a summary of the actions and plans taken by Institutional Research and Planning as a result of the discussion.

Attendees
Christina Gold (Behavioral & Social Sciences/Senate)
Don Goldberg (Math/Dean)
Irene Graff (Institutional Research and Planning/Director)
Lars Kjeseth (Math/Basic Skills)
Tom Lew (Humanities/Dean)
Jeanie Nishime (Student & Community Advancement/VP)
Jenny Simon (ESL/Curriculum Chair)
Vanessa Haynes (Counseling/CEC)
Merriel Winfree (Industry and Technology/Senate)

IRP Actions and Plans Derived from the Discussion

Changes from and comments on the discussion:

1.   Added mention of the positive influence of the changed W date on success rates as a factor contributing to the set standard. (p. 1)

2.   Lowered Retention (aka Persistence) Rate standard by 0.5 points as a hedge against the uncertain effects of future changes derived from the Student Success Act and course repeatability.

3.   Degrees/Certificates - unchanged. We feel that these standards are set at a safe level.

4.   Transfers - lowered to the 5-year average vs. the 3-year average based on an assessment of the wide fluctuations during this period and the many external factors that affect these counts, which are outside of institutional control.

Moving forward:

1.   Performance will be tracked over time. IR will create graphical displays of trends with an overlay of the standard (and average, min and max rates/counts noted) for those rates that have institutional meaning.

2.   Methodology for all rates (as well as the methodology and process used for setting standards) will be documented and publicized.

3.   IR recommends that additional disaggregated rates be based on a starting point statistical methodology to be reviewed for feedback through the consultation process. Individual program adjustments to these standards should be made only if accompanied by valid justifications based on expert knowledge of past or future factors.

4.   In general, we should continue to evaluate our performance by including the exploration of external research reports and available performance data, which can be used to inform the setting of goals for student achievement.

5.   The college will discuss the setting of goals for which to strive through collegial consultation processes as well as the upcoming Planning Summit.

El Camino College
Methodology for ACCJC Institution-Set Standards

Below is a brief summary of the methodology used to set the new institution standards for the 2013 ACCJC Annual Report for El Camino College (ECC) and El Camino College Compton Center. Due to the fact that Compton Center is not recognized as an independently-accredited institution, standards must be based on combined data for the two locations. The rates proposed in this document were calculated based on combined *counts* and therefore represent weighted averages between ECC (Torrance) and Compton Center.

The standards set for this annual report accompany the most recent rate that the college can report (Fall 2012 and 2011-12) and represent a new reporting requirement based on federal regulations for satisfactory institutional performance with respect to student achievement. Colleges shall also set rates by location, delivery method, program, demographic categories, and other subgroups, as appropriate. The development of these additional standards will take some time and involve analysis, deliberation and consultation before they are finalized. The standards described herein are the starting point of that process.

Successful course completion rate (Success Rate):

Success rates were analyzed across 10 years to average out the effects of external factors influencing enrollment composition, course offerings and academic performance (e.g., economic, state budgeting/funding, CSU/UC enrollment restrictions)—63.7%. Success rates also were analyzed across the most recent 5 years to reflect performance since Fall 2008 when Compton enrollments were beginning to stabilize—64.5%.

Another factor that contributed to the setting the standard was the change in the Withdrawal notation date that went into effect in Fall 2012 (shifted to census date), which likely has contributed to a slight and permanent increase in success rates.

The institution-set standard rate is set .5% to 1% points below performance in last 5 years (since this is an exceptional period likely influenced by an increase in deferred CSU/UC-bound students among other factors).

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for Course Completion Rate: **64.0%**

Successful student course completion rate for fall 2012: **68.2%**

> ### *El Camino College:*
>
> Proposed Institution-Set Standard for Course Completion Rate: **65.0%**
>
> Successful student course completion rate for fall 2012: **69.7%**

ECC_Compton Center:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for Course Completion Rate: **58.0%**

Successful student course completion rate for fall 2012: **62.9%**

Fall to Fall Retention Rate (known in California as "Persistence Rate"):

Fall to fall persistence rates were analyzed from Fall 2008 since this term marked when Compton enrollments were beginning to stabilize. The institution-set standard rate is set .5% to 1% points below performance in last 4 years (45.5%).

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for student retention percentage: **44.5%**

Percent of students retained from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 semesters: **46.1%**

El Camino College:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for student retention percentage: **47.5%**

Percent of students retained from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 semesters: **50.3%**

ECC_Compton Center:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for student retention percentage: **32.5%**

Percent of students retained from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 semesters: **33.3%**

Degree/Certificate Completion and Transfers:

The proposed standards are based on the 3-year average of degree and certificate completion. This is the same method used for the Perkins IV Core Indicators and Negotiating Performance Targets process. The 5-year average of transfer students was used in setting the Transfer standard.

Degree Completion:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for degree completion number: **1,662**

Number of students who received a degree in the 2011-12 academic year: **1,916**

El Camino College:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for degree completion number: **1,463**

Number of students who received a degree in the 2011-12 academic year: **1,686**

ECC_Compton Center:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for degree completion number: **199**

Number of students who received a degree in the 2011-12 academic year: **230**

Certificate Completion:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for student certification completion number: **511**

Number of students who completed certificate requirements and received a certificate in the 2011-2012 academic year: **591**

El Camino College:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for student certification completion number: **441**

Number of students who completed certificate requirements and received a certificate in the 2011-2012 academic year: **489**

ECC_Compton Center:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for student certification completion number: **70**

Number of students who completed certificate requirements and received a certificate in the 2011-2012 academic year: **102**

Transfers:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for student transfer to 4-year colleges/universities: **1,325**

Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2011-2012: **1,464**

El Camino College:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for student transfer to 4-year colleges/universities: **1,299**

Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2011-2012: **1,460**

ECC_Compton Center:

Proposed Institution-Set Standard for student transfer to 4-year colleges/universities: **278**

Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2011-2012: **463**

 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE 4260: Prerequisites and Co-Requisites

~~The following provides for the establishing, reviewing, and challenging of prerequisites, co-requisites, advisories on recommended preparation, and certain limitations on enrollment in a manner consistent with law and good practice. If prerequisites, co-requisites, advisories, and limitations are established unnecessarily or inappropriately, they constitute unjustifiable obstacles to student access and success. Therefore, this procedure calls for caution and careful scrutiny in establishing them. Nonetheless, it is as important to have prerequisites in place where they are a vital factor in maintaining academic standards as it is to avoid establishing prerequisites where they are not needed. For these reasons,~~Prerequisites, co-requisites, advisories, and limitations are necessary to ensure that students succeed in their coursework and have access to the courses they require. It is important to have prerequisites in place where they are a vital factor in maintaining academic standards. It is also necessary to ensure that prerequisites, co-requisites, advisories and limitations do not constitute unjustifiable obstacles to student success and access. Therefore, the Education Code, Title 5 and the El Camino College District ~~has sought~~ seek to foster the appropriate balance between ~~these two concerns~~ student success and access.

1. Information in the Catalog and Schedule of Courses.
The college shall provide the following explanations both in the college catalog and in the schedule of courses:
   A. Definitions of prerequisites, co-requisites, and limitations on enrollment including the differences among them and the specific prerequisites, co-requisites, and limitations on enrollment that have been established.
   B. Procedures for a student to challenge prerequisites, co-requisites, and limitations on enrollment and circumstances under which a student is encouraged to make such a challenge. The information about challenges must include, at a minimum, the specific process including any deadlines, the various types of challenge that are established in law, and any additional types of challenge permitted by the college.
   C. Definitions of advisories on recommended preparation, the right of a student to choose to take a course without meeting the advisory, and circumstances under which a student is encouraged to exercise that right.
   D. Definitions of contract course, co-requisite, noncredit basic skills course, non-degree-applicable basic skills courses, prerequisite and satisfactory grade.

2. Challenge Process
   A. Any student who does not meet a prerequisite or co-requisite or who is not permitted to enroll due to a limitation on enrollment but who provides satisfactory evidence may seek entry into the course as follows:
      1. If space is available in a course when a student files a challenge to the

prerequisite or co-requisite, the District shall reserve a seat for the student and resolve the challenge within five (5) working days. If the challenge is upheld or the District fails to resolve the challenge within the five (5) working-day period, the student shall be allowed to enroll in the course.

2. If no space is available in the course when a challenge is filed, the challenge shall be resolved prior to the beginning of registration for the next term and, if the challenge is upheld, the student shall be permitted to enroll if space is available when the students registers for that subsequent term.

B. Grounds for challenge shall include the following:

1. Those grounds for challenge specified in Title 5, Section ~~55003(m)55201(f).~~ 55003(p and q)

2. The student seeks to enroll and has not been allowed to enroll due to a limitation on enrollment established for a course that involves intercollegiate competition or public performance, or one or more of the courses for which enrollment has been limited to a cohort of students. The student shall be allowed to enroll in such a course if otherwise he or she would be delayed by a semester or more in attaining the degree or certificate specified in his or her educational plan.

3. The student seeks to enroll in a course that has a prerequisite established to protect health and safety, and the student demonstrates that he or she does not pose a threat to himself or herself or others.

4. The student has the obligation to provide satisfactory evidence that the challenge should be upheld. However, where facts essential to a determination of whether the student's challenge should be upheld are or ought to be in the college's own records, then the college has the obligation to produce that information.

3. ~~C.~~ Curriculum Review Process

The curriculum review process shall at a minimum be in accordance with all of the following:

~~1.~~ A. Establish a curriculum committee and its membership in a manner that is mutually agreeable to the college administration and the academic senate.

~~2.~~ B. Establish prerequisites, co-requisites, and advisories on recommended preparation (advisories) only upon the recommendation of the academic senate except that the academic senate may delegate this task to the curriculum committee without forfeiting its rights or responsibilities under Section 53200-53204 of Title 5 and within the limits set forth in Title 5 section 55003. Certain limitations on enrollment must be established in the same manner.

~~3.~~ C. Establish prerequisites, co-requisites, advisories on recommended preparation, and limitations on enrollment only if:

~~a)~~1.The faculty in the discipline or, if the college has no faculty member in the discipline, the faculty in the division do all of the following:

(1) a) Approve the course; and,

(2) b)As a separate action, approve any prerequisite or co-requisite, only if:

    (a) i) The prerequisite or co-requisite is an appropriate and rational measure of a student's readiness to enter the course or program as demonstrated by a content review including, at a minimum, all of the following:

        (i)1. involvement of faculty with appropriate expertise;

        (ii)2. consideration of course objectives set by relevant department(s). The curriculum review process should be done in a manner that is in accordance with accreditation standards.

        (iii)3. be based on a detailed course syllabus and outline of record, tests, related instructional materials, course format, type and number of examinations, and grading criteria;

        (iv)4. specification of the body of knowledge and/or skills which are deemed necessary at entry and/or concurrent with enrollment;

        (v)5. identification and review of the prerequisite or co-requisite which develops the body of knowledge and/or measures skills identified under iv.

        (vi)6. matching of the knowledge and skills in the targeted course (identified under iv.) and those developed or measured by the prerequisite or co-requisite (i.e., the course or assessment identified under v.); and

        (vii)7. maintain documentation that the above steps were taken.

    (b)ii) The prerequisite or co-requisite meets the scrutiny specified in one of the procedures for review of individual courses (see below), and specify which.

(3)c) Approve any limitation on enrollment that is being established for an honors course or section, for a course that includes intercollegiate competition or public performance, or so that a cohort of students will be enrolled in two or more courses, and, in a separate action, specify which.

(4)d) Approve that the course meets the academic standards required for degree applicable courses, non-degree applicable courses, non-credit courses, or community service respectively.

(5)e) Review the course outline to determine if a student would be highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade unless the student had knowledge or skills not taught in the course. If the student would need knowledge or skills not taught in the course itself, then the course may be approved for degree applicable credit only if all requirements for establishing the appropriate prerequisite have been met excepting only approval by the curriculum committee.

(6)f) Review the course outline to determine whether receiving a satisfactory grade is dependent on skills in communication or computation. If receiving a satisfactory grade is sufficiently dependent on such skills, then the course may be approved for degree applicable credit only if all requirements have been met for establishing a prerequisite or co-requisite of not less than eligibility for enrollment to a degree-applicable course in English or mathematics, respectively.

b)2. A course which should have a prerequisite or co-requisite as provided in (5e) or (6f) but for which one or more of the requirements for establishing a prerequisite have not been met may only:

(1a) Be reviewed and approved pursuant to the standards for non-degree applicable credit, non-credit, or community service; or

(2b) Be revised and reviewed as required to meet the criteria for establishing the necessary prerequisites or corequisites.

c)3. The curriculum committee also reviews the course and prerequisite in a manner that meets each of the requirements specified above.

4. Program ReviewPeriodic Review of Requisites and Advisories. As a regular part of the programcourse review process or at least every six years, the college shall review each prerequisite, co-requisite, or advisory to establish that each is still supported by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the curriculum committee and is still in compliance with all other provisions of this policy and with the law. The regular course review process occurs on a six-year cycle, except that prerequisites and co-requisites for vocational courses or programs shall be reviewed every two years. Any prerequisite or co-requisite that is still supported shall be reviewed promptly thereafter to assure that it is in compliance with all other provisions of this policy and with the law.

5. Implementing Prerequisites, Co-requisites, and Limitations on Enrollment. Implementation of prerequisites, co-requisites, and limitations on enrollment must be done in a consistent manner and not left exclusively to the classroom instructor. Every attempt shall be made to enforce all conditions a student must meet to be enrolled in the course through the registration process so that a student is not permitted to enroll unless he or she has met all the conditions or has met all except those for which he or she has a pending challenge or for which further information is needed before final determination is possible of whether the student has met the condition.

6. Instructor's Formal Agreement to Teach the Course as Described. The college shall establish a procedure so that courses for which prerequisites or co-requisites are established will be taught in accordance with the course outline, particularly those aspects of the course outline that are the basis for justifying the establishment of the

prerequisite or co-requisite. The process shall be established by consulting collegially with the academic senate and, if appropriate, the local bargaining unit.

Review of Individual Courses
If the student's enrollment in a course or program is to be contingent on his or her having met the proposed prerequisite(s) or co-requisite(s), then such a prerequisite or co-requisite must be established as follows. If enrollment is not blocked, then what is being established is not a prerequisite or co-requisite but, rather, an advisory on recommended preparation and must be identified as such in the schedule and catalog. Establishing advisories does not require all the following steps.

1. **Prerequisites and Co-requisites**
    A. Levels of Scrutiny. Prerequisites and co-requisites must meet the requirements of at least one of the following subsections:
      1. The Standard Prerequisites or Co-requisites. The college may establish satisfactory completion of a course as prerequisite or co-requisite for another course provided that, in addition to obtaining the review of the faculty in the discipline or department and the curriculum committee as provided above, the college specifies as part of the course outline of record at least three of the campuses of the University of California and the California State University which reflect in their catalogs that they offer the equivalent course with the equivalent prerequisite(s) or co-requisite(s). Any combination of University of California campuses and California State University campuses is acceptable in satisfaction of this requirement.

      2. Sequential Courses Within and Across Disciplines. A course may be established as a prerequisite or co-requisite for another course provided that, in addition to the review by faculty in the department or discipline and by the curriculum committee as described above, skills, concepts, and/or information taught in the first course are presupposed in the second course, and a list of the specific skills and/or knowledge a student must possess in order to be ready to take the second course is included in its outline of record.

      3. Courses in Communication or Computation Skills. Prerequisites establishing communication or computational skill requirements may not be established across the entire curriculum unless established on a course by course basis. A course in communication or computation skills, or eligibility for enrollment in such a course, may be established as a prerequisite or co-requisite for any course other than another course in communication or computation skills by Content Review.

      Department faculty will work with Institutional Research, key administrators and the College Curriculum Committee to identify and prioritize which courses may need communication or computational prerequisites. The process will be

documented using the form provided by the curriculum committee and attached to the course review proposal in CurricUNET that establishes the prerequisite. Once prerequisite courses are established, the affected departments will assure the prerequisite courses are reasonably available and will not unnecessarily impede student progress. College curriculum committee members will be trained on Title 5 regulations regarding the establishment of prerequisites. As part of Program Review, departments will study the impact of prerequisites on student success, giving special attention to disproportionate impact on historically underrepresented groups. ~~if, in addition to the review by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the curriculum committee as provided above, the following is also done:~~
  ~~a) A list of the specific skills a student must possess in order to be ready to take the course is included in the course outline of record; and~~
  ~~b) Research is conducted as provided above.~~
~~The prerequisite or co-requisite may be established for a period of not more than two years while the research is being conducted provided that a determination is made that a student who lacks the particular skills is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade because a sufficient percentage of the grade is directly dependent on these skills. This determination must be approved both by the faculty in the discipline and by the curriculum committee as provided above and must be based on a review of the syllabus as well as samples of tests and other assignments on which the grade is based.~~

4. Cut Scores and Prerequisites. Whether or not research is required to establish a prerequisite, data collected to validate assessment instruments and cut scores is always relevant to reviewing the prerequisites for the associated courses. If such data are insufficient to establish the cut scores, any course prerequisites established for the same course or courses may not be printed in subsequent catalogs and schedules nor enforced in subsequent semesters until the problems are resolved, and sufficient data exist to establish the cut scores. In such a case, the collection of these data shall be done in the manner prescribed above in addition to other requirements of law. Such a prerequisite may be changed to an advisory on recommended preparation while the problems are being resolved.

5. Programs. In order to establish a prerequisite for a program, the proposed prerequisite must be approved as provided for a course prerequisite in regard to at least one course that is required as part of the program.

6. Health and Safety. A prerequisite or co-requisite may be established provided that, in addition to the review by faculty in the department or division and by the curriculum committee as provided above:
   a) The course for which the prerequisite is proposed is one in which the student might endanger his or her own health and safety or the health and

safety of others; and

    b) The prerequisite is that the student possesses what is necessary to protect his or her health and safety and the health and safety of others before entering the course.

7. Recency and Other Measures of Readiness. Recency and other measures of readiness may be established as a prerequisite or co-requisite only if, in addition to the review by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the curriculum committee as provided above, the following is also done:

    a) A list of the specific skills a student must possess in order to be ready to take the course is included in the course outline of record.

    b) Data are gathered according to sound research practices in at least one of the following areas:

        (1) The extent to which students, those currently enrolled in the course or those who have completed it, believe the proposed prerequisite or co-requisite is necessary.

        (2) Comparison of the faculty members' appraisal of students' readiness for the course to whether students met the proposed prerequisite or co-requisite. The faculty appraisal could be done at any time in the semester that the college determined was appropriate and based on independent assignments, quizzes and exams, participation in courses or other indicators that the student was or was not ready to take the course.

        (3) Comparison of students' performance at any point in the course with completion of the proposed prerequisite or co-requisite.

        (4) Comparison of student performance in the course to their scores on assessment instruments in the manner required to validate an assessment instrument and cut scores for the course in question as described above.

    c) The standard for any comparison done shall be that a student is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course unless the student has met the proposed prerequisite or co-requisite. The research design, operational definitions, and numerical standards, if appropriate, shall be developed by research personnel, discipline faculty, and representatives of the academic senate. If the evidence fails to meet the standard established, each college may establish the proposed prerequisite or co-requisite as a recommended preparation and may seek to establish it as a prerequisite or co-requisite only by following the process described in this policy and any applicable college policies.

    d) If the curriculum committee has determined as provided in these procedures that a new course needs to have a prerequisite or co-requisite,

then the prerequisite or co-requisite may be established for a single period of not more than two years while research is being conducted and a determination is being made, provided that:
>   (1) All other requirements for establishing the prerequisite or co-requisite have already been met; and
>   (2) Students are informed that they may enroll in the course although they do not meet the prerequisite. However, students who lack the prerequisite may not constitute more than 20% of those enrolled in any section of the course.

Prerequisites and co-requisites that are exempt from review at the time they are, or were, established are not eligible for this exception, and the research must be conducted during the six years before they must be reviewed.

B. Additional Rules. Title 5, Section 55202 specifies additional rules, which are to be considered part of this document as though reproduced here.

2. Advisories on Recommended Preparation. The college may recommend that a student meet a standard of readiness at entry only if recommended by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the curriculum committee as provided in above. This process is required whether the college used to describe such recommendations in its catalog or schedule as "prerequisites," or "recommended," or by any other term.

3. Limitations on Enrollment. The types of limitation on enrollment specified below may only be established through the curriculum review process by the discipline or department faculty and the curriculum committee specified above, including the requirement to review them again at least every six years; for example, as part of program review. The following requirements must also be met in order to establish these particular limitations on enrollment.

A. Performance Courses. The college may establish audition or try-out as a limitation on enrollment for courses that include public performance or intercollegiate competition such as but not limited to band, orchestra, theater, competitive speech, chorus, journalism, dance, and intercollegiate athletics provided that:
>   1. For any certificate or associate degree requirement which can be met by taking this course, there is another course or courses which satisfy the same requirement; and
>   2. The college includes in the course outline of record a list of each certificate or associate degree requirement that the course meets and of the other course or courses which meet the same requirement.

Limitations on enrollment established as provided for performance courses shall

be reviewed during program review or at least every six years to determine whether the audition or try-out process is having a disproportionate impact on any historically under-represented group and, if so, a plan shall be adopted to seek to remedy the disproportionate impact. If disproportionate impact has been found, the limitation on enrollment may not be printed in subsequent catalogs or schedules nor enforced in any subsequent term until such a plan has been endorsed by the department and the college administration and put into effect.

B. Honors Courses. A limitation on enrollment for an honors course or an honors section of a course may be established if, in addition to the review by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the curriculum committee as provided above, there is another section or another course or courses at the college which satisfy the same requirements. If the limitation is for an honors course and not only for an honors section, the college must also include in the course outline of record a list of each certificate or associate degree requirement that the course meets and of the other course or courses which meet the same associate degree or certificate requirement.

Blocks of Courses or Sections.

Blocks of courses or blocks of sections of courses are two or more courses or sections for which enrollment is limited in order to create a cohort of students. Such a limitation on enrollment may be established if, in addition to review by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the curriculum committee as provided above, there is another section or another course or courses that satisfy the same requirement. If the cohort is created through limitations on enrollment in the courses rather than limitations on specific sections of courses, then the college must include in the course outline of record a list of each certificate or associate degree requirement that the course meets and of the other course or courses which satisfy the same associate degree or certificate requirement.

Reference:
Title 5, Sections 55000 et seq.

BOARD POLICY 4260   **Prerequisites and Co-Requisites**

The President/Superintendent is authorized to establish prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories on recommended preparation for courses in the curriculum. All such prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories shall be established in accordance with the standards set out in Title 5 *and in mutual agreement with the Academic Senate*. Any prerequisites, co-requisites or advisories shall be necessary and appropriate for achieving the purpose for which they are established. The procedures shall include a process by which a prerequisite or co-requisite may be challenged by a student on grounds permitted by law. Pre-requisites, co-requisites and advisories shall be identified in District publications available to students.

 Procedures for implementing the policy will be developed in collegial consultation with the Academic Senate, as defined in CCR § 53200.

Reference: Title 5 Sections 55000 and 55003

This Board Policy and its related Administrative Procedure replace Board Policy 4260.1.

See Administrative Procedure 4260.

El Camino College

Adopted: 7/20/09

Revisions: Educational Policies Committee 10/9/12

                        College Curriculum Committee 10/25/12

Academic Senate readings: 2/19/13; 3/5/13; 3/19/13