

# CCCCIO Executive Board Meeting Minutes - Draft

JANUARY 18, 2012

10 A.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

EXECUTIVE CONFERENCE ROOM, 3<sup>RD</sup>  
FLOOR, CCCCCO, SACRAMENTO

<b>FACILITATOR</b>	Mary Kay Rudolph
<b>NOTE TAKER</b>	Sherrie Guerrero
<b>TIMEKEEPER</b>	Claire Biancalana
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Executive Board Members, Executive Secretary

## **Welcome, Introductions, & Review of Agenda**

Those in attendance: Mary Kay Rudolph, Meredith Randall, Renee Kilmer, Claire Biancalana, Sherrie Guerrero, Pam Deegan, Craig Justice, Donna Burns, David Morse, George Railey, Kevin Trutna, Kenley Neufeld, Michelle Pilati; Debbie Ikeda; Erika Endrijonas (attending for Sharon Lowry), Barry Russell, Sue Nelson, Sidney Burks

Meeting began at 10:01. Mary Kay explained that the group was trying a new time (10 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.) with a working lunch. She reminded the group that we agreed to commit to the entire meeting and not arrive late or leave early. There were no additions to the agenda

## **Review & Approval of Minutes of October 26, 2011**

After review of the minutes, Craig Justice moved for approval; seconded by George Railey. Approved with one abstention (Erika Endrijonas).

## **Treasurer's Report**

Mary Kay reported that Larry Buckley is in the midst of moving and the treasurer documents are currently packed. He will forward them next week. She added that Larry may be stepping down from the Treasurer position. Mary Kay asked if anyone was interested in serving in this role. Claire explained that she collects the funds, logs them in, then sends them out to the Treasurer. Mary Kay explained that the work load is about a ½-hour commitment weekly. She is looking for someone who would be willing to make a two-year commitment for the sake of continuity and that it needs to be someone from the board. Craig Justice expressed some interest and will call Larry to discuss the demands of the position. If he is interested, Craig will notify Mary Kay. The board will then vote electronically to expedite the process and affirm the decision at the meeting in April.

## **ASCCC Report**

Michelle asked David to update the group on current issues from the Curriculum Committee. David explained that the curriculum committee is working on paper regarding setting course enrollment caps. The intent is to take the paper to the plenary in April for approval. David added that they have also been planning of Curriculum Institute which is at the Hyatt San Francisco in July. He added that one of the things they will be including is a session about working more closely with the K-12 system, especially in light of SB 1143 recommendations. David noted that there were several issues that will be discussed at the SAC meeting this Friday, including a review of draft written guidelines and a Q&A document concerning setting prerequisites through content review (which he hopes will be approved on Friday); revision of Program and Course Approval Handbook; and a review of the first draft of the repeatability change language. David reported that the Curriculum Committee is also considering doing regional curriculum meetings like last fall, both for helping people make the repeatability changes and to talk through content review process for prerequisites.

Pam expressed concern about consultation with CIOs concerning the course enrollment caps document. She explained that this issue could put the two organizations in a public conflict. She stressed that the senate and the CIOs have been working so well together, and she would hate to see something put out in public that puts us in conflict. David explained that Sharon Lowery is on the committee, and they are focusing on the process and putting out guidelines and suggestions. He added that the process issues include discussion of the proper roles for all constituent groups (e.g., curriculum committees, senates, administration, unions, etc.). In addition to Sharon's input, he has worked with former CIOs (e.g., Dennis Gervin) who reviewed the administrative roles piece and David is certainly looking to include that. He noted that the paper states this is the senate's perspective and acknowledges that there are other exigencies and demands that come into play. Mary Kay would like to see a draft of the document. She added that Santa Rosa is doing a workload study. She agreed with Pam and has worked closely with faculty but has never seen anything from any source with documentation and data to say this is the best way and why. Mary Kay is really concerned because the senate and CIOs have been wonderful partners and she worries that this could be controversial. She hopes there is a commitment to respecting the input in the paper process. Michelle explained that was the reason they focused on the process, which is often not based on pedagogical concerns. David will take the CIO feedback and the draft to the executive committee for discussion.

Debbie asked if research was included in this paper and whether or not data should drive these decisions. In certain isolated cases data exists with national organizations, but there is no overall broad research. She added there is always the possibility of doing local research. Pam added that she has not seen such research either. She added that she has only been able to find is k-3 research demonstrating smaller classes are really important. Other than that, she has been unable to locate research that smaller classes are beneficial. National organizations say there should be small classes, but those recommendations are not based on data. Mary Kay added that when Santa Rosa changed the maximum cap, she had to work with their union and added that many colleges have contractual issues. Some colleges have class caps in contracts while others do not. David explained that by focusing on the process, they mentioned changing class caps as well as setting them initially and reviewing the ways decisions should be worked forward. They tried to make it broad enough to cover different situations. Again, the focus was on process and roles and what is driving the decision—workload versus pedagogy. The direction was to start with the main arguments of pedagogy and safety and acknowledge that there are workload and economic issues that have to be included.

Michelle informed the group that the Accreditation Institute is in Anaheim in February 10 and 11 and that they are working on reaching out to deans as well as faculty and CIOs. The former Basic Skills Institute is being shifted to be more of an academy and will be February 24 and 25 in Anaheim. She added that the focus will be basic skills across the curriculum and student success. Michelle explained that they are really looking at what we are doing to facilitate student success, developing an integrated campus, and identifying what we can be doing to help all students in every way.

Michelle stated that she was hoping for a break after the SSTF recommendations were adopted, however that has not materialized. She explained that the SSTF recommendations are taking up more and more time. They were adopted after three hours of raucous commentary. There were times when speakers had not read the most current version or they wanted to comment on budget. The following day, the legislative agenda was adopted by BOG. Michelle added that it is troubling for the BOG to adopt that agenda after only one reading. She explained that the senate works to make changes more slowly and deliberately so that all issues are fully vetted.

Michelle informed the group that a committee is approaching how we respond to prerequisites. Within the details of the recommendations, the senate wants the CIOs and others to join them in advocating one interim common assessment before we are forced—just requiring extra time and money to make that change. She added that she has not formally discussed this yet, but she hopes that colleges can honor each other's assessments. Being required to move once, then move again is problematic, and they are working on a position paper. Michelle will share after it is compiled, and we can hopefully advocating for the same things. Mary Kay asked if Michelle saw the Long Beach presentation from the fall conference. Michelle added that she did and that Eloy will be at the conference as a speaker. All have a vested interest. Prioritized recommendations of what was most important, data, do we know what colleges are doing a really good job. Looking at the budget.

Finally, Michelle noted serious concerns about the BOG fee waiver changes, especially in view of the increase in fees. She said it will be interesting to see what the impact actually is. Erica added that the Pell changes and the increase in the Cal Grant GPA are additional factors that come into play. She commented that there is greater need, higher tuition, and changing pell. Many students won't be eligible, and this is a wicked combination coming all at once. All of those changes go into effect without any grandfathering.

### **CCCAOE Report**

Sid Burks said they were planning their spring conference in conjunction with senate's Vocational Education Institute. This is an experiment, and, if it goes well, they will make it permanent. The conference is March 21-23 at the San Francisco Westin. The theme is leadership, and they will unveil their new leadership certification program for CTE and Economic Development. He invited the CIOs to attend.

### **ACCE Report**

Donna reported that they will have two conferences, one in the north on February 29 at the Chancellor's Office and one in the south on March 22 at El Camino College. She added that they were aware it would conflict with CCAOE and they would like to be further ahead in planning so they could coordinate and collaborate. Also busy with SSTF just like everyone. Larger non-credit colleges are helping smaller ones implement SSTF 4.1 as an example. There is progress on non-credit ed plans. Some colleges have been unofficially doing ed plans for a long time because it's good practice. Another implication, the suggestion to backfill credit seats with fee based should not be a problem. Concerned about categoricals and watching outcomes related to adult education. Those students' needs are not being met, whether us or k12 does not matter. The non-credit accountability task force met at the Chancellor's Office and talked about the outcome recommendation Janet Fulks reported on behalf of the senate. The senate will likely come out in support of three "grades:" P-Pass, SP-Satisfactory Progress, and NP-No Pass, and then push forward as quickly as they can. Chancellor's Office needs to collect non-credit grades—absolutely critical to be able to report on non-credit outcomes. The AARC enhanced funded non-credit metric still does not show certificate gains because those aren't being collected. When you cannot report grades and cannot report certificates, it makes it hard to fight back in public forums to talk about how non-credit has made progress.

Debbie asked if fee-based classes can be offered for credit. The provision in AB 515 did not go anywhere. SSTF, section 4, would allow students to backfill available credit seats with fee-paying audit students who would not get credit. Michelle stated the senate is looking at that fee in situations where the student cannot pay. Auditing is not fee-based. David noted that the proposal for having fee-based students fill out credit students is also on SAC agenda for this Friday.

Other discussion: Michelle mentioned Senate discussion that non-credit cdcp should be funded at the level it is supposed to be so you can have conversations about what should/should not be credit. Also question students declaring major by one or two terms. Might use unit completion, need local control. Question was asked about noncredit grading of students if they have open enrollment. Practice at experienced programs is that grades should be based on competencies and measurable outcomes. Competency is not about attendance.

### **CCL Report**

Kenley presented to BOG before SSTF. For more than 20 years, annual survey data was collected. He presented the last 5 years' worth of data to BOG. The information should be on the Chancellor's Office website and includes information about collections, hours, staffing, etc. Kenley noted the information is useful for colleges to compare between campuses. It also has fte information. Some of the general trends revealed in the data include: 1) Larger percentages of budgets are shifting to electronic resources from print. The down side is that colleges no longer own their content when they lease electronic resources, however, the benefit is the increase in resources available to students (e.g., 300 print magazines versus 20,000 in a database). 2) Reducing hours across the state, 3) Ratio of FT faculty to students decreasing. Kenley noted that their conference will be in Sacramento on March 15 and 16.

They pay for hotel and food and usually have 60-80 people. The CSSOs will also be in Sacramento at that time. The main thing on agenda will be taking a look at librarians' role in strategic thinking for next couple of decades. What should library landscapes look like physically? See if there is a place in Title 5 or other language that needs to be modified to support that. Not instructional facilities, so funding opportunities limited. Maybe libraries should be considered instructional areas.

Mary Kay asked how many colleges still had deans with exclusive responsibilities for the library. Three colleges at the table did. Most others have deans who have the library with other responsibilities. Colleges have started to pile on tutorial, distance education, and technology into these dean positions. Kenley noted that it is an important issue to think about it because of amount of library expenditures ranks high like athletics, sciences. Need someone who understands. He also reported that the statewide database has been rolled out which is a win-win for system. The next discussion will be about some form of centralized library catalogue. The hope is that we can provide one and save colleges a lot of money.

Mary Kay noted that the movement in universities is to change the way their infrastructure is set up. Moving toward hook-up docks. Community colleges will not be able to do that because so many students do not have their own laptops. Kenley noted the demand is there for computer resources and is not going away. Mary Kay asked how many colleges still have computer literacy requirement. Three colleges at the table did. Long Beach does; embedded in the transfer English class. Probably 20-40 percent still have it. Senate passed a decade ago information competency requirement, DOF squashed.

### **Chancellor's Office Report**

Barry reminded the board that Instructional Service Agreements are required if you contract with an external agency to provide instruction on campus. He noted that auditors are now looking at those agreements. There is a list of 16 things that need to be in place for the agreement. Last year, two colleges were dinged heavily because those 16 things did not match up and were not congruent with other Title 5 regulations. Barry explained that the most popular is cosmetology where a college wants the program but does not want to develop a school, hire faculty, etc. These colleges will contract with a beauty school, but the curriculum goes through the curriculum committee, normal MQs for teachers are met, but beauty school is providing the instruction. He noted there are a lot of opportunities for misinterpretation and straying from guidelines. Barry will pull together a group to come together to review whether or not the 16 things are still viable given the changes colleges have been through since those 16 things were first adopted. Barry added that these agreements are also needed in the public service sector. For example, fire and police decide they want to run an 8-hour certification so students get credit and do it quickly. These need approval from local boards and need to complete the entire process. He wants to be sure they are more reactive to industry needs and is working to make these things work better.

With regard to the TBA auditing issues, Barry reported that many schools are being dinged. The most common issue is that some campuses identify classes as TBA when they really are not. Colleges are using TBA to mean lots of different things. If you put, TBA, you have to follow those guidelines: set time, separate assignment, all those restrictions. Auditors are asking for all of those things. Some schools are putting TBA for online classes. As long as TBA is in schedule, it is TBA. Barry asked the CIOs not to use TBA for online. Use distance education which has another set of rules. Use TBA if actually you are actually doing it; if your hybrid class has a portion DE, do not use TBA. Michelle asked if there was a mismatch between what a college says in their schedule and what they were actually doing. That would make it appear that something is wrong. Renee noted that with TBA issues, a lot depends on the auditor.

Barry also reported that ACCJC approved new language regarding the catalog. The standard now states the catalog can be print or electronic. That will be a relief.

Barry recently provided a report on the 1440 implementation. Seven colleges are still not compliant; three of them are waiting on final approval at their board meeting this month. The rest are still a ways away from getting it done. Barry congratulated everyone, especially those colleges who have five or more approved degrees. He also mentioned that he recently sent out an informal survey asking what future degrees colleges were thinking of developing. He will resend more formally and added that he needs the information for their meetings with CSU. Michelle encouraged colleges to look at the data—the

spreadsheet is on the Chancellor's Office website and shows all campuses, how many CSUs have accepted which degrees. She added that CIOs can see what other colleges have completed theirs and their respective faculty members connect.

Barry reported that it has been suggested to do some auditing of DE. However, there are so many issues that can be examined, and each college does it differently. It is an oversight issue for each campus, not necessarily from the state. However, he reported that they are getting pressure to prove our effectiveness with DE. Also, differing types of pressure: some camps pressing for more because they think it is cheaper. In some ways, DE is more expensive. Another pressure point has been concurrent enrollment, that it all be online. Taking more k12 online.

Barry reported concurrent enrollment is also a high priority. There have been discussions and meetings about how that works, how we can make it better, and engage more students. Barry asked that those who have strong programs send him a contact person who would be good to contact if he gets questions. Connected to concurrent enrollment is middle college. There are 11 approved middle college programs. This year, there was a new RFA so those campuses who have current programs can apply, but any others who decide they want one can also apply. Barry clarified that middle college is not early college, and has specific requirements. Barry recommended that in the applications, college should respond directly to SSTF 2.2, 2.3 (how they are dealing with assessment, placement, goal setting). Colleges collect apportionment from college classes the students are in (in the afternoon), and K-12 collects ADA for their high school classes (mornings). Middle college programs have proven very effective and are meant for low economic students who are not doing as well in high school. Mary Kay would like to see a list of colleges that have middle college programs.

Barry reported on the instructional materials discussion and gave the group new draft language. Section 59400b details you what you cannot charge fees for (e.g., Blackboard, administrative costs, electronic gradebook, etc). He explained that colleges can approach it a couple of ways: 1) go buy access or go get electronic textbook; colleges can do that. 2) a math department could decide we are all going to use my math lab; the college could then negotiate a one-time, common course access and reduce the cost, then charge students for that department wide. Additionally, at the time of purchase, students have to be told up front how long they have access to the material. Must be at least one year. One publisher chose until graduation. We are responsible to make sure students are treated fairly and are not paying extra fees. The draft regulation language will be taken to SAC, Senate, and Consultation Council. The goal is to take it to BOG in March with an effective date of fall 2013.

Barry explained that SSTF is pushing for overhaul of Community Education, especially for pushing some programs out to CE. There have only been informal guidelines for CE. Districts need to develop CE policies.

Barry reported that there are some CSU projects in discussion. Several campuses are working with pilot programs and their local CSU. Lumina and AACCC are working to come up with a project that figures out a different way to assess attainment of general education—competency based versus a list of classes. Students could get credit for providing service in the local food bank. There are 10 pilot projects funded at 5-10k dealing specifically with transfer. He has list he could provide of the pilot colleges. The other project involves reverse transfer—those students who leave community college without their associate degrees. This project would identify those CSU students who transferred without first getting their associate degrees, identify the courses they would need to complete to obtain the degree, and notify the students of that information. They are CSU Fresno and Fresno Community College. Barry explained they will be looking for volunteers after a funded source is identified.

The draft prerequisite guidelines emailed to the group. Barry explained that the consultation process will be occurring in the next few months. Barry added that three to four campuses have agreed to be test sites. Barry added that they did not want to create another model district policy since the districts will need to write policy appropriate for their respective colleges.

Barry stated that he has asked his staff to get the revised Program and Course Approval Handbook out to the field as soon as possible. He added that they are having problems with campuses submitting curriculum incorrectly using the old guidelines. He added that they were going to a new curriculum inventory, a second edition with CurricUNET. He explained that the major problem was that people didn't

know which forms and fields to fill out. Curricunet version two will use pull down menus—only feeds you the information you need to fill out, and individuals do not necessarily need to know which form they need. Barry added that Sally Lenz is putting the final touches in now, and it should be done by

the end of month. Webinars will be held in February and March, as well as a presentation at plenary. He added that there will not be any down time for the system during the conversion.

Barry reported that the BOG approved the SSTF recommendations, and they will be sent to the legislature in March. He added that many individuals are still under the impression that changes can still be made—they cannot. Many of the items in those recommendations are being implemented through our regular process, coming to groups, consultation, etc. Regarding non-credit, there is no recommendation to do anything with the 9+1 non-credit categories. There is a push for campuses to be clearer on what they offer with older adults. He will provide more guidance on how to do that. He added that the Chancellor from San Diego provided some input on what older categories should be (e.g., better living conditions, increasing their skills, mental or health improvement, etc.). Those more on the fringe need to be pushed to community service, however, that is locally determined. LAO has a report, but it is not out yet. Colleges need to have discussions on campus, and this area is self monitored. All students need to have ed plans. Still waiting on governor's office regarding categorical.

Donna had questions concerning the non-credit ed plans, for example, in the area of cognitive functioning--How do you show progress on an ed plan?

### **Lunch**

The lunch was a working lunch, with the exception of a 20 minute break from 12:00 p.m. to 12:20 p.m.

### **President's Report**

Mark Kay reported that so much is happening so quickly, and the important role of this board is to stay in contact with our respective regions to keep everyone updated.

Mary Kay attended the BOG meeting virtually. She noted that Consultation Council was tomorrow (1/19/12) and reminded the group that we had discussed extra CIOs attending consultation council. The president, past president, and president elect cover consultation council and BOG. Board members need to be ready and available to help cover these meetings whenever conflicts arise and make arrangements to attend Consultation Council when available. She added that this is especially important in light of SSTF recommendations.

Mary Kay reminded the group of the CIO goals established after the "hummingbird" retreat. At the time, the SSTF commenced and many of our goals aligned with those anyway. She asked what do the board wanted to do this year with the goals. Meredith recommended that we do a "crosswalk" of our goals with the SSTF Recommendations to see what goals are still not being addressed. At that point, we will move forward with those goals. Mary Kay asked everyone to review the goals and comment as appropriate. She will work with the executive committee to crosswalk the CIO goals with the SSTF recommendation.

### **Fall 2011 Conference Review**

The board reviewed the evaluation comments concerning the conference. Most of the comments were good. Mary Kay added that we need to do a better job working with presenters to clarify what we want them to present. Claire added that 99% of attendees had paid, and we made almost \$3,000. There were several complaints about the meals. It was recommended that Mary Dowell's presentation be earlier in the conference and of longer duration. There was not enough time to talk through all of the issues. For the first time, there was no sponsor, however, we made money anyway. Mary Kay added that when assigning people to be leads on presentations, we need to be clear with them and effectively liaison with them. Mary Kay reported that the questionnaire results about location were to continue with San Diego. We will be at the Dana again, in spite of the room issue. Many complaints were about the quality of the cheaper rooms. Claire has already talked to the Dana about reserving more higher-end

rooms. With Meredith serving as president elect, she will be able to plan spring, fall, spring and help with continuity.

### **Spring 2012 Joint Conference with ASCCC**

Meredith reported that Claire sent out the current working draft. There will be no 411 at the spring conference. Pam will spearhead the first session on leadership. Pam was asked how she envisioned the scenario going, whether it would be interactive using case studies. Pam suggested that we use the format from our Monterey conference which included scenarios; however, when the groups report out, there are experienced panelists who have been through disasters/change/transitions and can inform the discussion. Kevin reported that the handouts from the Monterey session were helpful, and he was able to use them as a round table with his deans. It was asked whether or not this would be a shared session with faculty. The consensus of the group was that this needs to be a private session since many new CIOs are afraid to speak up and much of the discussion involves personnel issues.

The next session is on enrollment management, lead by Debbie and Craig. Possible suggestions included addressing registration priority, leadership in time of reduction, and inviting Randy Lawson. Since Randy does this session during 411, it was felt that many people have already seen that presentation. Mary Kay added the issue of how CIOs work with faculty and deans. Craig uses his instructional council which includes all department chairs. They prioritize courses in an objective manner so that no one feels on guard. He has had no push back from faculty. Phil Smith and Diana Ciabatti from Napa were suggested as possible speakers. Erica added the context of rationing. Pam suggested having a two pronged approach—one if taxes pass, one if they don't, and both Pam and Sherrie have scheduling tools that can be demonstrated. The conference theme is better together, but we could change the title to be about the process. Michelle will identify faculty to present in the session. Craig's recommended title: From Open Door to Gated Community. The sessions need to be planned by the first part of February. Meredith will contact Julie to coordinate.

Wednesday is set with everyone attending the lunch. Leadership session is private, enrollment management is open. Meredith invited to meet with senate executive committee. Need firm title and format by February 1<sup>st</sup>.

Wednesday evening—dinner. The group considered whether or not to have a speaker. Decision was to have dinner only but to also do award presentations at the dinner.

Thursday--Combined general and regional CIO meetings in the morning. Board members are to check in and report back on items. Mary Kay, Meredith, and Claire will work on those items which will include the CIO goals and the SSTF recommendations

Repeatability session—Barry and Randy, possibly David Morse. Keeping CIOs in mind for their breakouts.

Lunch: speaker – Barry is working on it.

After lunch is the 1440 session with Sally Lenz and Jeff Spano. There is still a need for a CIO. It was suggested that we get an associate vice president and his/her respective curriculum chair to explain how they do their degrees. Suggestions included having the CIO discuss the struggle part of it (however, the group would rather focus on the positive); have Barry talk about where we are with CSU and/or bring in someone from CSU. It was noted that there is still conflict between some CSU and CCC faculty and it has been a challenge to get them to work objectively. Some mentioned they were not sure how helpful that would be. The biggest issues are the acceptance and explanation of the transfer, how the degrees are going to transfer, how do we do it on our end? Barry said he could have Donald there to talk about the grid he has developed. It was noted that we still have not worked out the mechanics—they want us to certify. Mary Kay asked who would be introducing and shepherding the session. Sherrie will do that. American River Associate Vice President was suggested; Michelle will check with a faculty member.

Michelle and Mary Kay will coordinate and present the SSTF session.

With regard to sponsors, Claire explained that people are interested in us, but no one has come through with funding. She noted that we have a sliding scale from \$1,000 to \$5,000. She was directed to come

and ask the board for a special rate for non profits. The board consensus was no. She also asked about the reception, whether or not the senate has an open bar, uses tickets, etc. Michelle said it is usually a time to get together, have drinks, and figure out where to go for dinner. Claire asked if it would be troublesome for the senate attendees if we pay for drinks for CIO members with tickets. There was concern about the CIOs getting drinks but not the faculty. Clair will cost out the price to buy everyone one drink.

On Friday morning, the senate will be doing elections and area meetings. The CIOs will be on their own for the first session (Chancellor's Office and Legislative Update) then together with faculty for the second one (Prerequisite Implementation). The three CIOs who suggested by Barry were: Larry Buckley, Tim McGrath, and May Kay Rudolph.

A question was asked about whether or not there should be some accreditation break outs, and that topic is in the parking lot for the fall conference.

It was noted that the senate members are paying \$355 per person to attend while the CIOs are paying \$320. There was concern about the message this sends. Mary Kay reminded the board about this issue of the excess funds and compensating travel expenses for board. Erica shared that the CCCAOE board had opposite problem—they had too much money and came up with a board policy that until they reached a certain threshold, each person on the board had travel funds available for the president elect, president, past president, etc. Mary Kay asked the board to vote on whether or not to pay \$320 or \$355. George Railey moved that we pay the same amount of \$355 and pay travel costs of three presidents (present, past, and elect). The motion was seconded by Debbie Ikeda. Motion passed unanimously. It was asked whether or not we would have a joint program. It was suggested that rather than doing a joint program, we complete ours and send it to the senate to include as an addendum to their program. Mary Kay, Meredith, Michelle, Julie, and Claire will meet to discuss and decide.

The senate's theme is: Better Together: Equity, Access, and Success. Mary Kay reminded everyone that the coordinator needs to attend to all of the details—presentation needs, bio, and gift.

### **Repeatability**

Barry explained that the regulations were a long time coming and that his staff had done a great job consolidating all of the resolutions and trying to come up with starting language.

There is no real definition of "significant lapse of time," each campus determines locally. After surveying the numbers colleges had, they settled on a number in the middle. That minimum amount of time that needs to pass is three years or more. Barry added there was overwhelming outcry from certain disciplines. PE repeatability is gone. Athletics is treated differently. Beginning, intermediate, and advanced are treated as individual courses a student can take one time each. However, each course has to have totally different content, competencies, and slos. The draft is up for discussion and depending on how much feedback he gets, the regulations may or may not go to BOG in May. As for repeatability in the fine arts, it is eliminated for ceramics, painting, etc. CTE is interpreted to be allowable, sections C2bi and ii. The example used was court reporting. First students are in a lab, but before they get to the second class, he has to type so many words per minute. The student would not fail the class, but would practice to get to the exit skill. Music, theater, dance, ensembles fit into that C2bii category or the regulations.

Pam asked if section 2b could be removed, leaving only 2a? Repeatable courses are in B, cte, performing arts, music, theater, or dance. The request was to reverse the order of the list, and note that only under these conditions would repeatability be permitted. Michelle added that the reorder would help a lot. Barry asked that this copy not be distributed yet. He will send another draft out after more review has occurred.

One other thing in this version, section #6 refers to the "family" issue (e.g., Piano 1, 2, 3, 4). To be eligible, it would require students to enroll in ensembles in theater as long as the student was enrolled in the degree program. People could still enroll in courses and take as fee based. Implementation would not before fall of 13.

Non-credit students can already repeat. Barry mentioned that the auditing portion of the regulations is the appropriate place to address auditing, coming of fee-based with traditional, etc. The goal would be to let colleges to charge an amount that covers the cost of instruction. Limitations on audit—students have to have taken the class before, they can't audit a class at a higher level. It is a local policy.

The last issue is intercollegiate athletics, specifically the 175-hour issue. There was some discussion that this number needs to be increased because it is taking away methods athletes use. Some felt this would potential create opportunities for huge abuses and did not understand why athletics was not taking a hit for repeatability.

#### **Other Items from the Floor**

Debbie informed the group that she will be trying a CCC Webinar on Friday and will let the group know how it goes.

Mary Kay asked the group to affirm that agenda worked (putting guests first, the time, etc.) well, which they did. She reminded members to submit agenda topics. Mary Kay also reiterated that all board members will be required to volunteer to either present at the other organizations conferences or serve as a coordinator at ours. She also reminded the board to forward the minutes to their respective rump groups, possibly with commentary. Finally, she reminded board members that they cannot miss more than two meetings, and if they are going to be absent to send a proxy.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:42 p.m.