Minutes
Sacramento City College
Academic Senate

Tuesday, March 2, 2010

President  Connie Zuercher
Vice President  Greg Rose
Secretary  Angela-Dee Alforque


1. Call to order: 12:03 p.m.
2. Guests: Jeff Carlson, Learning Resources Center; Thomas Greene, Associate Vice President of Student Services; Ginny Gessford, Basic Skills Initiative Coordinator; Catherine Fites, Dean of Enrollment & Student Services; Deborah Blair, Physical Education Faculty; Victoria Cornelius, Physical Education/Athletics Counselor; Karen Kunimura, Physical Education Faculty; Alan Keyes, Psychology Faculty/Faculty Research Coordinator; Annette Barfield, LRCFT SCC President; Carl Sjovold, History Faculty; Marybeth Buechner, Dean of Planning, Research & Institutional Effectiveness.
3. Approval of minutes: Minutes for February 2 & 16 were approved by consensus.
4. Reports: no reports.
5. Announcements:
   a. President Connie Zuercher asked the Senate to inform colleagues that two coordinator positions will open for new applications: Staff Resources Center Coordinator position, currently occupied by Gerri Scott; and Basic Skills Coordinator, currently filled by Ginny Gessford.
   b. Thursday March 4 the CSU and UC students are planning campus walkouts and students on our campus might be participating as well on Thursday at 10:00 a.m.
   c. The “March in March” is a huge demonstration effort in collaboration with statewide unions. The SCC Associated Student Government has requested that Connie ask faculty to consider excusing students who choose to participate in this event on March 22.
   d. Connie gave an update on what is now the Folsom Lake College/Sacramento City College Senate Resolution. At the recent District Academic Senate meeting it was reported that Folsom Lake College has agreed with and adopted our recently-passed Senate resolution.
e. Textbook Loan Program: Thomas Green will do some further research and a Senate committee will be called at a later time.

NEW BUSINESS

1) Election update: Senate Secretary Angela-Dee Alforque reported back on the results of the nomination process. By the deadline on noon February 26, most but not all nomination form were submitted with all requirements needed. The Elections Committee asked the Senate to consider and vote on two exceptional issues, in order to avoid short-term (one-year) appointments to what would otherwise be an uncontested seat:

a) One nomination form from the Business Division was submitted with the three required supporting signatures, but without the nominee’s signature. Since the position was uncontested, the Election Committee recommended that the nominee be allowed retroactively to sign the nomination form and thus be elected to a regular two-year Senator position. The Senate approved the recommendation by majority vote, with 1 abstention.

b) At the time the election packet was sent out, only 1 vacant seat was available for a Full Time position in Language & Literature. Two valid nomination forms were submitted. However, only one valid nomination form was submitted for the position of Secretary, from current Language & Literature Senator Troy Myers. Since this officer position is uncontested, Troy would be vacating an additional Language & Literature Senator seat next Fall. The Elections Committee recommended that the available seats for this division be changed from 1 to 2, and that both nominees be elected to regular two-year terms, rather than one nominee being appointed to a 1-year term in the Fall. The recommendation was approved by consensus.

Only one position, that of Senate Vice President, remains contested. The electronic ballot for the two candidates will be prepared and released to All Faculty for voting beginning March 18.

2) Priority Registration /2nd Reading and Priority Registration for Student Athletes. Thomas Greene, Catherine Fites and Victoria Cornelius were present to answer additional questions regarding the revision to Priority Registration Guidelines. A question was asked to please clarify the phrase “in good standing,” and whether it is possible for students with higher GPAs to be given priority. No, students with higher GPA’s would not be considered for special status at his time. Another Senator asked if the present revision would address what to do with a student repeating the same class over and over again, taking away from other students. Catherine does not think that issue can be addressed in Priority Registration, but my come up in future
discussions about course repeatability. Athletics Counselor Victoria Cornelius presented some arguments supporting priority registration privileges for student athletes. She informed the Senate that many of our student athletes are recruited by universities, but they need a minimum number of units before they are eligible for these programs. Also, the 16 week compressed calendar adversely impacts the athletes’ schedules. Changes in scholarship, transfer and graduation requirements puts added pressure on student-athletes to complete certain courses within two years. She asked the Senate to support considerations specific to student-athletes in the revised Priority Registration policy. A Senator asked how many additional students would that include? The number might increase by about 300 students or so, since about 20% already get Priority Registration though federal programs such as EOPS or DSPS. A Senator asked if there some way to target the specific conditions of the athletes who would fall under special circumstances in order to focus on what the actual priority needs are? Thomas Greene pointed to the one-time .5 priority registration that often has been used to address the needs of transferring athletes. When called for a motion, it was moved & seconded to support consideration of student-athletes in the revision of the Priority Registration policy. It was suggested that there may other students whose scholarships in other disciplines may also need this kind of consideration. Another suggestion was to consider that the time factor is an important consideration for athletes. A response was that there are also International Students on student visas who must meet certain time-constrained requirements, as well other groups such as those whose health insurances coverage is dependent on their full-time status. A question was raised as to how much to separate out the different groups who might need priority registration considerations for various purposes.

The motion was modified to recommend that the research be done to consider the broad implications of various groups being granted Priority Registration for different reasons. The motion was seconded and approved by majority vote, with 2 opposed and 1 abstention.

NEW BUSINESS

1. SLO’s Alan Keys gave a PowerPoint presentation on the on-going assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). “SLO Assessment: Moving Forward in the Wake of Accreditation.” The Accreditation Site Visit team made several recommendations related to SLO’s. Three immediate needs that have been identified are:
   a. accreditation recommendation response plan
   b. increased faculty engagement
   c. increased support and guidance from Senators and Deans.
Since there is only one Senate meeting before Spring break, Alan is requesting that we go back to our divisions and get some feedback on these points: Ideas for increasing faculty engagement in SLO Assessment; determination of administration’s role in SLO assessment process; and clarification of “consistent assessment.” Marybeth Buechner mentioned that all colleges in LRCCD received recommendation on their SLO assessments, but only SCC is required to produce a 1-year update report. The SLO committee has a campus website for faculty to review their recommendations. Continued discussion will be re-agendized for the March 16 meeting.

2. **New Title 5 Guidelines (and)**
3. **Roster Management** - Catherine Fites asked Senators to consider 2 issues in particular: 1) how do we increase instructor management participation and 2) who is responsible for dropping students? She gave an example of how failing to pay attention to adding or dropping students can impact the college and the student. She stressed the need to have procedures or incentives for increased accountability on students for enrollment. The reinstatement process is easy and smooth, it might to better to drop in those cases with uncertainty rather than keeping student enrolled and attempting to remedy later. Finally, she asked that senators take the American River College petition (a handout) back to their divisions and seek input

4. **Censor Ware** - Jeff Karlsen read the first segment of the “Statement on Content Filtering at LRCCD.” He noted that the group meeting on Censor Ware voted on the statement with all approving, except on abstention. There was discussion on content filtering and problems with too many false positives. Concern was noted concerning the content filtering and Censor Ware occurring with a lack of faculty input; this was unacceptable for an academic institution and for the library (reduction in access). The District was aware that system was too restrictive and turned off; plans are to again filter gambling sites. It was noted that District Academic Senate was also concerned with this being implemented without faculty input.

**Meeting adjourned:** 1:03 p.m.

Next meeting: March 16, 2010 at Noon
Senate Presentation

- Student Athletes **MUST** have 12 units per semester for eligibility, 9 or which must be academic units. 
  - Most SA’s have 15-18 units per semester so they can meet their educational goal in 2 years.

- From one season to the next, they **MUST** pass 24 units, 18 of which must be academic units. No other extracurricular club requires full-time attendance.

- **MUST** maintain a 2.0 to be eligible for competition.

- SA’s have 5 years in college to play their sport for 4 years.

- 16 Community Colleges support Priority for Student Athletes and 4 more are in the process

- We offer 18 sports that are in conjunction with Title IX compliance so women have the same opportunity as men.

- 30 hours a week commitment for Student Athletes - practices, games, travel, weekends and study hall. Over 65% of our students also hold a job to help pay for school expenses.

- Given 2 years to achieve AA and 40% of their overall degree (this is a 4 year college requirement – for our students to qualify for scholarships and transfer, they must have 40% of their overall BA/BS degree complete – which is 48-50 transferable units from SCC). Remedial classes mean more classes to take and every summer a full load.
  - Student athletes **MUST** have 2 transferable English and 1 transferable Math complete in order to meet the 4 year APR scores.

- Many Student Athletes come as High Risk Students – low assessments mean athletes need more classes.

- Compressed Calendar and class cuts have made it extremely hard for athletes to get their classes registered between 7:30 and 12:00. May cannot take afternoon or evening classes due to practice or games.

- About 45% of our SA’s are attempting to earn an athletic scholarship to be able to attend a 4 year college. If they are delayed even one semester, their transfer window may disappear.

- In the fall, we average 400 student-athletes. In the spring we average 300 student-athletes. ¾ of our SA’s would take advantage of priority registration if it was offered. 20% already receive it from DSPS and EOPS.

- Student-athletes represent SCC in the community. Successful programs draw competitive athletes to SCC and give us positive public recognition in Northern California. All sports participate in community service as well. IE – Shriners Hospital Sports Day every spring.
SLO Assessment: Moving Forward
in the Wake of Accreditation

Presentation to Academic Senate
March 2, 2010

Alan Keys, Faculty Research Coordinator
Marybeth Buechner, Dean of PRIE

Accreditation Recommendation #1

In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends:

1. ...to begin widely assessing the learning outcomes

2. ...ensure that courses are assessed consistently across different sections of the same course and...

3. ...resulting findings are used by the departments to improve student learning.

SCC’s SLO Foundation

- Strong Philosophy Statement* with Good Practices and protections
- Fully developed SLOs at course, program, & GE levels
- Wealth of assessment activities/examples across the college
- Administrative support: PRIE
- SLO-experienced, committed faculty/staff from both Instruction & Student Services

*See SCC's SLO Philosophy Statement at http://www.silvercreek.edu...
Long-term Feedback Needed

- How can we gather evidence of the dialogue that occurs about SLO assessment?
- How can we better document SLO assessment and changes made in response to SLO assessment?
- How can assessment data be utilized across levels (i.e. course, program, GE)?

Long-term Feedback Needed (continued)

- How can we link SLO assessment results to institutional planning?
- Are current Departmental SLO Assessment Planning documents effective?

Resources and Contact Info.

For more info on current status of SCC's SLO efforts visit http://web.scc.losrios.edu/slo

Direct feedback and questions to either:

Alan Keys (ext. 2941 / keysa@scc.losrios.edu) or

Marybeth Buechner (ext. 2512 / buechner@scc.losrios.edu)
Statement on Content Filtering at LRCCD

Sacramento City College Academic Senate
Jeff Karlson, with support from SCC Librarians
March 2, 2010

The District Office recently began employing a device that filters out certain classes of websites district-wide. The principle reason for this action was to block access to sites known to distribute spyware and malware, which pose a significant threat to the security of our network and the privacy of its users.

The use of the filtering device was expanded when Vice Chancellor Bill Karns, motivated by evidence of widespread and sustained viewing of pornographic and gambling websites on staff computers, ordered that sites classified as pornographic or gambling sites by the filtering device be blocked.

Few if any of us would defend the use of campus computers and/or work time for gambling or the viewing of sexually explicit material. Yet DO's actions merit our concern, both for the substantive question of content filtering in an academic environment and for the non-transparent and unilateral way in which these actions have been and continue to be conducted.

Content Filtering

Institutions of higher learning value freedom of information as central to the cause of free inquiry and the development of critical thinking. Inasmuch as the Los Rios Community College District strives to create "an atmosphere of thoughtful, unfettered expression, discussion, testing, and proof of ideas," content filtering plainly contradicts this effort.

Sacramento City College librarians unanimously endorse the American Library Association's statement of Intellectual Freedom Principles for Academic Libraries, which holds:

Open and unfiltered access to the Internet should be conveniently available to the academic community in a college or university library. Content filtering devices and content-based restrictions are a contradiction of the academic library mission to further research and learning through exposure to the broadest possible range of ideas and information. Such restrictions are a fundamental violation of intellectual freedom in academic libraries.

Even without this blanket statement, the well-known technological limits of filtering devices (sometimes referred to as "censorware"), which are prone to arbitrary "overblocking," make them unacceptable in an academic environment.


http://www.ala.org/Template.cfm?Section=Interpretations&Template=/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=8551
3. For the erratic performance of content-based filters, see Heinz, Cho, and Feldman, Internet Filters: A Public Policy Report, 2006, http://brennan.3cdn.net/7951c7de1aa9be08d6_83m62ui9o.pdf