

San Diego Miramar College
Academic Affairs Committee
Co-Chairs: Jerry Buckley and Linda Woods
Thursday, March 21, 2013

APPROVED 04/18/13

MINUTES

Present: Jerry Buckley, Linda Woods, Lou Ascione, Dawn Burgess, David Buser, Bob Fritsch, Sheryl Gobble, Mary Hart, Helen Houillion for Dana Stack, Mary Kjartanson, Steve Lickiss, Mark Manasse, David Navarro, Jordan Omens, Tom Schilz, Susan Schwarz for herself and for Paulette Hopkins, Duane Short, Sandy Slivka for Marie McMahon, Katinea Todd and Harvey Wilensky. Guests: Daphne Figueroa, Mark Hertica and Laura Murphy.

Absent: George Beitey, Ed Brunjes, Adela Jacobson, Lynne Ornelas, Rod Porter, Gerald Ramsey, Dan Willkie and Joe Young.

1. **Call to order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m. by J. Buckley.
2. **Approval of agenda.** It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the agenda of March 21, 2013.
3. **Approval of minutes.** Postponed.
4. **Old Business.**
 - a. Program Review Subcommittee recommendations. D. Figueroa said the Academic Senate postponed the recommendations so that senators could take them back to their departments prior to the April 2nd Senate meeting. J. Buckley confirmed that these recommendations addressed adopting a three-year cycle for the full program review report.
 - b. Full-time tutoring coordinator position. D. Figueroa and S. Gobble said The PLACe Advisory group will be meeting again on April 8th to consider making a formal recommendation regarding campus tutoring needs at The PLACe. Discussion was postponed to the next meeting.
5. **New Business.**
 - a. The summary of the tutoring services report. D. Figueroa said that our campus was briefed on the draft District-wide supervised tutoring report on March 11th and the report will not be disseminated until after all briefings have been completed on all the campuses. She summarized and discussed the draft report, which only addressed basic skills, and said it indicates that tutoring has improved student success, student retention and student persistence in English, Math and ESOL on our campus and across the District

as a whole. She suggested following up and using District data to promote the services that we need for SB 1456 and to incorporate tutoring into our institutional planning, grant applications, etc. Mark Manasse discussed anecdotal surveys given in the ESOL lab which seem to validate the need for more Math instructors. J. Buckley suggested working with our part-time campus researcher to design specific focus groups to help expand on that.

6. **Information/VPI Report.**

a. MLTT Program. J. Buckley reported and discussed the status of the popular MLTT Program. The California Department of Health has estimated 45,000 job openings for technicians in this high-demand and expanding profession. The program cost is approximately \$89,000 per year, and the program is running out of grant funding. There is an \$8,000 shortfall to finish out the current cohort through the summer of 2014 and there is no funding for this coming year for a new cohort to begin. J. Buckley offered to allocate one discretionary reserve FTEF from the VPI budget to fund the MLTT program through next year and institutionalize the program, if we receive additional FTEF for the next year. It was moved, seconded and carried, with one abstention, to allocate one reserve FTEF to fund the MLTT program through next year.

J. Buckley emphasized the need to develop a procedure for institutionalizing programs at Miramar College. D. Figueroa said there are State Senate guidelines for doing so and suggested that Academic Affairs and the PIE Committee are looking into this. She will put this topic on the April 16th Academic Senate agenda for discussion. The Senate will consider it and make a recommendation.

b. Distance education vs. correspondence education. J. Buckley reported on an ACCJC workshop which he attended on February 22nd in his role as campus ALO. He discussed changes in federal regulations which are resulting in regional accreditation commissions becoming more attuned to differences between distance education and correspondence education. He distributed an excerpt from the 2012 ACCJC Distance Education Manual, "Definition of Distance Education and Correspondence Education" which defines distance education:

*...for the purpose of accreditation review as a formal interaction which uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separate from the instructor and which supports **regular and substantive interaction between the students and instructor**, either synchronously or asynchronously.—Emphasis added.*

Compare that definition, contained in the same document, to correspondence courses, which "...are typically **self-paced.**"—Emphasis added. We may have distance education (DE) courses that currently operate like correspondence courses. Additionally, if a hybrid course combines a face-to-face component and an online component, and the online component is self-paced, the entire course is considered to be all correspondence. DE courses are funded by financial aid money and correspondence courses are not. Site visiting teams are being trained to go in and look at this material, examine sample courses and see how they're being taught and whether there is regular substantive contact. We need to be sure that our DE courses measure up to these standards. D. Figueroa pointed out that by this definition the whole MOOC program would be considered correspondence, so she'll make sure the MOOC task force is aware of it.

J. Buckley also said we need to make sure to maintain the quality standards initially invested in creating and now maintaining our DE courses. The Accreditation Commission is requiring that we have proof of ongoing training for DE instructors. He strongly advised that DE instructors work through our liaisons to work with Andrea Henne to retool the existing training program and make it more useful. We need to agree on how we're going to require faculty to be certified as DE instructors and to have documentation for the Accreditation Commission in three years. This will be a continuing item on our agenda.

c. Joint Board meeting of SDUSD and SDCCD. J. Buckley reported on the March 19th joint board meeting where our college was given four tasks for the coming year:

- Develop a summer bridge program for high school students who have graduated to help them develop collegiate Math and English skills. This would enhance what we're currently doing with the freshman year experience and other related courses which engage the students and get them closer to college level before they start the fall semester.
- Develop ideas to enhance student success based upon implementation of SB 1456. Perhaps we can set up discussions about monitoring student success from this point forward as we implement these ideas.

- Develop new pathways for teachers – encourage students in the K12 system to continue on and become teachers. We've already been doing that in the STEM area.
- Develop a middle college High School. J. Buckley and Gerald Ramsey met with principals of area high schools last year to discuss the subject and J. Buckley followed up with a report for the college president. Additional resources would be needed and J. Buckley is looking into what the related expenses would be to have a middle college high school on our campus. He requested suggestions, and D. Figueroa suggested that we might use the Antelope Valley College CTE program as a model. This will be a continuing item for discussion.

d. Grade appeals process. J. Buckley has been working with Deans' Council to create a standardized letter to students for the school deans to use after the student goes through the grade appeals process with the faculty, department chair and finally the dean. The standardized letter, incorporating Policy 3100 and AP 3001.2, will then go to the student and if the student is grieving a grade from more than one school, the student will get the same response across campus.

7. **Presentations.** None.

8. **Subcommittee Reports.**

a. The PLACe Advisory Group. No report.

b. BSI. No report.

c. Program Review/SLOAC. L. Murphy said that in her role as SLOAC Facilitator, she was asked in fall 2013 to develop a plan for the college to reach proficiency in SLOs and to move forward to reach sustainability. She presented and discussed the draft plan for the college which has been reviewed and approved by the PR/SLOAC committee and posted to the SLO assessment page of the college website. She requested this committee's approval, and it was suggested that she take it to the Academic Senate because this committee only deals with Instructional program review/SLOAC, and she agreed to do so.

- d. Distance Education. No report.
- e. Academic Standards. No report.
- f. Honors. No report.

9. **Other**. None.

10. **Adjournment**: The meeting was adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

Next regular meeting: April 18, 2013.

Reporter: K. Todd