

COLLEGE OF THE SISKIYOU
INSTRUCTION COUNCIL MINUTES – MEETING #8

Friday, March 6, 2015

Board Room

Present: Brian Busk, Neil Carpentier-Alting, Dave Clarke, Vickie Donaldson, Tim Frisbie, Eric Houck, Steve Reynolds, Valerie Roberts, Bart Scott, Nancy Shepard, Greg South, Bob Taylor, Chris Vancil, Dennis Weathers

Absent: Dennis Roberts

Guest: Kent Gross

- Item 1. Approval of Minutes from Meeting 7
The minutes from meeting #7 were approved as read (Taylor/VRoberts). No discussion. All in favor.
- Item 2. Accreditation Follow-Up Report
Last March we were asked to do a follow-up report by the ACCJC. They originally listed four recommendations that we needed to address. An accreditation team visited campus last summer and found that three of the four recommendations had been addressed. This report addresses the last recommendation, to develop a long-range budget plan to resolve OPEB financing. COS has not been meeting the ARC obligation. Going from self-insured to CVT has helped considerably and reduced our liability. We have been making payments and intend to make another payment to meet our ARC obligation. This report will go to the Board on March 10 and then to ACCJC by March 15.
- Item 3. Administrative Procedure No. 3720
This procedure addresses our computer and network use. The language was replaced with the language from CCLC. It covers all the points that were in the old procedure. We are currently working on what our requirements are for wireless. Discipline is addressed under item Legal Process and also in the statement at the end of the document. The level of discipline will need to be bargained with faculty and CSEA. Greg will take this to cabinet on Monday. IC is in support of this procedure, with the exception of the discipline statements.
- Item 4. Administrative Procedure No. 3260
This is a first draft of the Enrollment Management Plan. Student Services Council looked at this procedure this week and will submit input to Vickie. Student Services Council noted that the recruitment piece may be missing, timelines may not work, and Val Robert's title is wrong.

IC noted:

- Where's the faculty piece?
- FON is irrelevant
- Missing academic calendar
- Curriculum development is missing
- Education plan is an important component

Greg asked that IC submit input by next Wednesday and we will look at it again next week. The input will be e-mailed with the agenda by Thursday.

Item5. Budget Augmentation Process

Two weeks ago we reviewed the new budgeting process. Departments are working on their budgets now, which are due today. A clearly defined way to augment the budget is needed for when things unexpectedly come up. Greg brought up this need at cabinet and they are working on a formal process.

Item 6. SSSP/Equity Update

SSSP funds are related to counseling. The money is for assessment, orientation, education planning, and at-risk student follow-up. Last year we received \$75,000, with a 3:1 match. We didn't spend a lot of this money because we didn't have the funds to match it. This year we received \$378,000, with a 2:1 match. We can use transitional money (programmers, research, etc.) as a match. When we do the things we are supposed to, we receive more funding. The funds need to be spent by December 2015 and must be directly related to the four core services. We are currently spending a lot of the money on upgrades to Degree Works.

Equity funds are more overarching than SSSP funds. Equity funds are geared towards access, course completion, ESL/Basic Skills course completion, graduation rates and transfer rates.

- Target groups are foster youth and veterans
- We are not good in ESL and course completion rates
- We get the minimum amount for this grant, \$200,000, with no matching dollars required. The amount is based on data from Data Mart.
- We have to develop a plan on what we will do with the funds
- Val has met with various people/groups to gather information for the plan
- We may have other groups on campus that are underrepresented, but we cannot add them at this time.

Possibilities would be distance education, adult education. We can only use the target groups right now.

Instruction Council Minutes
March 6, 2015
Page Three

- Dave Clarke requested demographics on the target groups. Val will send out information.

Item 7. Value of W's

Bart distributed some data on grade distribution, comparing COS to the rest of the state. We assign more F's and less W's than other schools. A's are about the same, and we give fewer B's, C's, and D's. Also, our percentage of students on academic probation is higher than the state average, in part, because we assign more F grades. Bart would like to move COS closer to the state level.

- An F is not better than a W in most cases. The only time an F is better is for eligibility for athletes and for financial aid. If athletes fall below 12 units and they are in season, they are not eligible to play.
- F's affect GPA; W's do not.
- If students are on academic probation for two terms in a row, they lose their financial aid
- If students drop a class instead of receiving an F it helps their GPA
- Students need to be made aware of using a W, rather than receiving an F
- Faculty can be proactive and let students know if they are not doing well, there is an option to drop with a W
- Counseling lets students know what the long-term repercussions are when they receive an F. RRTF is making students aware as well.
- Val would prefer that students talk with an advisor or counselor about W vs. F. They can explain the options.
- Student success seminars on how to calculate GPA would be helpful because students don't understand how it works.
- This should go to Academic Senate so that they are aware.

Item 8. Other

No other items were discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.