

Community College of Philadelphia

The Path to Possibilities™

Meeting Minutes
Academic Support Standing Sub-Committee
October 25, 2007
3:30-5:00 p.m.
Counseling Conference Room, W2-3E

Delegates Present: Pamela Gallimore, Sandra Gonzalez-Torres (co-chair), Todd Jones (co-chair), Betsy McCoubrey, Bronwynne Rhode, Margaret Stephens, Alison Tasch, Susan Tobia

Alternates Present: Diane Freedman, Ardencie Hall-Karambé, Gina MacKenzie, Tom Ott (representing delegate Fran DiRosa), Marline Paramour, Carmen Serrano

Guests: Ruth Baker, Lennora Shelley, Sharon Thompson

The meeting was convened by Sandra Gonzalez-Torres, co-chair.

Group members introduced themselves and Betsy McCoubrey moved to accept the minutes which were unanimously accepted.

Agenda Items

#1 Standing Committee Guidelines

Susan Tobia questioned whether it was the role of this subcommittee to accept the guidelines for all governance committees. She also pointed out that item II.B. states that a member of the administration, faculty, or student body may serve on only one committee. This is not the case now, so how would this be put into effect if we voted to accept. It was explained that the Federation's Rep Council had accepted these guidelines and that Dr. Curtis had discussed them with Federation members on September 4th; he was to get back to the group.

Susan suggested that, given the question raised by Todd Jones at the last meeting concerning the placement of Counseling under Academic Support, we add in parentheses after "Counseling" the words – "as it relates to academic issues." In Item I.C., the suggestion was to add "Counseling (as it relates to student affairs issues)."

A question was raised about item IV.B. as to whether each standing committee would be assigned an administrative office. This did not seem realistic, but it was felt that at least

there should be a centralized place for all committee agendas and notes to be found. An archive of minutes could be posted on the College website for reference.

Marline Paramour asked how the selection of committee members was made. The Federation and administration appoint 4 delegates and some number of alternates, and 4 student delegates and some number of alternates are appointed through the Student Government Association.

There was some discussion about item I.E. Members thought there should be more specifics concerning the process between the standing committees and IWC. A standard format for proposals and a timeline would be helpful. There should also be a feedback mechanism between IWC and the committee making recommendations. Recommendations rejected should be referred back to the standing committee with a rationale.

The above recommended changes will be forwarded to the Federation via the minutes.

#2 Academic Restructuring

There was some discussion about the process for addressing this item, which concerned the placement of the library in the ESS Division. Do we listen, discuss and then vote? Alison Tasch noted that when a guest presented to the Curriculum subcommittee, that person stayed in the room for the discussion and vote. A question raised was whether we should vote without discussing the recommended library change in the context of the whole academic restructuring proposal presented last semester. Tom Ott responded that the specific library change is what we are voting on. He made a motion that for any given presenter, he/she should remain in the room during discussion of a proposal in order to provide clarification as needed and also for the vote if the committee deems it is indeed ready to vote. The motion passed. Todd asked who in the room was eligible to vote. The group referred to the subcommittee list and identified those eligible to vote. Tom Ott, an alternate, was asked to represent and vote for Fran DiRosa who could not be at the meeting.

Sharon Thompson, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Liberal Studies, introduced herself and stated that she was here to represent Judy Gay, Vice President for Academic Affairs. She also introduced Ruth Baker as a representative from the library. Sharon then noted that there was an error on page 3 of the document. The first two sentences in the last paragraph should be removed as they pertained to another proposal. She then walked the group through the document. She explained that the proposal evolved from numerous discussions concerning the administrative structure of academic affairs. The timing for restructuring is opportune as the ESS Division leadership is open and the Library Director has retired. The vision for the library of the future is one of a learning commons rather than silos of student support. We need to be thinking from a student perspective rather than an employee perspective. Conversation across units including the Learning Lab, Library, and Academic Computing need to be strengthened, and the physical space should reflect this relational model. Sharon referred to a recent Chronicle article on the future of libraries. She stated that people seem to be

on board with the restructuring. In addition, there would be no administrative cost involved.

Alison asked if this recommendation fit with how the library faculty see themselves. Ruth responded that the learning commons idea was desirable. She also stated that not everyone sees the role of librarian as fitting in a support services division. Library faculty see themselves as teachers. There are parts they can get behind such as teaching credit courses.

Alison asked if there was any thought given to creating a new division. She wondered about the place of a library in a division with grant-funded programs. Sharon explained that some of the grant-funded programs and community service programs have moved to the Division of Adult and Community Education. ESS is focused on student academic support which includes instruction. The Library's Information Literacy plan could continue. Sharon noted that a positive result has already been seen in that people from the units involved are talking together. Ruth reiterated that library faculty see themselves primarily as teachers; every interaction with students is a teaching opportunity.

The restructured ESS Division would include the Learning Lab, Library, Student Academic Computing, Advising, Developmental Education, Act Now/Act 101, ESL Services, and TRIO Student Support. There still needs to be approval concerning SACC since faculty are involved; this proposed change will go through the governance structure.

Margaret Stephens asked if there was any piece of a broader nature that this reorganization would affect. Sharon could not think of any. It was noted that the committee was voting only on this one move.

Tom shared that as a member of ESS, he thought the consolidated services for students would be more powerful, and he welcomed his library colleagues to join the ESS faculty.

Carmen Serrano asked if Distance Education was lumped with this restructuring. Sharon responded that Distance Ed courses belong to the departments. Distance Ed administration is not involved in course content.

Todd remarked that the proposal to IWC might be stronger if specific examples were given of what might happen at CCP under the restructuring.

Margaret asked if there was any advertisement out yet for the position of ESS Dean. Will the person have expertise in libraries? Sharon responded that there was no ad as of yet and that the position did not need to be filled by a librarian but that it could be. The important thing is that the Dean has a broad understanding of how support services work. The Library Department Head would report directly to the Dean.

Margaret asked if this would create a vacuum concerning information literacy. Sharon explained that there is a hiring process taking place now to bring on a Coordinator of Library Operations to handle the business matters. The budget and academic decisions

are the purview of the Department Head, so information literacy efforts could continue. Ruth remarked that it is not unusual for librarians to have other skills, such as collection and purchasing, and that she didn't see a vacuum concerning information literacy. Margaret asked if the Department Head would have an increase in compensation. Sharon replied that this was not relevant to the proposal.

A question was raised concerning the ESS restructuring in the context of the overall restructuring recommended in last semester's proposal. A point of order was called as to the relevance of this question.

Betsy wondered if, given all the responsibilities the new Dean will have, the library would be lost in the shuffle. Sharon didn't see that happening.

Sandra asked if there were any other questions and if not proposed a call to vote. Tom made a motion to vote on the proposal. Todd added that the vote should be on the proposal as amended by Sharon. Ardencie seconded the motion. A vote was taken: 9 members voted in favor; 1 member abstained. The proposed restructuring was accepted.

Sharon and Ruth left the meeting.

Margaret, though agreeing with this restructuring proposal, suggested that, for the future, committee members take it upon themselves to consult with people involved in any given change. Todd remarked that library faculty were made aware of this meeting. There was some concern expressed about the process; one person thought it was rushed. Another remarked that in the current climate at the College, it may be that people do not feel free to speak. Tom responded that there was plenty of opportunity for people to question or communicate concerns. What more process is needed? Alison offered that publication to the College community would help. She gave the example of the Allied Health restructuring which faculty did speak out against. Margaret recommended as a matter of process that in the future the committee offer a specific invitation to those affected to hear potential concerns; the student voices should be heard as well.

Diane Freedman remarked that no one is saying how library faculty might be negatively affected. Susan responded that Ruth alluded to this in her statement that faculty see themselves primarily as teaching faculty and are concerned about being in a "service" division.

Susan called a point of order and recommended that the group accept Margaret's suggestion of consultation with affected parties for future issues. She noted that the committee had already voted and suggested that we move on.

#3 Time Amnesty

Given that there were only 10 minutes left for the meeting, it was decided to move this item to the next meeting. The IWC has asked for a written rationale and supporting data for the proposal. Betsy had previously distributed her rationale to the committee. Susan stated that data collected on a small random sample of students applying for time amnesty

indicated that there was no difference in performance between those students who received amnesty prior to completing a successful semester and those who did not. She reiterated that this was a small sample.

Susan distributed to the group some further data collected since August which pointed to a possible amendment to the proposal – that only students on probation/provisional or dropped from the College be required to complete 6 credits successfully before applying for time amnesty. Those students in good standing should be recognized for their good performance and given the chance to apply at any time.

Pam raised a question about effect on financial aid if students received amnesty for poor grades. How would eligibility for financial aid be determined if grades and credits were wiped out? It was explained that the grades and credits attempted remain on the student's transcript. Pam noted that many students do not realize this.

Sandra called for a motion to adjourn which was seconded and accepted.

The next meeting will be held on November 29th from 3:30-5:00 p.m. in the Counseling Conference Room, W2-3E.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Tobia
10/27/07