

# Community College *of* Philadelphia

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Institution-Wide Committee**  
**Monday January 25, 2010**  
**2:30 p.m.**  
**Isadore A. Shrager Boardroom**  
**Community College of Philadelphia**  
**1700 Spring Garden Street**  
**Philadelphia, PA 19130**

## **Committee Members Present**

Pascal Scoles, Judith Gay, James Cochran, Tom Hawk, Chuck Herbert, Sam Hirsch, Sharon Thompson, Earl Weeks, Louise Whitaker

## **Alternates and Delegates Present**

Richard Keiser (voting)

## **Guests Present**

Diane Freedman, Sandra Gonzalez-Torres, Kathy Harter, Pete Watkins

### **I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Pascal Scoles.

### **II. Approval of Minutes**

Accepted the amended minutes of December 21, 2009

### **III. Old Business**

None

### **IV. New Business**

#### **(a) Proposal for a Revision to College Policies and Procedures Memorandum No. 13: Existing Timetable for Completion of Registration, Add, Drop and Withdrawal**

**Discussion:** Diane Freedman introduced the proposal by stating that the policy had last been revised in 1983. Issues with the policy came to the attention of the Subcommittee on Academic Support from some faculty members who were concerned about students being added to class lists after the start of the semester. When the Subcommittee investigated the situation, they found that the College was operating based on past procedures rather than policy. The goals of the Subcommittee were to: (1) tighten definitions; and, (2) change procedures into policy.

The Subcommittee made a distinction between “drop” which occurs up to the 20% period and has no repercussions for the student, and withdrawal which occurs after the 20% period and has repercussions. The Subcommittee believes every effort should be made to register students before classes start. The proposed language on “add,” Professor Freedman said, reflects current practice. The Subcommittee is proposing new language for distance education courses

that the Subcommittee believes reflects what Records and Registration says is current practice. The Subcommittee wanted to balance student needs with instructional integrity.

Sandra Gonzalez-Torres added that the Subcommittee has worked on the policy for the past two years.

Chuck Herbert said the Subcommittee has done good work, but he expressed concerns about how the proposed policy will be implemented given the many variations of credit hours and contact hours across disciplines. He expressed concern about how often the deans may need to get involved. Some students may be kept out of class while waiting for a signature. He asked whether the policy for adding a class should be based on something other than hours. He suggested using percent of part of term and perhaps basing that on what is equivalent to missing one week of work. Kathy Harter asked whether calendar days is a viable alternative.

Diane Freedman stated that the Subcommittee considered many possibilities, but the use of hours seemed to be the most reasonable. Calendar days, for example, would not work because of the different parts of term used for courses.

Sharon Thompson said the proposed policy is not clear and does not take into account the many different parts of term at the College. Sam Hirsch added that there seems to be a conflict between item 1 under the section on adding a course (i.e., once the class has met, the written approval of the instructor is required) and item 2 (i.e., if the class has met three to six hours, the written approval of the instructor and the respective department head is required).

Sharon Thompson said she has three major concerns:

- (1) Deans never saw the proposal;
- (2) Department heads never saw the proposal;
- (3) Distance education administrators never saw the proposal.

She also identified minor issues such as: inconsistent language; mentioning the Course Listing brochure in the document when that may not be the venue for communicating course information in the future; failure to consider hybrid courses; and, lack of clarity about what happens during summer sessions.

Pete Watkins asked whether the policy would affect students who are late to the first class. The IWC agreed the proposed policy does not apply to such students if they are already registered for the class. He also asked whether the curriculum coordinators should be included as an alternative to the department head for adding a course. No members of IWC expressed support for this idea.

Sam Hirsch said he believes the student voice is missing and the policy does not consider how future changes (e.g. how students gain access to information) may influence College practices.

Tom Hawk asked how the process for adding classes works off-campus. Sharon Thompson responded that at the regional centers it is accomplished by emails and phone calls.

Judy Gay made the following motion:

The IWC recommends that the President reject the Proposal for a Revision to College Policies and Procedures memorandum No. 13: Existing Timetable for Completion of Registration, Add, Drop and Withdrawal; and, recommends that the President identify a small working group to draft a revision of the policy, taking into account the issues raised by the IWC and charged with sending the draft policy through the College governance structure.

The IWC discussed the motion. Chuck Herbert said the faculty have concerns about sending forward recommendations to not approve a proposal and by-passing the governance structure. This creates a political/social problem for faculty if the proposal is modified substantially. Several members of IWC said that the motion includes returning the proposal through College governance.

Chuck Herbert asked Diane Freedman how the Subcommittee would respond to the policy being worked on by another group. Diane Freedman first mentioned that she did not understand that it was possible to consult other groups about the proposal and that is why the Subcommittee did not do that. Then she added that she thinks it is fine for another group to work on the issue and that she does not believe the Subcommittee will be upset by this approach.

Sharon Thompson asked if Judy Gay would accept a modification to the motion. She suggested that the motion be:

The IWC recommends that the President reject the Proposal for a Revision to College Policies and Procedures memorandum No. 13: Existing Timetable for Completion of Registration, Add, Drop and Withdrawal; and recommends that the President return the proposal to the Subcommittee on Academic Support for discussion.

Sandra Gonzalez-Torres said the Subcommittee could identify a subcommittee to do that work.

Judy Gay did not agree to the proposed amendment to the proposal and asked that the IWC vote on the motion on the table.

**Action Item: The IWC recommends that the President reject the Proposal for a Revision to College Policies and Procedures memorandum No. 13: Existing Timetable for Completion of Registration, Add, Drop and Withdrawal; and, recommends that the President identify a small working group to draft a revision of the policy, taking into account the issues raised by the IWC and charged with sending the draft policy through the College governance structure. Vote: Six (6) in favor; four (4) opposed**

## VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 p.m.