



ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted Minutes

March 5, 2012
Board Room 626
3:00 pm –5:00 pm

1. Call to Order

President Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm.

2. Roll Call:

Thomas Watkins, President

Abla Christiansen, Nick Cittadino, Kevin Brewer, Joe Conrad – *ex officio*, Dale Crandall-Bear – *ex-officio*, Tracy Fields, Susanna Gunther, LaNae Jaimez, Richard Kleeberg, Amy Obegi, Scott Parrish, Melissa Reeve

Guests: Jowel Laguerre, Peter Cammish, Charlene Snow

Connie Adams, Admin Assistant

3. Approval of Agenda – March 5, 2012

Motion to Approve – Senator Gunther; Seconded – Senator Brewer; Passed – Unanimous

4. Approval of Minutes – February 6 & March 13, 2011

Deferred

5. Comments from the Public

Charlene Snow expressed concern regarding pink slips given to some faculty, potential threats to programs, and the district may not be following policy.

6. President's Report

Deferred for other items

7. Reports

7.1 Superintendent/President Jowel Laguerre

7.1.1 LMS

S/P Laguerre reported that, as College LMS discussions continue, he is paying attention to savings, not just the product, and listening to concerns. Just before the decision to continue with eCollege was made, he received information from another college nearby that will institute Canvas within a reasonable 1 ½ years transition time. S/P Laguerre opined the College LMS process was good and had a lot of input. He will not make the decision on what the permanent platform should be and suggested Dale Crandall-Bear may want to look and see if there are any other platforms to consider. A report on funding for personnel is needed. The current plan is to extend the eCollege contract, make an LMS decision starting the second year, implement pilots, determine if the College can migrate with eCollege in the last year, and have two platforms working side-by-side in case something doesn't work. S/P Laguerre invited Mr. Crandall-Bear in negotiations with eCollege. The Academic Senate and online faculty received a recap of recent events from Mr. Crandall-Bear and everyone should be aware of the nature of this decision. A new arrangement, rather than extension, was proposed by Pearson /eCollege. Pearson would provide the LMS free of charge in exchange for the opportunity to sell digital format Pearson books which would be integrated into the LMS. The students would pay a materials fee of approximately \$80 and not actually purchase textbooks. Pearson claims that students would see a savings based on the average \$111 cost of their textbooks. Mr. Crandall-Bear queried to what extent faculty would be

teaching courses as compared to the roll of the publisher in teaching courses. He emphasized that the Senate will play a very important role as the primary faculty voice while the College embarks on an agreement with Pearson and added that caution should be observed because the arrangement could take the College down the wrong side of the road. Mr. Crandall-Bear pointed out that the Accreditation Commission specifically cited the College Humanities LMS guidelines as something done right here. A key component is that when a new online course is proposed, or going through Curriculum Review, the instructor is asked to state what percent of their course is authored by the instructor and what percent by the publisher. This is an attempt to counter a trend toward canned courses where the publisher is essentially teaching the course. This issue will be necessary to address in discussions with Pearson and the Academic Senate needs to keep monitoring it. Mr. Crandall-Bear added that this was not the decision he would have made. S/P Laguerre replied that, before embarking on the RFP, Pearson offered a deal and S/P Laguerre told them he was not interested and added President Watkins would be the person to have the power to make that decision as it falls in the faculty domain. Pearson returned and said they understood the issue and were willing to work with the College. If both parties don't reach agreement, migration to another system could take place in the next year. S/P Laguerre stated that he is definitely not in favor at all of forcing a textbook on anyone and added there are certainly textbooks he would rather not use.

Comments/Questions: Senator Gunther opined the situation would be extremely convenient for Pearson and expressed concern that a trend in the direction of courses taught based on publisher materials would be difficult for DE and the Academic Senate to control. Senator Gunther wrote and delivered scripts when she worked for Pearson and she feels these issues are not getting addressed. In regards to staffing costs Senator Gunther queried how S/P Laguerre could think the budget will improve and be different later. S/P Laguerre responded that since he's been here, he has felt that the College hasn't done justice to the DE program with enough staffing. He added that he tends to be optimistic and that progressing forward, resources may have to be reallocated but there are no current plans. It is difficult, but at the same time this is about a medium of delivering one-fourth to one-third of total College instruction. S/P Laguerre will not make the platform decision but he plans to continue and expand support for DE. He summarized that it makes sense to give faculty more time to migrate, which could be a year or two and shouldn't compromise the process. Senator Kleeberg agreed with Mr. Crandall-Bear and Senator Gunther regarding avoiding canned courses. He opined that this needs to be addressed with the Curriculum Committee, which should be asked to set standards. An important part of that would be to set standards for face-to-face classes as well as online. Senator Kleeberg stated two books he uses in class are not textbooks and questioned if the students would be charged for textbooks they don't use. Mr. Crandall-Bear responded that, if an instructor adopts a Pearson textbook, the students would pay \$80 each. Other textbooks could be used but they wouldn't have the electronic integration which might be a disadvantage. Senator Reeve asked if the contract would have contingencies for the College to allow a change of timeline, to back out or, if the percent of texts purchased doesn't meet a Pearson plan, would the LMS still be free. She also queried if an additional dean will still be hired based on the current financial climate. S/P Laguerre replied that the strategy may need revising, costs and savings need to be reviewed, and added that he doesn't want to be in a position where savings are gone after a year or two.

7.1.2 Program Review

S/P brought this topic to the Senate before to share the potential to overhaul Program Review. He was asked for more information and put together ideas that included steps, concepts and a list of items to follow through with the process that was distributed at the meeting. He reported that Program Review was mentioned in the Accreditation Commission report as being inconsistent and should be assessed regularly and incorporated into resource allocation processes. A College-wide committee should be formed, made up of faculty, staff, students, and maybe some alumni to review self-studies. He encouraged the Senate to issue guidelines, recommendations of what faculty would like to see happen, to present to the Governing Board. Results should be reported a year after actions are taken based on the program reviews. S/P Laguerre noted it would be important to provide training for everyone going through the process to ensure consistency with the College-wide committee that would be reviewing the self-study of programs.

Comments/Questions: Senator Obegi queried about release time for individuals who are primary authors of program reviews. Other community colleges have 20% release time and a Senate subcommittee but there has been no release time or support here. S/P Laguerre responded that he has seen consideration at other institutions for a person to work on reviews and it will be considered here. President Watkins clarified it would be called reassign time, rather than release time. Senator Gunther asked about basic skills reviews when not related to a degree or certificate. S/P Laguerre replied it would be reviewed as a program by itself and would be stronger that way. Mr. Conrad, as Curriculum Chair, pointed out that Curriculum Review should be occurring on a five-year rotation schedule and should take into account those things that come through Program Review, SLOs and other assessments. He suggested that, if another school is added, it would be convenient to set up a five-year rotation, one school per year for Program Review, followed the next year by Curriculum Review. That could keep the process consistent and clear. Senator Reeve recalled that in early SLO conversations, the rotation was to be set up so that SLOs would take place in all courses in the four-year period leading to Program Review in the fifth year, followed by Curriculum Review.

Senator Obegi noted that other institutions had support staff help develop surveys. S/P responded that Pei-Lin Van't Hul, Research & Planning Analyst, will provide that. The Research office could have templates for each program. S/P Laguerre stated it is up to the Senate to help decide on the Program Review process.

7.1.3 SLOs – Peter

Peter Cammish, Research & Planning Director, reported on student performance data and how it works with SLO assessments. His presentation included screen shots and explanations of data gathering and an SLO Power Point.

Mr. Cammish reported that data can compare a course from one semester to the next to track performance. He pointed out, as shown on his visual presentation, squares of different size and color that relate to student numbers and success rates. Many grids and filters can collect summarized grade data, equity measures of ethnicity and gender, efficiency measures by division level or expanded, and reference to different categories. Courses can be selected and filters applied to any of the charts. The information will be put into a network folder and be available for all faculty. Images can be exported for Program Review or individual types of analysis. Students can be tracked from one semester to the next. More semesters could be added but it would be very complicated with such a huge amount of data and would probably be best to track a specific group of students separately. Success is tracked by grade scores.

Mr. Cammish next presented an SLO Power Point which was forwarded to Senators. He covered the need for planning resource allocations, the SLO path from assessment to funding proposals, proposal review, and awarding funding. He noted that with budget concerns and reductions in enrollment, a key component is to maintain initiative in order for people to do things that are important. What is important should be a group decision. Mr. Cammish covered the decision process: a proposal is created; sent to review groups; forwarded to S/P Cabinet to confirm availability of funds, and; submitted to the Governing Board once it passes the other group reviews. President Watkins pointed out the first review group acts like the Curriculum Committee technical review, to ensure a technically correct and complete document and requesting amendments as needed. The entrance point is initiated and prioritized in the specific school through discussion of faculty and the dean based on what is needed for their program based on SLO assessment. Shared Governance looks at the quality of the proposal, the timeframe, considers the relation to College direction and the impact on students. FaBPAC considers the budget and financial needs, risks and funding sources. The proposals are scored on a simple rubric.

The SLO assessment form should identify actions and how data might be used at Program Review. A proposal process based on SLO assessment should move ideas into actions and through to completion.

Comments/Questions: President Watkins clarified that the proposal document revision came through the idea to get simple. Senator Reeve noted that when the strategic proposal process came through, completion didn't follow. She likes the idea of group process but queried if the College actually has a percentage of the budget set aside for these proposals. Mr. Cammish responded there is, but only about 5% of the total budget is termed discretionary. He heard from VP Julian Ligioso that there might be only 5% of 5% of the budget available for this process, which might be about \$100,000. It is not a great deal of funds but hopefully a step in the right direction. President Watkins added that the amount of money available needs to be known and it also can be negotiated in the future. Senator Reeve agreed and opined that faculty would be motivated to go forward, if they knew some funding were actually available. Mr. Conrad reminded everyone, based on his experience in math, that SLO assessments happen more at departmental levels and are not going to generate the larger scale amounts. That should be in proposals grouped as evidence that SLO assessments are being used. Mr. Cammish stated he has SLO forms now, but cannot say what is going on in summary level. He will enter proposal outcomes in the database once he gets the OK.

Senator Reeve suggested that another missing piece is that student level success data and SLO data don't have a place to match up to identify causes on outcomes students aren't getting. What students are mastering or not mastering at course level, how items are related and can be matched up, so data can inform the SLO assessment process and instructional changes can happen to improve student success. Mr. Cammish responded that some faculty would give students a grade for each learning outcome. Senator Gunther agreed that looking at disaggregated data won't catch what students aren't continuing to move forward and why. Mr. Cammish replied that it is part of the progression side and also what's going on at learning outcome level which takes a lot of effort to set up. President Watkins reminded everyone that the March 14th Flex Cal day will be devoted to the SLO process. Berkeley City College instructors will give a morning presentation and work throughout the day with faculty and deans in their schools. This active learning experience will help ensure all faculty understand the process by working and sharing within their own areas. Senator Reeve invited the Berkeley faculty after attending a presentation about departmental assessment at another venue. They were able to show very positive results and program changes within a couple years. She considered this a way to relate program outcomes to program level success. She added that, while some departments at Solano have done assessments well, mostly the process dies there, partly because it was designed to maintain autonomy and individual faculty control. It doesn't yield broader data to suggest program improvement or to request funds to make improvements. The Berkeley guests will present portfolio assessment in basic skills all the way through transfer level English and how it has led to program changes and a paradigm shift in basic skills instruction.

7.1.4 Faculty Driven Process – Thom Watkins (10 min.)

President Watkins asked Senators to take the Faculty Driven Process paper they received to their school meetings and ask their colleagues the following questions:

- What does it mean to be “faculty driven”?
- How do we own the process?
- How do we proceed and get something done by October?

President Watkins acknowledged the value of a good SLO process. Senators need to bring responses back and the Senate will look at how to help faculty see the value and believe in the process.

7.2 Sub-Committee Reports

7.2.1 Basic Skills – Melissa Reeve (5 min.)

Melissa reported on several things happening in Basic Skills. Last fall the Academic Success Center (ASC) coordinator position was a big accomplishment that was approved and finally advertised on February 29th. Because no one can start mid-semester at 50%, it will start on April 1st at a reduced load of 20% reassign time this semester to increase to the approved 50% in the fall. The application deadline is March 9th. Primary aspects of this job will be to provide leadership to create the ASC (formerly CAS) where students can come for lab, tutoring, student services, and answers to financial aid questions. The second part of the job responsibility will be related to the Teaching and Learning Center.

The two division level basic skills coordinator positions are going to the union for approval. Terms for BSI English Coordinator Josh Scott and BSI Math Coordinator Corrine Kirkbride both end this semester.

A call for BSI grant proposals will be sent out in the next couple weeks. Faculty will have the opportunity to apply for Basic Skills funds for projects for the next academic year.

The Center for Urban Education (CUE) presented at Flex Cal last fall. A March 14th Flex Call CUE workshop will take place and include a small group of faculty, deans, and Peter Cammish (R&P) to work with a team from USC. They will look at student success data through the Basic Skills Math and English pipeline with focus on disaggregating data by ethnicity and how to benchmark less successful groups in order to plan intervention to help those groups succeed. The Committee and Mr. Cammish have been working to define that cohort.

7.2.2 Curriculum – Joe Conrad

Curriculum Chair Joe Conrad reported that the Committee approved the Curriculum Handbook revision, which was emailed to the Senate and is agenda discussion item 9.2.

The Committee has progressed well with the number of courses coming through and CurricUNET is working better now after EVP Reyes and Tina Abbate had conference calls to follow-up on problems previously brought to CurricUNET's attention. The Curriculum office and Committee expects to see improved performance and reliability. The CurricUNET pipeline is apparently too narrow for the number of clients they have and rapid growth challenged their server and staff.

Comments/Questions: Senator Obegi raised concern about the slowed down process in getting items to the Chancellor's office since Pei-Lin Van't Hul transferred and Tina Abbate has the responsibility of two jobs. She queried how things can move forward for the Chancellor to approve courses so they can be entered in the catalog and begin in the fall. Chair Conrad replied that he shares her concern and added that items are getting sent. Part-time Curriculum office help was hired but has to be trained.

7.2.3 Distance Ed – Dale Crandall-Bear

Dale reported that the LMS project has taken up most of his and the DE meeting time.

7.2.4 Elections

President Watkins reported that he sent out a call for nominations on February 27th, followed by a reminder and extension of the nomination deadline to noon on March 9th. He asked senators to keep recruiting. There are a number of nominations for at-large senators but only one for adjunct. Senator Gunther reported that Senator Kleeberg withdrew his name for Senate President and she has agreed to run. President Watkins explained that, if Senator Gunther wins, the Vice President position will be vacant. The Senate Executive Committee discussed placing a contingency on the ballot. President Watkins will inform faculty of the potential VP position and contingency plan on his next reminder for nominations. Someone is needed to chair the Election Committee.

7.3 Treasurer's Report

Deferred

8. Action Items

8.1 Faculty Hiring Procedures I - IV Approval

President Watkins noted this item was discussed at the last meeting, closed for further discussion, and placed on this agenda as an action item. Based on new input Senator Reeve has brought from her colleagues, he asked Senators to decide whether to vote or defer for consideration of the additional information. Senators were in

general agreement to complete discussion on Items I – IV at the March 19th meeting and defer action to the April agenda.

Senators need to forward any additional input they have or receive from colleagues in time to be forwarded to everyone.

Additional comments made:

- Letters or numbers should also be stricken where items were stricken
- III g 2 – Remove period after “to” (1st line), and add “not” in front of “releasing any information” (2nd line)
- IV c 4 – Change “insure” to “ensure”.
- III e (d) – Concern raised about including professionals outside of the district; look at the worst possible scenario; may be misinterpreted or have pressure from someone, even if the decision is subject to committee majority. Consider as a non-voting consultant. If CTE issue, add separate verbiage to specify.
- III b – Everyone who has the ability to be on a hiring committee should have the opportunity – should be verbiage to address beyond rotation.
- Should full-time/part-time faculty be specified?
- Should committee size be smaller if hiring for a small discipline to make a committee that is in allied disciplines?
- Committees include a dean and should have a minimum of three faculty.

9. Information/Discussion Items

9.1 Faculty Hiring Policy/Procedures V-VIII – Sandra Dillon, Interim HR Director & Charo Albarran, HR Manager (30 min.)

Deferred

9.2 Curriculum Handbook Revision – Joe Conrad (10 min.)

Curriculum Chair Joe Conrad reported on the revised and edited document. It was last revised in 2001 and should be reviewed every other year. Mainly changes updated the style to be more realistic and included CurricUNET. Erin Duane began the process when she was Curriculum Chair and completed most of the work with assistance from Mr. Conrad and Ms. Van’t Hul. She had to work from one typewritten and two electronic manuals to create a complete and all electronic collation. The handbook will be reviewed every two years. New state rules and codes were cut and pasted from the Chancellor’s documents, but overall not much has changed. The handbook outlines how Curriculum Committee proceeds with a normal course of actions that reflect current practice and includes tips for Committee members regarding their responsibilities. The Committee discussed the handbook during meetings last fall and approved it in February. The Academic Senate needs to review it and vote on approval.

10. Action Reminders

11. Announcements

12. Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn – Senator Kleeberg; Seconded – Senator Cittadino; Passed – Unanimous
Meeting adjourned at 5:01pm