



ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted Minutes

December 2, 2013

ASSC 1421

3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

1. Call to Order

President Gunther called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

2. Roll Call:

Susanna Gunther, President

Sabine Bolz, Kevin Brewer, Nick Cittadino, Lue Cobene, Catherine Cyr, Joe Conrad – *ex officio*, Erin Duane, Lisa Giambastiani, Amanda Greene, Les Hubbard, LaNae Jaimez, Katherine Luce, Amy Obegi, Teri Pearson-Bloom, Ken Williams, Michael Wyly, Connie Adams, Admin Assistant

Absent/Excused: Dale Crandall-Bear *ex-officio*, Scott Parrish

Guests: Jowel Laguerre, Diane White

3. Approval of Agenda – January 9, 2013

Motion to approve – Senator Jaimez; Seconded – Senator Cittadino; Passed – unanimous

4. Approval of Minutes – November 4, 2013

Motion to approve – Senator Bolz; Seconded – Senator Brewer; Passed – unanimous

5. Comments from the Public

6. President's Report

Faculty Hiring: President Gunther sent an email to S/P Laguerre regarding the faculty hiring list and notations as discussed and approved at the November 25 Academic Senate meeting.

Accreditation: President Gunther just returned from a meeting with Accreditation Coordinator Annette Dambrosio. They spoke of having a continual accreditation group and also a task force with faculty and administrators to help alleviate last minute reports and stress. S/P Laguerre received information that student equity, staff equity and DE were potential concerns.

7. Superintendent/President's Report

Faculty Hiring: S/P Laguerre reported the faculty hiring list that was approved at the November 25 Academic Senate meeting looked fine to him and he will move forward with the hiring process. Based on FON and retirees, the number to hire started with eight and will likely include two more, but he could not confirm that all thirteen could be hired. S/P Laguerre confirmed the horticulture hiring will move forward.

Senator Pearson-Bloom reminded S/P Laguerre that meeting time was spent narrowing the original list but not on ranking and, if only eight faculty are to be hired, the Senate requested the opportunity for input on ranking. President Gunther expressed the hope to return to a better process next year with data and proposals needed for review delivered before a joint meeting. S/P Laguerre agreed to discuss ranking at the 10 + 1 meeting if less than ten faculty are to be hired. IVP White stated that deans working with faculty used the data provided and added that all factors are not always quantitative. Senators noted it is always beneficial to have the data anyway. The process is complicated due to different mandates, lack of numbers, and retirement replacements. Mandated positions should be separate from others.

Accreditation: The Accreditation Task Force met today to look at what the College will do. It is important to continue with SLOs, PLOs, ILOs, master plans, etc. and continue to fund a full-time coordinator to be ready for the 2016 self-study.

8. Interim Vice President's Report

EMP: The plan is in process of completion, many submissions will be reviewed and people will be contacted if edits are needed. When complete, it will be distributed to the Academic Senate and SGC.

Accreditation Task Force: IVP White reported that accreditation standards are being revised and are much more focused and specific. SLOs will actually be spelled out in syllabi and has to match exactly in the database. There is a really nice table with old and new standards. The new ones are clearer but it is still a work in process. The Accreditation Commission will meet in January but it is likely there will only be minor modifications to the revised standards. Implementation will be decided in June. The next full self-study will be in 2016. IVP White suggested to the Task Force and Academic Senate to thoroughly review the new standards, have a campus-wide conversation, and include accreditation as a standard item on all school agendas and possibly on the Academic Senate agendas.

Points of changes to the standards from the Commission and the Community College League of California:

- demonstrate ongoing data collection and assessment
- routinely publicize assessments and demonstrate actions taken on assessments for the purpose of continuous improvement.
- demonstrate student level of skills and knowledge
- evidence of actions for all assessments
- governing boards need to demonstrate they have access to data and reports, and are giving direction to ensure action is done.

Accreditation questions cover: how the institution actively fulfills its mission; measurement of resources and allocations to maintain mission or cut down to make reasonable; evidence of efficiency in delivery so that resources and students' time are not wasted; paying attention to unit value; EMP goals and the ways in which to spend money; very basic information on every single program with success and completion rates; demonstration that the governing board meets with the public they represent.

IVP White will forward a summary and the ACCJC and CCL links. She noted that a lot of this is driven by the US Department of Education.

9. Information/Discussion Items

9.1 Faculty Hiring Update – S/P Laguerre
Discussed under item 7.

9.2 Assessment Committee continued discussion

IVP White noted there is a lot that can be done for accreditation and continuous improvement. She is interested in developing an assessment committee. It could be titled institutional effectiveness or another name. IVP White envisions it as an umbrella committee because assessment isn't just about SLOs and PLOs, but also finance, HR, maintenance, and all areas of the College. She contacted a couple faculty members who expressed interest and have some experience in assessment. Different models can be looked at and decisions made on College needs prior to bringing something to the Academic Senate in January. If covering institutional assessments, not just academic, it would not be a Senate subcommittee. President Gunther suggested it should be discussed and find out who is willing to step up. The more faculty members are involved early on the better that will be. IVP White reiterated that accreditation should be an agenda item at every school meeting. The culture of compliance needs to change to self-reflection and what can be done better. It will take time to change the culture and it must come from all levels in shared responsibility. Deans have been informed and faculty need to step forward and talk about their program reviews and such.

9.3 Academic Senate Bylaws and Subcommittees – LaNae Jaimez

9.3.1 Potential Subcommittees

Senator Jaimez suggested the addition of an ad hoc/task force clause for items that come up occasionally, such as Tenure Tea and Distinguished Faculty committees, and require only one or very few meetings. Senator Pearson-Bloom recommended that it would be best to keep minutes for a policy committee. It would be helpful to add a summary of how different committees work.

The Academic Senate has had committees set up for Student Success, SLO, PLO, and Accreditation. The SLO and PLO committees could go under Accreditation. President Gunther suggested waiting to see how the assessment type committee is set up. Senators agreed that faculty development could be a subcommittee of Flex Cal. She will speak with Flex Cal Chair Chuck Spillner. There will be some money guaranteed from the state for faculty development along with other College funds that should be available for that. There should be a more formalized process and, if funds are limited, there is more reason to place faculty development under the Senate oversight to ensure a fair system. Senator Pearson-Bloom, President Gunther, Senator Jaimez will join with Chuck Spillner to work on that either over or under Flex Cal or as one committee. The 10+1 Committee is an official subcommittee that is useful to work more effectively with administration. It is more reliable than one-on-one meetings and ensures regular open communication with the College president and academic vice president. Dr. Conrad agreed it is an important committee to continue, but questioned it being a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. President Gunther replied that it is a type of shared governance, a common meeting place for campus leaders. Senator Jaimez noted it is very useful as long as the College president continues to attend Senate meetings as well. Senator Cittadino agreed and pointed out that S/P Laguerre shares information at Senate meetings that might not be heard otherwise. Based on the discussion, Senator Jaimez acknowledged having a relatively clear view on how to proceed.

9.4 Program Review – Proposed Changes to Process and Template – Amy Obegi

PR Coordinator Obegi gave an update with feedback that has been received. No one has yet completed the full PR process and collection of feedback will continue and adjustments made. Coordinator Obegi reported the process is in a place now where training needs to be done for spring. The handbook needs to be updated to best reflect the process as it now looks, knowing revisions will be made as needed.

Changes reflect the following:

- Programs that receive Perkins funding have to go through an abridged review every two years
- The original vision included reassign time, stipend, or pay. IVP White suggested trying nine hours per week except in programs that have no FT faculty. The new contract gives any adjunct faculty three hours per semester. This item will have to be revisited now that PR is a more substantial task. Clarification is needed as three hours is limited to read and give a good review. Adjunct faculty where no FT instructors were available were paid for 20 hours over the summer but that wasn't enough. In terms of compensation, there is also optional flex.
- Benchmarks are needed and were not in place for CTE review. Guidelines (page 2) include training and student surveys and a process that begins in the spring prior to the review. One of the concerns is to allow time to use for hiring.
- Committee process: the coordinator sees all of the self-studies; they are divided among Committee members in small groups for review using rubrics; the review form is completed with constructive feedback. The process is not meant to be restrictive and changes are not required. The program faculty can decide whether or not to use the input. The PR goes to the Academic Vice President for review, then back to the program faculty and S/P Laguerre, and is published online.
- Incomplete reviews will not be rejected but will be sent back as incomplete. If a review is rejected by the vice president, the program faculty, the PR Committee, and VP will meet to discuss concerns as a work in progress that will be revised or rejected. Follow up reports are written and short and long-term goals can be put into a database to review a year later and be adjusted each year as needed.
- Two rubrics are used. The first one determines if the review is complete. If it is good or exceptional, the Committee will review. If not, it will be sent back for completion and resubmission. The second rubric looks for attainable goals. A minor adjustment was made. Dr. Conrad noted that it is working OK in practice and some see it more as a continuum. It may be adjusted or revised. The goal is to be constructive and move forward in each cycle.

- Page 7 notes the abridged reviews required every two years for Perkins funded programs.
- The self-study template was revised to limit pages in the introduction to bring the scope down a little. Due to new CTE standards, gainful employment needs to be documented and not be just anecdotal. The definition of gainful may need revision as no one knows yet what to do about employment outcomes, but the state has required the information. “Anecdotal” may be removed and just use “assess” and do the best we can.
- A signature page was added to ensure not just one faculty member will work on a review but will discuss with other faculty in the program. This gives a guideline and will show that faculty have read and agree with the self-study.

Faculty had difficulty finding data. Coordinator Obegi showed samples of what she had done in the ECE review and a list of where data was found for each section. Ultimately the goal is to have a database to access directly. Senators congratulated Coordinator Obegi for the tremendous work she has done. She shared that it has been good to have faculty wanting to learn about different programs and she has appreciated the Committee work and input.

Dr. Conrad pointed out that many programs have other components, such as Basic Skills. The Committee hasn't faced that situation yet and the question remains if there should be three different reviews or one with three different perspectives. Math is one of the smallest programs but with many students and a majority take Basic Skills math. Some faculty may want to do separate reviews, but the requirement needs to be defined.

Chair Obegi requested everyone review and forward any input. The revised Handbook will be an action item for approval at the January 9 meeting, so that training can proceed for spring reviews.

10. Action Items

10.1 Update Current Subcommittees in the Bylaws

Motion to add Basic Skills and Program Review subcommittees to the Academic Senate Bylaws – Senator Jaimez; Seconded – Senator Obegi; Passed – unanimous.

10.2 Syllabus – Add Standardized Recycling Statement

VP Wyly suggested the information be made available where faculty can download it along with sending in an email and providing hard copy. President Gunther suggested careful thought to what is required and recommended, noting that academic freedom will be questioned. Senator Bolz suggested posting the information somewhere and inform all faculty. President Gunther will have the recommended standardized recycling statement added to the faculty handbook.

Motion to add the standardized recycling statement to the faculty handbook – Senator Duane; Seconded – Senator Brewer; Passed – unanimous.

11. Reports

11.1 Subcommittees

11.1.1 Accreditation – Annette Dambrosio
no report

11.1.2 Basic Skills – Melissa Reeve
no report

11.1.3 Curriculum – Joseph Conrad
no report

11.1.4 Distance Ed – Dale Crandall-Bear
no report

11.1.5 Program Review – Amy Obegi

PR Chair Obegi gave an update on program reviews completed and their status. One more fall meeting is scheduled next Monday. Spring reviews will include fire, aeronautics, CIS, journalism, nutrition, PE and dance.

11.1.6 10+1 Committee – LaNae Jaimez

The Accreditation visit was discussed at the last meeting. S/P Laguerre received a copy of the original report that included concerns about student and staff equity and DE.

Senator Pearson-Bloom requested the need for a revised organizational chart be addressed at the next 10 + 1 meeting. She heard rumors about another reorganization, specifically the School of HP&D will be disbanded, and she wondered if anyone had been consulted. President Gunther will bring up the need for an updated organization chart and for insurance that if/when reorganizations are planned, time is allowed for faculty input.

In response to questions about the purpose of the Committee, President Gunther stated it is about implementing 10 + 1 items. Senators expressed concern about the way communications happen on campus and opined the Academic Senate needs to and can do something about it. President Gunther pointed out that both top administrators attend Senate meetings and questions should be directed to them as they come up. She encouraged Senators to take advantage of that time at meetings. Discussion continued with concern about a lack of integrity of process for faculty hiring and Senator Pearson-Bloom requested having on record that Dean Peter Cammish agreed to send a hiring list with all proposals right after the deans meet the next time. Administration should be informed at the next 10 + 1 meeting of how disappointed the Senate was about how process was affected and how it set a low bar for the new deans. VP Wyly suggested that deans and Senate engage in the process together to create the list. Senator Bolz added that salary ranges should be reviewed for all positions along with looking at how many managers have been hired to cover other jobs. Senators noted it seemed mostly administrators have been hired, rather than faculty and staff. The unfulfilled promise to hire department chairs was another issue Senators raised. Job descriptions for coordinators are very vague and vast and chairs would be more focused.

11.2 Treasurer

12. Action Reminders

13. Announcements

Program Review needs reps from Math/Science and Health Sciences.

The next regular Senate meeting will be held on January 9 from 9 am – 12 pm; the Academic Senate/Ed Admin joint meeting will be held on January 9 from 1 pm – 4 pm, both in ASSC 1421.

14. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn – Senator Pearson-Bloom; Seconded – Senator

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.