

Academic Senate

Open Meeting

Monday, May 23, 2005 * 3:00-5:00 * Board Room

MINUTES

Executive Committee members present					
x	Cathy Anderson	x	Toby Bodeen	x	Carolyn Borg
x	Dave Bush	x	David Cooper	x	Kendall Crenshaw
	Jeff Cummings		Kevin Fox	x	Scott Gordon
	Pamela Highet		Vickie Kimbrough	x	Gary Lewis
x	Sue Loring	x	Warren Lytle		Ron Marley
x	Susan Meacham		Michael Pitcher	x	Frank Nigro
x	Marsha Ray		Alan Spivey	x	Chuck Spotts
	Ramon Tello	x	Terry Turner	x	Laura Valvatne
	Andrea Williams		Dave Wright		

Other faculty present					
x	Stephen Concklin				
Guests present					
x	Jane Harmon				

1. Call to Order: Meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes –05/09/05 (1 Attachment): Warren Lytle moved approval of the May 9th minutes. Terry Turner seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Reports

a. No reports were given.

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Tenure Review Committees (One Attachment): *We will address the committee members highlighted in orange.*

The following changes were noted for these tenure review committees (TRC):

Phyllisa Eisentraut TRC: Laura Valvatne was recommended as a replacement for Jim Gilbertie since Laura is in a discipline that's more closely related to Phyllisa's.

Kele Fitzhugh TRC: After further discussion with the dean, it was determined Mark Smith was an appropriate fit for this committee.

April Howell TRC: John Cicero will be replaced by Diane Schweigert, who is in a discipline closer to April's.

Paul Calkins TRC: Kathryn Gessner will remain on the committee as per the Senate's request.

Brad Rupert TRC: We suggested Dave Wright and Sonny Stupek be switched as TRC member and mentor. The dean agreed to this.

Head Coach Track: Sonny Stupek was kept on.

Shelley Presnell TRC: Ramon Tello was appointed as Shelley's mentor.

Scott Gordon moved approval of all of these changes. Susan Meacham seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

b. Program Review for Accounting (One Attachment): *A request had been made to postpone the PR for Accounting until 2006-2007.*

Accounting will have no continuing full-time faculty member since Larry Lease is retiring, so his replacement would have to do program review in the first year here. Sharon Lowry is requesting that we postpone program review for this program.

Chuck Spotts moved that we postpone the program review for Accounting and for Culinary Arts below. Scott Gordon seconded this. The motion carried unanimously.

There was some discussion about whether we should then require the next program reviews for four years' time instead of five years' time since these reviews are being done late. However, it was felt this was not necessary in these two cases since the delays are not the result of any negligence by the instructors.

c. Program Review for Culinary Arts (Attachment same as above): *A request had been made to postpone the PR for Culinary Arts until 2006-2007.*

Culinary Arts is in a similar situation to Accounting. It will have no continuing full-time faculty member with Mike Piccinino retiring. Instead, his replacement would have to do program review in the first year here. Sharon Lowry is requesting that we postpone program review for this program.

This postponement was approved by the Senate (see item b above).

d. Online Course Development Timeline (1 Attachment): *Frank will present this from the DE committee.*

Frank Nigro presented a draft of an online course development timeline developed by the Distance Ed Committee. It's still in a draft form, and the committee is interested in feedback at this point. The purpose of this document is to ensure that online classes are developed over a reasonable period of time and not at the last minute. Frank noted that there have been several cases where online classes were scheduled and instructors did not begin to design their courses until a week or two before they were supposed to teach them. The D.E.C. has been concerned to ensure quality in online instruction.

Two of the more controversial aspects of this timeline, Frank explained, were the role of the “peer advisor” in reviewing the course’s technical plan and content. Frank emphasized that the peer advisors would not be evaluating the quality of a course’s content. Instead, they would be making sure that content was being developed and that it was being put into a format that would be navigable by anyone. If it looked like a course was not being developed in a timely manner, the dean would have the option of canceling the class in time for students to find other options.

There were questions about who would have to go through such a timeline. Frank noted everyone would if they were teaching a new online class, even experienced online instructors like himself.

Kendall Crenshaw recommended that as far as ensuring ADA compliance in this course, that the peer advisors not be involved with this, but that they should instead send it through DSPS. Mike Buckley in DSPS is qualified to analyze webpages for compliance.

Terry Turner noted that the sentence reading “The peer advisor fills out the Course Plan Review form and reviews it with the dean” should be modified to include the instructor.

Frank agreed to take these changes back to the D.E.C. He will also share a version of this with all the online instructors via email before bringing it back to the Senate.

e. Cheating Policy (2 Attachments): *Frank has updated what we worked on at the last meeting.*

Frank presented the latest changes to the cheating policy. He incorporated all the changes that the Senate had recommended at the last meeting and again asked for further input. The big change is that the proposed Board Policy procedure has been made into an Administrative Procedure, tentatively numbered AP 5515. Here’s a summary of the changes suggested by the Senate:

Under Level One, the second paragraph was deleted.

Under Level Two, it was clarified that the instructor alone could give a failing grade in cases of plagiarism. Also, it was clarified that once a student was failed, they would not be permitted to attend class meetings for the class.

Under Level Four, it was clarified that that the student would fail the course and be given an “administrative withdrawal” for other courses as part of the Suspension. Also, someone pointed out that the language about presenting

documentation of the violation, putting the violation on the transcript, etc., from Level Two, needs to be repeated for subsequent levels.

Finally, under Level Five, it was clarified that after Expulsion, the student could still “petition to Scholastic Standards for reinstatement of student status.” Here, there was discussion about whether or not Expulsion violated our open admissions policy. Frank noted that the Expulsion option was provided for under Board Policy.

Frank will make these changes and then present the procedure to the Senate again at a future meeting.

f. Revised Timeline and Flowchart for SLOs (2 Attachments): *The SLO subcommittee has been hard at work.*

These two documents have already been approved by the Senate, but Cathy Anderson is suggesting changes. The SLO subcommittee she’s on initially thought it would be good to start by defining SLOs for certificates and degrees, and then move on to individual classes. But they decided to do the opposite. They’ll start with classes in the fall, and then go to certificates and degrees in the following fall. They ran into problems doing sample SLOs for certificates and degrees. However, they found they were able to go into various courses and use the objectives to write up the SLOs, and it was relatively easy to do.

Dave Bush pointed out that if we make this switch, it will mean we will have no SLOs until the spring, which is almost a year from now. Cathy admitted this but pointed out that in the meantime, we could be working on sample SLOs and training people how to write them. Hence, the time would not be wasted.

Terry moved that we accept the timeline as adjusted; Scott seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

There was discussion about how SLOs differ from course objectives. Cathy noted that the subcommittee is writing up several “narratives” that they’ll later use for training. These will present some of the different scenarios people might encounter when developing the SLOs for their disciplines. She invited others to serve on the subcommittee. They’ve met every Thursday this semester from 11:30-12:30.

g. CAN (Attachment-email forwarded from Carolyn earlier): *Carolyn will discuss this with us.*

CAN stands for the California Articulation Numbering system, and it’s a system the community colleges have been working on for some years. Carolyn Borg explained her recent forwarded email to us about how the CSUs are pulling out of

this system, and they are doing so with virtually no discussion of the matter with the community colleges. There's concern that the CSUs do not understand the implications of this for our system.

She read a letter written by the president of Allan Hancock College to their local senator. Carolyn's question was whether we want to send a similar letter for our senator. Toby Bodeen moved that we send such a letter: Kendall seconded the motion. Toby moved that we send the letter by next week, and Terry seconded it. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Other:

a. Sue Loring's email on the Vice President of Student Services hiring process came up for discussion. Jane Harmon was asked to step out of the room for this part of the meeting. Sue reminded us of her complaint about the process of this hiring committee. She recommended that we need to look into the timeline for hiring processes to ensure that administrative hires are being done in the best possible manner.

Gary Lewis took responsibility for the delays in this particular hiring process that led to Sue's complaint. He explained it had nothing to do with the Human Resources Director but was in part occasioned by a personal crisis in her family and in part by his failure to communicate changes to the hiring timeline. Gary agreed that we need to stipulate in our hiring process that a certain amount of time be given for different stages of the process to make sure that candidates can get here on time and that out-of-town candidates will not be discriminated against.

The hiring procedure is an administrative hiring procedure, and Gary invited recommendations for this; such timelines are already in place for the faculty hiring process. Gary will bring any recommendations we come up with to College Council.

Gary also wanted to assure everyone that there was no hidden agenda behind the delays on this hiring committee, and that it was simply a failure of communication.

6. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 pm, August 22, 2005 in Room 1108.