Academic Senate
MINUTES
Monday, September 23, 2013
3:00 – 4:45 p.m.
Room 1119

Executive Committee Members Present					
x	Cathy Anderson	x	Terry Bailey		Keith Brookshaw
x	Paul Calkins	x	David Cooper	x	Kendall Crenshaw
	Camilla Delsid	x	Richard Fiske	x	Leo Fong
x	Lenore Frigo	x	Scott Gordon		Robb Lightfoot
	Sue Loring	x	Jennifer McCandless		Rob McCandless
x	Susan Meacham	x	Ray Nicholas	x	Brad Peters
x	Carolyn Salus-Singh	x	Terrie Snow	x	Brian Spillane
	Chuck Spotts		Don Cingrani (N/V)		Ron Marley (N/V)
	Meridith Randall (N/V)				
Other Faculty Present					
x	Teresa Doyle	x	Roger Gerard		
Guests					
x	Marc Beam				

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:00pm.

2. Approval of Minutes from September 9, 2013 Meeting (Attachment): Terry Bailey moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Susan Meacham. Motion carried.

3. Opportunity for Public Comment
   a. This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Executive Committee on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

4. Report
   a. Report from Senate President (Jennifer McCandless)
      i. Senate Retreat—This will be held next Monday at the Student Center Stage. Faculty Association has provided funding for snacks. Beth Smith, the president of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, will come to speak. Jennifer reminded everyone that this will be more of an informal session to discuss matters such as the ten-plus-one list of the Academic Senate's responsibilities and the handling of succession for Senate officers.
      ii. Peer Evaluators—Jennifer looked into this issue from our last meeting. The basic requirements for being a peer evaluator include being a member of a division or department, selected by the division's supervising administrator, and confirmed by the Senate. A few years ago the Senate passed a resolution to not require Senate approval of full-time tenured faculty who are peer evaluators. However, the problem encountered at our last meeting involves head coaches evaluating assistant coaches, and because some of these coaches are themselves newly hired, a number of Senate members expressed concern about the situation. Jennifer found that for these types of evaluations a different form is used, but she was not able to find this form; also, she learned that coaches do not go through the same evaluator training as faculty are required to go through as stipulated in the faculty contract, and there's also a stipend involved. Because this matter falls under the Senate's purview, Jennifer will research this further and put it on a future agenda.
      iii. Resolution for Fall Plenary—This resolution was originally adopted in the spring, but Carolyn Borg, our delegate for the Spring Plenary, was not able to take it with her. This resolution involves the establishment of on-line exchanges with faculty at other colleges, and it read, "Whereas professional development funds and sabbaticals are limited or nonexistent in many districts, and whereas faculty can learn much by visiting other campuses and observing other campuses' processes and instructions, resolve that the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges recommend that its Executive Committee establish an on-line exchange board for full-time faculty seeking to do a faculty exchange with a colleague at another college within the California Community College system." Jennifer will first take this to the Area Meeting in October, and it will need to be approved there before it can go on to the Fall Plenary Session. Resolutions for the Fall Plenary will be posted on the statewide Academic Senate's website on October 11. Jennifer wanted people to be prepared for this so that she can get any feedback on resolutions before she attends the Area Meeting and the Fall Plenary.
   b. Report from Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)
      i. Instructional Council met last Thursday, and the following items were discussed: Tim Johnston presented a proposed two-year scheduling guide for ADT

programs. It was announced that a proposal to create learning community cohorts had been tabled because of anticipated lack of enrollment. Tim also explained that there was a gap in the system that failed to catch situations involving courses that had multiple prerequisites; apparently students were able to register for these courses having met only one of the prerequisites. Finally, Tim brought a "scheduling wish list" from Student Services, and some of the items on this list were discussed at the meeting. Tom Orr provided an update on tenure review training, noting a high compliance rate. Meridith Randall reminded all faculty to attend CurricuNet training. There was also a reminder that Area Plans and Program Reviews were due on November 1 in TracDat. Marc Beam talked about mapping SLOs and PLOs; there was discussion about administrators being able to view this data. Because this overlaps with the Senate's discussion on the topic of instructors' names being visible on SLO reporting data during our last meeting, Marc was invited to speak at today's meeting.

ii. Marc explained that in TracDat administrators are able to view information at the program level, but not at the course level. However, there is a potential that administrators could view course level SLO results when these results are linked to the Area Plans and PLOs because reports at these levels are available for all to see. In addition, Marc noted that some faculty have been putting course level results into their narratives, so these would also be able to be viewed by all. He asked what faculty would want to see done about all of this. Do faculty want course level SLO results to be "locked down" so that they can only be seen by faculty? If course level SLO data are not linked to Area Plans and PLOs, faculty must then provide narrative summaries of the data. Marc proposed that TracDat could be configured to give faculty options to do this. Susan agreed that this is a matter that Senate needs to discuss further. Jennifer asked about an option available to individual faculty asking if they consent to allow others to see their course level SLO data. Marc believed that such an option could be made available. Discussion continued about faculty views toward how SLO reporting data could potentially be used, and whether there need to be stipulations through an MOU defining how SLO data can and cannot be used.

c. Report from SLO Committee (Cathy Anderson)

i. Last year we were required by the ACCJC to put together a special report on our implementation of Learning Outcomes, and this was submitted at the same time as the follow-up report. ACCJC has sent back a report assessing our performance, using scoring on a 5-point scale, with 5 being "exceeds the norm." The expectation was that we would be at a score of 4, reflecting adequate compliance, in every category. We did receive a number of 4's, but we received a score of 1 on PLOs and ISLOs. Cathy acknowledge that the low scores in these areas were to be expected because we haven't been able to do much assessment on PLOs, and we have not been able to set up anything for ISLOs, so these will be areas the SLO Committee will focus on this year. She expects that by the end of this year every program will be assessing PLOs, and this data will be available in Areas Plans and Program Reviews. For ISLOs, the committee plans on creating and implementing surveys of students to collect data. Marc Beam added that some colleges use a college learning assessment, which is a test that measures skill levels in a number of different areas, and this can be

administered at any point, but most colleges tend to give it as an exit exam. Cathy encouraged anyone who knows of a PLO that could also be utilized as an ISLO to take advantage of this. Cathy also mentioned that for GELOs, which are the PLOs for transfer programs, there hasn't been any activity with the last part of the assessment cycle, the application of the data to improve programs. Marc noted that no one really "owns" General Education, so there is not a specific entity to take charge of this. Cathy suggested that the General Education Committee could take on this responsibility to "close the loop" on the assessment cycle for GELOs.

    d. Report from College Council (Cathy Anderson, Sue Loring)
        i. At their last meeting, College Council had first readings of all the APs and BPs that were revised; the majority of the revisions were simply mandated changes. They also discussed the ACCJC follow-up report, and how to do the Strategic Plan progress reports, particularly the question of whether progress reports need to be done annually for initiatives that have target completion dates in the future. College Council wants all Strategic Plan information to be incorporated into TracDat to centralize everything, but there are logistical problems with doing this.

    e. Report from Curriculum Council as needed (Ron Marley)
        i. Jennifer noted that Ron would be present at the CurricuNet training sessions to serve as a resource on Curriculum matters.

    f. Report from Student Success Committee as needed (Teresa Doyle)
        i. Teresa shared the latest draft of the bylaws for the new Student Success Committee, pointing out the specific changes made since our last reading. This draft tries to clarify the differences between the responsibilities of this committee and those of the Enrollment Management Committee; she explained that the Student Success Committee makes recommendations on matters involving new students, basic skills students and students on academic probation; whereas the Enrollment Management Committee focuses on seeking out and retaining students. Teresa asked Senate members about the student representative on the committee; how would this representative be selected, and what would be this person's role on the committee? Jennifer said that she would put the bylaws on the agenda of the next Senate meeting. She suggested that the bylaws explicitly identify the committee as a joint committee of the Senate, and because of this the committee's membership would need to be sent to the Senate for approval. Teresa said that she would do this and bring the revised version back for the October 14 Senate meeting.

    g. Report from Scholastic Standards Committee as needed (Don Cingrani)
        i. No report.

    h. Report from Textbook Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
        i. Carolyn reported that the Theresa Poore trust awarded over $20,000 in textbook funds to students. She also mentioned that many students commented that they do not care for traditional print textbooks and prefer open-source textbooks available in electronic form.

5. Discussion/Action items
    a. Professional Development Committee proposed Bylaws (2 Attachments)

       i.   Roger Gerard explained the revisions made to the proposed bylaws and flow chart for the Professional Development Committee. He pointed out that the only change to the flow chart was the addition of CEA. Kendall Crenshaw suggested that the Learning Academy for new faculty be added to the chart. Susan Meacham asked about the use of the term "All College Day" to replace the current term "Flex Day." Roger mentioned that this was simply a proposal and open to change, but this reflects the statewide trend to move away from the term "flex." Teresa Doyle mentioned that the deans were testing out the rubric used to evaluate requests for professional development funding. Jennifer suggested the bylaws explicitly mention that this committee would be a joint committee of the Senate. Additionally, under membership, she suggested that faculty have greater representation on the committee, and the Senate should be able to appoint the faculty members; she also recommended that the co-chair be specifically a faculty co-chair, which is a standard feature for joint committees of the Senate. The draft only stipulates that one chairperson be the Associate VP of Human Resources, and the other co-chair would be appointed by majority vote. Teresa explained that this reflected a general attempt throughout the bylaws to lessen the distinction made between faculty and classified staff so that classified staff don't get the sense that they take a backseat to faculty, and thus the other co-chair could be either faculty or classified. Cathy Anderson asked about the need for the Associate VP of HR to be one of the co-chairs. Teresa stated that the rationale for this was the administrative co-chair's control of the budget. Cathy also asked about any potential conflict of interest having the Associate VP of HR serve as co-chair. Teresa believed that this arrangement made sense because of efficiency; she explained that the committee itself does not make any decisions on where professional development funding goes, so the Associate VP of HR does not have control over this matter. Roger added that the rubric plays a big role in determining where funding will ultimately go. Jennifer asked about the payment of substitutes for instructors who travel to attend conferences or professional development activities. The District currently does not fund these substitutes, so it discourages faculty from pursuing professional development opportunities. Lenore Frigo asked about sections VII (Evaluation of Professional Development Campus-wide Proposals) and VIII (Professional Development Credit), questioning whether they belong in the bylaws because their content is likely to change on a regular basis, and this would require bringing changes back to the Senate for approval. Roger and Teresa asked everyone to review the draft, share it with their constituents, and bring back any suggestions for the next Senate meeting.

b.   BP 4250: Probation, Disqualification and Readmission (Attachment for this BP and all BPs and APs that follow)

       i.   All BPs and APs were not available before our meeting time, so these will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

c.   BP 4260: Prerequisites and Corequisites – Establishment and Review of Prerequisites and Corequisites

       i.   All BPs and APs were not available before our meeting time, so these will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

d.   AP 4260: Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories

        i.   All BPs and APs were not available before our meeting time, so these will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

    e.   BP 5010: Admissions and Concurrent Enrollment

        i.   All BPs and APs were not available before our meeting time, so these will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

    f.   AP 5055: Registration Priorities

        i.   All BPs and APs were not available before our meeting time, so these will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

6.   Informational Items

    a.   Follow-Up Report for ACCJC (due October 15) (Attachment)

        i.   Jennifer provided a summary of this report, which has been approved by College Council. Last October, we submitted a follow-up report on Accreditation Report Recommendations 1, 2, and 3, but for Recommendation 4, we simply stated that we would continue to work on it with the expectation that we would complete it during the following year. Now this follow-up report addresses that recommendation concerning our governance structure. The biggest part of fulfilling this recommendation was the completion of our Participatory Governance Manual. Jennifer reminded everyone that College Council is asking for any feedback on the content of this follow-up report.

7.   Other?

    a.   For informational purposes, Jennifer sent out via e-mail an update from the Chancellor's office on ADT (Associate Degrees for Transfer) programs; the update identifies the progress each college is making towards the establishment of ADTs.

    b.   David Cooper praised the training for CurricuNet and how this new system will help streamline the curriculum process.

8.   Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:46pm.

9.   Next meeting: Senate Retreat Monday, September 30, 3:00pm.