Academic Senate
MINUTES
Monday, March 24, 2014
3:00 – 4:45 p.m.
Room 1120

	Executive Committee Members Present				
x	Cathy Anderson	x	Cristina Berisso	x	Keith Brookshaw
	Paul Calkins		David Cooper	x	Kendall Crenshaw
	Camilla Delsid	x	Richard Fiske	x	Leo Fong
	Lenore Frigo	x	Scott Gordon	x	Robb Lightfoot
x	Sue Loring	x	Jennifer McCandless		Rob McCandless
x	Susan Meacham	x	Ray Nicholas	x	Brad Peters
x	Mark Racowsky	x	Carolyn Salus-Singh	x	Terrie Snow
	Brian Spillane	x	Craig Thompson		Don Cingrani (N/V)
	Ron Marley (N/V)	x	Meridith Randall (N/V)		

	Other Faculty Present				
x	Mark Blaser				

	Guests				
x	Marc Beam	x	Will Breitbach	x	Dan Haskins
x	Tom Orr				

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

2. Approval of Minutes (Attachment)—March 10, 2014: Ray Nicholas moved to approve the 3/10/14 minutes; seconded by Craig Thompson. Motion carried, with one abstention.

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. The spring plenary session is coming up on April 10-12 in San Francisco; Jennifer confirmed that she will be attending, as will Robb Lightfoot, and she encouraged anyone else interested in attending to contact her.
   b. Report from Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)
      i. No report.
   c. Report from SLO Committee (Cathy Anderson)
      i. The SLO Committee is working on completing the learning outcomes section of the annual report to ACCJC. They discussed ways to improve the assessment cycle, particularly with the part of the cycle that involves faculty implementing changes based on SLO results. Cathy also reported on the first use of ISLO surveys; there were some problems, mostly involving student IDs, but overall process went well, with over 2,200 surveys collected. Marc Beam stated that the Research Office will have a full report out in about a month.
   d. Report from College Council (Cathy Anderson, Sue Loring)
      i. Sue reported that College Council discussed the annual report to ACCJC due this Friday. Much of the discussion focused on the various benchmarks that were set, such as with course completion rate, degrees awarded, transfer rate, etc. Some of these benchmarks were difficult to determine; for instance, there was debate about how to define standards for the employment rate of graduates. Marc Beam explained that a five-year average is typically used to come up with these benchmarks. College Council also finalized the draft of the revised Mission Statement; this will be sent out campus wide for feedback.
   e. Report from Curriculum Council as needed (Ron Marley)
      i. No report.
   f. Report from Student Success Committee as needed (Teresa Doyle)
      i. No report.
   g. Report from Scholastic Standards Committee as needed (Don Cingrani)
      i. No report.
   h. Report from Textbook Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
      i. No report.
   i. Report from Distance Education Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
      i. Carolyn reported on ACCJC standards for library services and instruction (Standards II.B.9-12).

5. Informational Items
   a. Report from Area Meeting if needed (Robb Lightfoot)
      i. Robb provided highlights from the Area A meeting. He summarized state Academic Senate President Beth Smith's talk, which focused on the financial state of the community college system; she wanted everyone to be cognizant of

the fact that there is money available, so there needs to be a shift in our mindset from "just getting by" to a greater focus on excellence; she believes that we need to start thinking about what we would like to see happen in the California community colleges. She also spoke about the proposal for community colleges granting baccalaureate degrees; Robb mentioned that this topic generated much discussion throughout the meeting. She also touched on these various topics: How the implementation of Common Core standards will affect the community colleges; how colleges should be using the FON (Faculty Obligation Number)—initially this was proposed as a minimal standard each college was required to meet, but we need to re-examine this; the upcoming expansion of adult education—there is considerable planning money coming, so there needs to be a lot of thought given to how this is to be used, such as with the hiring of administrators to oversee adult education programs. Robb also spoke of how he was able to get a better understanding of what makes for an effective resolution; one of the most basic lessons for anyone crafting a resolution is to make sure the issue isn't something that the Senate has already taken a position on, so proposers need to do their homework. There is also the way that the discussion of items on the consent agenda can provide a better sense of how much traction a resolution would have later in the process. Robb gave the example of a proposed resolution that would allow a college to choose which accreditation entity it would work with; through the discussion it became evident that there would need to be major legislative changes made to allow for this. Another proposed resolution involved allowing student athletes to receive priority registration; although there was willingness to explore this issue, most felt that expanding the use of priority registration ultimately impacts the majority of students who don't fall into any specialized category. Both of these proposed resolutions were pulled off the agenda as a result of discussion. Overall, Robb saw the meeting as a "101 course on how to write a good resolution," and he offered to help anyone who is interested in writing a resolution.
   b. Report from Succession Planning subcommittee
         i. Scott Gordon reported on what the subcommittee found after researching what academic senates at other colleges do. They specifically examined the bylaws and found that some were very detailed, but many others were not; Scott assessed our bylaws as falling somewhere in the middle. The subcommittee noticed that bylaws don't specifically address succession planning; however, some do address the issue of problems involving membership, such as instances when personality conflicts occur. Jennifer asked about the process for electing the Senate president. Scott noted that our bylaws allow anyone on the faculty to be nominated for Senate president, but most other colleges specify in their bylaws that only members of the Senate are eligible. (Point of Order: Scott's cell phone chimed earlier in the meeting, so Ray reminded everyone that he's required to bring in chocolate for the next meeting.)

6. Discussion/Action items
      a. **Institutional Tenure Review Committee replacement** – *ITRC needs a replacement member and has requesting a temporary appointment*

i. Tom Orr explained that Bethany Schaarschmidt is on a leave of absence this semester, so he asked Terry Bailey to step in to serve on the IRTC for the remainder of the year. Cathy Anderson moved approval of this; seconded by Susan Meacham. Motion carried.

b. **Board Policies and Administrative Procedures - *First Readings*** (Attachments)
- AP 7210: Faculty Hiring Priorities (and new form, rubric)
- AP 4225: Course Repetition

i. There was only one change to AP 7210 suggested by Instructional Council—the addition of a statement on faculty affected by ongoing categorical funding ("If a new faculty request has ongoing categorical funding, the position will not be ranked through this process, but may be approved by the Superintendent/President"). Kendall Crenshaw suggested adding "replacement" along with "new faculty." Robb Lightfoot asked if this change was due to an oversight. Meridith explained that it was never anticipated, and occurred for the first time last year, thus necessitating this change. Robb also asked how long it would be before we re-visit this AP to make any significant changes to it because of institutional changes, such as revisions to the Strategic Plan. Ray Nicholas emphasized how this process has come a long way and is a significant improvement over previous procedures used for hiring. Susan Meacham reiterated that since 2006, when she first began participating in this, the process has become much more objective. Jennifer agreed; the revisions to the rubric reflect the debate that's been occurring on issues such as programmatic diversity, and she sees this as an ongoing process that would allow for the kind of changes that Robb described. Scott Gordon also added that faculty now have much more opportunity for input. Next, Jennifer asked everyone to examine the Hiring Priority Rubric. The accompanying criteria sheet was added to help clarify what each category involved; these criteria can change in the future depending on goals in the current Strategic Plan. The wording was geared towards the potential for using data for support. Jennifer showed the request form that Marc Beam helped create based on the rubric; the rubric now drives the form, whereas previously it was the other way around. Susan noted that this form is a vast improvement because it provides a clear, uniform, systematic means of reporting supporting data. Robb asked about how the form could be used for new programs that don't have established data; Meridith suggested that there are criteria such as "community needs" and "student demand" that could be used.

ii. Changes to AP 4225 were intended make it consistent with language in Title 5. There were no comment or suggestions made.

c. **ACCJC Standards –** *We have the opportunity to provide input on the new Standards that are being developed* (Attachment – e-mail from Meridith)

i. Jennifer highlighted the proposed changes that specifically impact instruction: Standard I.B ("Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness"); I.C ("Institutional Integrity"), in particular I.C.3 ("The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public"); Standard II.A ("Instructional Programs"). Robb added that during the Area A Meeting, faculty were encouraged to revise and improve the language in the standards. Jennifer reminded everyone that

feedback is due on April 30, and because our next meeting will be on April 28, we should be ready to propose any suggestions and comments to submit.

d. **Faculty Professional Development follow-up –** *Continue discussion from last meeting and decide whether to form a committee that is a Standing Subcommittee of Academic Senate* (Attachment and link below)

- https://faculty.sdccd.edu/facflex/facflexview.cfm?action=goals

i. Jennifer pointed to several resources that would be useful for our discussion; her 3/21 e-mail included as an attachment a FAQ on flex from El Camino College. Brad Peters also sent the San Diego Community College District link above; he noted how much work was put into creating this system for flex; it was rough going early on with around 80% of flex proposals rejected, but over time the system became more efficient and consistent. Jennifer read a note from Teresa Doyle requesting the formation of an ad hoc committee with representatives from each division that could get started over the summer. Cathy Anderson identified two separate issues here—1) the immediate needs that the ad hoc committee could work on to set up a basic framework for flex that will be starting up July 1 (i.e., what counts as flex credit, how should credit be awarded, etc.); 2) long-term needs that a standing subcommittee could oversee. Jennifer invited Mark Blaser to talk about professional development options. He spoke of the benefits of sabbaticals, sharing his own experiences with this. He encouraged us to "go big" and develop a teaching and learning center for faculty that would have the resources to provide workshops and training. Susan Meacham expressed her dismay that these discussions were not had before this move to require more flex days. She also asked about HR involvement in handling flex. Meridith noted that her office, rather than HR, would be handling much of the tracking of flex; she also pointed out that there is current legislation that aims to provide more money dedicated to professional development for faculty and staff. Cathy Anderson moved that the Senate immediately form an ad hoc committee for the purposes of establishing guidelines for flex credit and flex approval; this ad hoc committee will have at least 5 faculty member, with at least one CTE representative, one non-instructional faculty, and one instructional administrator; seconded by Ray Nicholas. Motion carried. Cathy suggested Teresa Doyle or Shelley Presnell could oversee the formation of this ad hoc committee. Ray Nicholas volunteered to serve on this, as did Mark Blaser. Kendall Crenshaw was a maybe as the non-instructional faculty member.

7. Other?
   a. Susan Meacham reminded everyone that it is time for nominations for at-large representatives; there are four terms that are expiring, so these will need to be filled. She sent out an email last Friday announcing this. Anyone interested will need to contact Susan by April 2.

8. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:52pm.

9. Next meeting: Monday, April 28 at 3pm