

Academic Senate

MINUTES

Monday, September 22, 2014

3:00 – 4:45 p.m.

Room 1120

Executive Committee Members Present					
	Cathy Anderson		Mark Blaser		Keith Brookshaw
x	Paul Calkins		Kendall Crenshaw		Camilla Delsid
x	Richard Fiske	x	Leo Fong	x	Lenore Frigo
x	Scott Gordon	x	Debra Griffin	x	Karen Henderson
x	Susan Keller	x	Robb Lightfoot		Jennifer McCandless
	Rob McCandless	x	Susan Meacham	x	Ray Nicholas
x	Brad Peters	x	Mark Racowsky	x	Carolyn Salus-Singh
	Terrie Snow	x	Brian Spillane		Craig Thompson
	Don Cingrani (N/V)		Ron Marley (N/V)	x	Meridith Randall (N/V)
Other Faculty Present					
x	Carolyn Borg	x	Teresa Doyle		
Guests					
x	Will Breitbach	x	Kate Mahar	x	Frank Nigro

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:02pm.

2. Approval of Minutes (Attachment)—August 25, 2014 and September 8, 2014: Ray Nicholas moved to approve the 8/25/14 minutes; seconded by Susan Meacham. Motion carried. Richard Fiske moved to approve the 9/8/14 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 Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)
 - i. Instructional Council met last Thursday and the agenda included the following: Sandra Hamilton-Slane reported that the College has over \$500,000 in Student Equity funds to spend; these funds are to be used to target specific populations. Information Services and Technology provided an update on the 2014-15 disbursement of funds, detailing what had been completed and what is still pending. Tim Johnston reviewed the procedure that students must follow to change their majors or programs of study; he also gave an overview of the Open CCC Apply online application. Instructional Council discussed the role of PIC, particularly concerning the scope of the committee's duties. Susan also added that she offered to serve on PIC.
 - b. Report from SLO Committee (Cathy Anderson)
 - i. Cathy sent an e-mail to all faculty announcing the formation of a Faculty Inquiry Group (FIG) for the Critical Thinking ISLO, and ten faculty have volunteered to serve on it, with five more expressing interest in serving; there soon will be a second FIG for the Quantitative Reasoning ISLO. Cathy also announced that Brad Rupert from PEAT suggested that the committee "adopt" PEAT as a project for the year to help them find meaningful PLOs; Carolyn Singh has suggested doing the same for the Library. Finally, the SLO Committee still has three vacancies—it needs representatives from Science, Social Science, and Arts and Communication.
 - c. Report from Curriculum Council as needed (Ron Marley)
 - i. No report.
 - d. Report from Student Success Committee as needed (Teresa Doyle)
 - i. The Student Success Committee will meet soon to finalize the Basic Skills Initiative action plan, so Frank Nigro and Teresa Doyle provided a summary of this year's report, highlighting 11 accomplishments that have helped institutionalize basic skills programs and projects. Some of these included hiring five new math instructors, tutor training, professional development, and curriculum changes. Teresa singled out activities like Proactive Counseling, Path2Stats, and Math Camp. Both Frank and Teresa asked for any feedback to help finalize the report.
 - e. Report from Scholastic Standards Committee as needed (Don Cingrani)
 - i. No report.
 - f. Report from Textbook Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
 - i. No report.
 - g. Report from Distance Education Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)

- i. Carolyn announced that Counseling has online student success workshops. There also is a survey on library services and online instruction that was sent out via e-mail to all students; Will Breitbach shared that approximately 370 surveys have been completed and turned in so far. The DE Committee also discussed the proposed Faculty Instructional Technology (FIT) committee, and determined that the many of the duties identified in the FIT committee's draft bylaws would overlap with the duties of the DE Committee.
 - h. Report from College Council (Robb Lightfoot)
 - i. Robb reported that the faculty/staff climate survey closed last week and the results will be shared once they are available. There is a Strategic Plan task force that is being assembled, so administrators, faculty and staff will be invited to serve on it; along with this are several other committees that are seeking representatives.
 - i. Report from Senate President (Robb Lightfoot)
 - i. Robb stated that much of what he wanted to report on would be covered in the informational items and discussion/action items later in the agenda.
- 5. Informational Items
 - a. Basic Skills Report/ SBCC Action Plan
 - i. This was covered earlier in 4.d.
 - b. Course Repeatability –Training Documents
 - i. Ron Marley asked to distribute this document to all faculty.
 - c. Student Equity Meeting – 9/26 Sacramento
 - i. Robb will be attending this conference later this week. There's also a need for a CTE representative on the Student Equity Committee.
 - d. Midterm Report for Accreditation
 - i. Meridith Randall also sent out a copy of this. The period for public comment ended last week.
 - e. Faculty Appointments – Strategic Plan Task Force & Professional Development
 - i. As mentioned earlier in item 4.h, this task force is being formed and will include administrators, faculty and staff.
 - f. AB 86 – Survey Info Requested
 - i. This is the statewide initiative on adult education. Kate Mahar explained that it's currently in the action planning stage, so faculty input is actively being sought.
- 6. Discussion/Action items
 - a. Excellent Program Nominations
 - i. Robb added this to the agenda to remind faculty about the statewide Excellent Program Award sponsored by the Board of Governors. The deadline for nominations is November 11. Robb acknowledged that the Academic Senate does not have any process in place to nominate and select a program as we do with the Excellent Educator Award, but he encouraged faculty to go ahead and identify possible nominees. Several mentioned the College Connection program as a good candidate because it fits this year's theme of transition from high school to college. Robb stated that he would inquire further about this.
 - b. Technology Committee
 - i. Robb had an opportunity to meet with both James Crandall and Randy Reed to discuss the proposed Faculty Instructional Technology (FIT) Committee. Susan

Meacham noted that James Crandall spoke to Instructional Council about increasing faculty input on the Technology Committee by adding two more faculty representatives, and this may be a more efficient way to devote greater attention towards instructional technology than creating a new committee.

c. Community Engagement bylaws

- i. Robb stated that he would move this item to next meeting's agenda.

d. PIC

- i. Robb began by asking Meridith Randall and Frank Nigro to explain the difference between Program Improvement and Program Vitality. Meridith did not think that the distinction between the two was clear enough, so there's a pressing need to clarify the charges and duties of both committees. Frank, with an assist from Ray Nicholas, who has been a member of PIC since the beginning, provided some background on PIC; it started off as PAC (Program Assessment Committee), which had broader scope of duties. After its bylaws were revised numerous times, PIC became a committee with a very circumscribed mission—to review programs that have been identified by a dean as struggling. College Council has requested that AP 4020, which defines PIC's mission, be revised to expand PIC's responsibilities to look at programs more broadly; Frank explained that the current AP is geared towards eliminating programs, but not reviewing and evaluating them. Meridith reminded everyone that the process of evaluating the efficacy of programs falls under the ten-plus-one list of the Senate's responsibilities, and it is a process that is essential to any college; she pointed out that Title 5 mandates this, and it's also necessary for accreditation. Robb wanted clarification of the process for handling programs that are identified as struggling. Meridith used the example of the Dietary Service Supervisor (DSS) program, which is a program that has good enrollment, but produces very few graduates; it clearly needs a review to determine why it has such low completion rates, and the committee conducting this review would need to examine factors such as labor market data to arrive at an objective assessment of the program's viability; if the program is determined to be viable, the committee would need to generate an action plan to help that program thrive. She was aware that many faculty are hesitant to serve on PIC because they would not want to be involved with a committee that was charged with potentially eliminating programs. Ray favored expanding PIC's mission to include approving new programs as well as evaluating existing programs for viability and recommending the elimination of programs that are deemed no longer viable; he was aware that such a mission would bring with it a large workload, and there would be a definite need for the expertise and knowledge of faculty in all areas. Robb pointed to the 42 different University Studies and General Studies programs that were created years ago; now with the ADTs, these programs are for the most part redundant. Robb saw this matter as tied to student success; he was concerned about our catalog being filled with programs that are not currently active or viable; this would undoubtedly confuse students. He shared a table that identified the number of degrees awarded over a six-year period from 2008 to 2014. Many of the numbers were low, especially for the last two to three years, mostly due to the introduction of ADTs, but he noted that not all students want to go for an ADT, so he saw a compelling reason for keeping the University Studies and General Studies

degrees. Both Susan Meacham and Brad Peters wanted to see more data, such as the total number of students in the program and not just the completers, to get a more complete picture. Robb argued that it would be a disservice to our students if we continued to offer degree programs that would be difficult or impossible to complete. Frank wanted to clarify that just because a degree program is eliminated it does not mean that the courses that are part of that degree program would be eliminated. Ray encouraged members of the Senate to attend the next College Council meeting when PIC will be on the agenda.

e. Program Vitality

- i. This item was discussed in item 6.d above.

f. Block Scheduling

- i. Robb explained that this item was added because recently there has been both formal and informal discussion about the effects of block scheduling; he shared that several faculty have expressed their concerns to him about this. Susan Meacham reported that this matter was discussed at the last Instructional Council meeting. One of the concerns was that there are instructors who feel that block scheduling was being imposed on faculty, but Meridith reiterated that block scheduling was not mandated, and she acknowledged that there are subjects that would not be well served pedagogically with block scheduling. There was also a concern that block scheduling made it more difficult for some CTE students, specifically those in Agriculture and Hydraulics, to sign up for certain math and English classes because of scheduling conflicts; Ray Nicholas confirmed that he had heard from two instructors about students, 15 in one class and 17 in another, who were unable to fit required GE courses into their schedules. Frank contended that any scheduling conflicts were not the result of block scheduling because block scheduling was not being widely used this semester as some have assumed. Meridith noted that many sections of math and English courses are offered both during the day and in the evening, and nearly all English courses and most math courses are also offered online, so she's surprised that students would be unable to find a section of a math or English course that would work with their schedules. Robb acknowledged that this issue of students not being able to fit required courses into their schedules is clearly more complicated than just block scheduling, so there's a definite need to examine this problem and identify what could be causing it. Meridith pointed out that Tim Johnston has asked counselors to look out for scheduling difficulties that students might be having.

7. Other?

- a. Carolyn Borg noted that the template for the AA-T Education degree discussed last meeting has been removed from the Chancellor's web site, so we will need to postpone further discussion until the template is restored.

8. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:38pm.

9. Next meeting: Monday, October 13, 2014, at 3:00pm.