

Academic Senate
March 5, 2009
Minutes

I. Opening Business

A. Called to Order 2:45 PM

Roll Call:

Alfred Hochstaedter, President- FH
Heather Faust, Vice President - HF
Laura Loop, Secretary--LL
Anita Johnson, ASCCC Representative – AJ
Alexis Copeland—ABSENT
Jamie Dagdigian--ABSENT
Alan Haffa -AH
Debbie Anthony – ABSENT
Lauren Michel--LM
Jean-Claude Prado--JCP
Chris Calima--CC
Susan Joplin - SJ
Mark Clements - MC
Jonathan Osburg – JO
Marguerite Stark – MS
Deborah Ruiz--DR

B. Acknowledgment of visitors

Douglas Garrison, Michael Gilmartin, Rosaleen Ryan

C. Approval of Draft Minutes from meeting of 02/19/09

Motion (AH) to accept minutes as recorded: AH

Second: LM

Carries unanimously

II. Reports

A. President/SLO/CAC Committee Report (FH)

1. Senate elections: SJ has been elected as Senator at Large for the 2009-2012 term.
2. Thank you to Michael Gilmartin for his proposal to start classes on the hour. A new policy was adopted by Administration after discussion by Academic Affairs Advisory Group.
AH: This policy was not discussed by senate before implementation; falls into the purview of senate matters.

B. COC (MC)

1. Proposal to add Paola Gilbert to the Academic Freedom Committee; she will bring greater diversity. Motion to add Paola's name to the Academic Freedom Committee: AH. Second (MS). Carries unanimously.
2. The Academic Freedom will bring forward for next senate meeting a formalized document to delineate their charge.

Academic Senate
March 5, 2009
Minutes

C. Flex Day Committee Report (LL)

1. A skeleton draft for Fall 2009 was distributed. Accreditation will be a major focus of both a general session and some breakouts.
2. Faculty names were suggested as possible keynote speakers.
3. Tech offerings were better received as drop-in tutoring sessions than large demo classes.
4. LM suggests online networking, facebook as a tech session.
5. Flex Scheduling Committee meets Thursdays opposite senate meetings at 2:30 in the Library lounge (upstairs). All are welcome.

III. Old Business

- A. Faculty Screening Committee Composition (2nd Reading): *“Faculty hiring committees shall have at least one faculty member from outside the division”* versus *“Academic Senate recommends that hiring committees have at least one faculty member from outside the division”*

Discussion:

SJ: Humanities division voices concern over time constraints made more difficult by mandating someone outside of the division; also concerned about the degree of control over the composition of hiring committees and where that may be leading. The intent for diversity is already being honored by the mixture of voices on our hiring committees.

AH: Social Science division shares the views above. AH Has personally seen the requirement work at other community colleges. Without a clear rule there will be a perception that finding an outside member is optional and that it's too time consuming. The time constraints are really related to how many people need to be on the committee.

HF: Life Sciences does not support *mandating* a member outside of the division. It leaves no flexibility in the event that the committee needs to meet at unusual times or outside of the regular semester. It is also not clear how many committees do not already have an outside member. It's more reasonable to collect that data first; make a recommendation that every reasonable effort is made to include an outside member, and then allow the COC to review the hiring committee's composition. If there is consistently no improvement after merely recommending, then stronger language can be used.

FH: About half of the hiring committees in the past year have included an outside member.

We need to remember that we take the recommendations of the COC very seriously and so if the COC recommends that the

Academic Senate
March 5, 2009
Minutes

hiring committee look for an outside member, the senate would most likely support. Small steps toward the goal are better than none at all.

There is no need to *add* members; just to assure that one of the members is outside of the division. e.g. the EEOAC member could fulfill that role if outside the division.

MC: The obstacle to timeliness in finding an outside faculty member is usually a lack of planning ahead. The current language does not put the recommendation in writing, so even a recommendation from the senate would lend support. COC can facilitate by finding a pool of participants from which to draw committee members.

CC: Can support either a recommendation or a rule; but is Student Services considered one "division?"

FH: Recommendation for Student Services hiring committees would be to include an instructional faculty member.

AH: Hiring practices should be consistent and clear. It's better to do Nothing at all than to merely make a recommendation that can be ignored sometimes, followed sometimes.

HF: Even without a rule, we have outside members half of the time. We need to at least try to ask hiring committees to make a reasonable effort before mandating it. Perhaps a new subcommittee of the senate could help the COC find a pool of participants.

Motion: *The Academic Senate recommends that faculty hiring committees make every reasonable effort to include at least one faculty member from outside the division (HF).*

Second: LM.

Carries unanimously.

B. Changing the Schedule: a few possibilities (See "*Calendar Options, Models A-D*")

FH: Background—Early Spring session results in an inefficient use of resources with so few classes in session. Model D for a quarter system has not been supported; Model C to eliminate Early Spring has been more accepted with some flexibility for the timing of summer sessions (e.g. one long or two short sessions), as well as for the timing of Spring semester to begin (not necessarily the first week of January).

JCP: It's better for students to be ready to enter the labor market earlier in May, before June graduations of other institutions.

LM: CSU system graduates Memorial Day weekend, but still begins Spring semester in February.

DR: Teaching faculty calendar is probably different for CSU system.

AH: High school students use the summer session; we want to be

Academic Senate
March 5, 2009
Minutes

sure to keep them. It will be difficult to have such little down time between semesters. Also need to consider flex day timing, especially in the Spring.

HF: If a longer summer session results in varying start/stop times, how do we know we won't have the same problem with declining enrollment and inefficiency?

Douglas Garrison: The reasons to alter the academic calendar are primarily to support student persistence and to minimize skill loss over long breaks. Early Spring and even summer sessions as they are currently scheduled are too short to effectively teach in some disciplines.

MC: Early Spring is non-productive, and even results in overlap of teaching and flex schedules. 12 weeks of summer session provides ample opportunity for high school students. Doesn't mean every course has to use the entire time.

JCP: Requested informal poll of senators for preferences expressed by divisions for the various models: Models C, then A, were most popular

IV. New Business (*Vice President HF presiding*)

A. Accreditation Standard 1 (*Full text of self study can be found on the academic senate website*).

1. Standard 1A Institutional Mission (Rosaleen Ryan)

a. This standard is relatively straightforward. Deals with our mission statement accurately describing who we are, our commitment to learning and opportunity to revise the mission statement and use it to guide decision making.

b. We meet the standard with opportunity for improvements. We have not been through a full cycle with the current mission statement yet. While it is central to planning and decision making, processes, it's not always explicitly stated.

2. Discussion

MC: That depends on how "explicit" is defined. A card in our wallets? The institutional goals and all action plans presented to College Council are based on the mission statement. Anyone on campus could name 1-2 things their areas/divisions are working on that are driven by the mission statement.

AJ: Some colleges post a copy of the mission statement in every classroom.

MS: As above; classroom posting is done at CSUMB. Our mission statement is posted on our homepage on the internet.

FH: We purposely created a succinct mission statement that faculty and staff could "hold in their hearts" and articulate in planning and prioritizing.

Academic Senate
March 5, 2009
Minutes

Rosaleen Ryan: It is apparent that the mission statement is used in planning. A hallmark example is the way Facilities Committee used the mission statement to prioritize building projects. They actually referenced it at meetings.

B. Accreditation Standard 1B (Fred Hochstaedter) (*See Standard 1B Summary*)

1. This standard deals with planning, resource allocation, program review and student learning. Questions seem redundant. The introduction includes Program Review, Student Learning Outcomes, Planning and Resource Allocation processes explained in a holistic manner rather than piecemeal.

2. Component 1B1 requires ongoing dialog about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. We do this in the academic senate. But there are problems with the timeliness of program reviews, partly because of the clogged nature of the curriculum review process.

MC: Does this really mean that the existing program review process is ineffective, or just that we can identify how to make it more effective/timely?

Rosaleen: This component speaks to continuous improvement, which we do. Perhaps the actual timeliness is better placed later in the standard.

3. Components 1B2, 1B3, 1B4 are met. Our shared governance system provides many examples. The Planning and Resource Allocation process has been in place for two years, although information from individual program reviews could be better.

4. Component 1B5 is met, but depends on how "assessment" of SLOs are defined. Does it mean across the board standard evaluation of writing skills, for instance? If so, we do not report as such to a wide audience, and we have strongly maintained that the method of assessment of stated SLOs is the prerogative of the instructor.

MC: The statement as written in this self study is incriminating; we need a strong statement that we **do** assess SLOs. The BSI program is an excellent example of how outcomes are assessed and reported.

5. Components 1B6 and 1B7 are met (how well mechanisms to evaluate resource allocation processes and learning support services work).

C. The Accreditation Visit—What might happen?

FH: The writing of the self study is in progress and will be submitted prior to the accrediting team's visit next year. The team will write a report after the visit which will be used by the accrediting commission to renew our accreditation, and/or to issue sanctions, warnings,

Academic Senate
March 5, 2009
Minutes

recommendations. Doug Garrison has participated on accrediting teams and can alert us to expectations of the visit.

AJ: At the Fall plenary session, faculty members reported that team members stopped by faculty offices to interview them.

Douglas Garrison:

- 1) The first afternoon when the team arrives involves welcome, introductions. They retire to an evidence room where they will have workspace to evaluate documents. They will have received the self study 1 month in advance, and may have divided up the standards between members and already have questions ready to investigate. The team will interact with representatives from faculty and staff to explore the gaps uncovered in the self study: *Does the self study accurately reflect what happens on this campus? Then they will make recommendations in the form of a written report with evidence.*
- 2) We can expect a combination of scheduled appointments for questions, multiple open forums intended to provide the team with information, and a closing forum where the team will provide initial impressions.
- 3) The team will be looking for inconsistencies and trying to fill in the blanks by interacting with faculty and staff. It will be important to edit the self study with this in mind.
- 4) Remember that no college is perfect. The standards are open to interpretation. The best message is that we engage in the process and are not afraid to review it.

President/Superintendent Douglas Garrison directed several mock survey questions to the Academic Senate President and Senators:

- *How has the decision to open the Marina Ed Center been a good example of how the mission statement is used to guide planning and resource allocation?*
- *Tell me about the needs assessments you have conducted.*
- *In component 1A/1B you indicate an implicit, rather than explicit, connection of the mission statement to planning and resource allocation. Explain.*
- *Do you think you explicitly meet Standard I or not?*
- *Your implementation of program review is inconsistent, yet you say in component 1B that you maintain sustained quality improvement. How do you explain the discrepancy?*

Adjourned at 4:45 pm

Academic Senate
March 5, 2009
Minutes

Academic Senate
March 5, 2009
Minutes