

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes September 15, 2016

Present:

Heather Craig (President)
Glenn Tozier (Vice President)
Lynn Kragelund (Secretary)
Sunny LeMoine(ASCCC Delegate)
Robynn Smith
Alfred Hochstaedter
Jacque Evans
Susanne Muszala
Adria Gerard
Sandra Washington
Kathleen Clark
Merry Dennehy
Mark Clements
Student Representative: Dan Schrum

Absent:

Mike Torres
Abeje Ambaw
James Lawrence
Elias Kary

Visitors:

Michael Gilmartin
Diane Boynton
Jon Knolle
Rosaleen Ryan
Lauren Blanchard
Rushia Turner

Called to Order at 2:35pm

I. Opening Business

a. Public Comments/Welcome

Diane Boynton - interested in the resource guide discussion. There was a conversation at college council this week about this guide. Would like to follow up with the AS discussion last spring about changes to college council and ask the AS to consider the recommended

change to the name and role of college council. Would like the CC to focus on big picture issues of the institution and feels the CC is currently working beyond it's scope.

AH - Urge the AS to look at the Bylaws of the AS as a group.

RS - John Anderson, Division Chair Creative Arts, sent an [email](#) to be presented at this AS meeting with a request from the creative arts department to call a referendum for a Campus wide vote on the changes that CBT suggested.

b. Approval of Draft Minutes from [May 19, 2016](#)

Approval of Draft Minutes from [September 1, 2016](#)

ACTION:

AH moves to approve of the minutes from May 19, 2015 and September 1, 2016

RS seconds

Unanimous approval with 3 abstentions: AG, SL, and LK

II. Reports

a. President's Report

Accreditation team would like to have an AS meeting during the visit: Tuesday October 11th from 3 - 4 pm. Eight senators would be able to attend. This meeting would be in lieu of the following meeting on October 20th.

b. Committee Requests and Placements

COC - proposed appointments for multiple committees

There is difficulty finding new members for many committees. Suggestion: have deans and division chairs ask their faculty to volunteer, especially faculty who are not yet involved in a campus wide committee..

ACTION:

JE moves to approve the following members: Paola Gilbert

RS seconds

Unanimous approval with no abstentions

College Council -

Elias is stepping down and needs to be replaced, two faculty have expressed interest: Lyndon Schutzler and Dawn Rae Davis.

Discussion: Both faculty would be wonderful, since Dawn is joining the Budget Advisory committee, maybe Lyndon would be a better choice. Lyndon, as a division chair, is on two other committees but also has valuable institutional memory and experience on College Council.

ACTION:

RS moves to approve Lyndon Schutzler

JE seconds

Unanimous approval with one abstention: HC

Interim Dean hiring committee - need 3 faculty

ACTION:

AH moves that if Anthony Villareal is willing to join the committee, he is approved.

CK seconds

Unanimous approval with no abstentions

*** Anthony Villareal agreed to join the hiring committee via text during the meeting**

c. CTE Liaison Report - deferred

III. Old Business

a. Academic Senate Reply to Recommendation from CBT on Institutional Decision -Making Processes

Discussed in AS during three meetings last spring with most discussion about the changes with College Council. The motion to approve the recommendations from CBT was voted down by the AS during the May 19 meeting. AH sent around more information via email about the college council changes including specifics about the changes and reason for the changes.

Discussion: The concept of the handbook is a good concept. However, the proposed restructuring of College Council would take away some of the opportunity to faculty to

participate and have a voice in shared governance. And adding another dean would add an extra layer of administration. Would this addition of administration skew representation in decision making away from faculty? The proposed Dean of Institutional Effectiveness creates a new administrator that faculty would interface with instead of potentially having access to the president and another division creates a barrier to discussion across all the levels of administration and faculty. And what about the loss of communication between the different advisory groups?

There is a proposal for one new Dean, but all the other committees memberships will stay the same. The feedback shared seems to reflect the perception of greater change to the organization than is actually proposed.

The perception of these changes is possibly the problem - faculty sense that there is a move to decrease the faculty voice, even if they are not making dramatic changes.

There is a feeling of mistrust that might have resulted from a feeling of being rushed to make changes. Other changes happening at the college are affecting the overall feeling of mistrust and displeasure with the proposed changes and especially with the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.

There is concern that the President's Advisory Group will have no official charge other than a review of the College Mission every 6 years as is currently specified in the draft handbook. Some faculty and senators expressed discomfort with the language "at the discretion of the Superintendent/President" in the role description of the new President's Advisory Group. The handbook also includes a comment about a group will review it each year, but it doesn't say who will review it? The AS? The handbook should specify what group is responsible perform the yearly review.

The handbook is still under development. Feedback, like the suggestions and concerns above, are encouraged and will be used by the workgroup to make modifications. The workgroup is meeting next Thursday to look at the feedback and make changes to the draft. The workgroup had hoped that the handbook was completed last spring.

The AS should formally comment on the handbook. .

Each committee should make decisions for themselves about how they will function, but following the norms as listed in the handbook. The AS should not look at everything and every line concerning each committee. Legally the AS needs to do 10+1, has real power over these issues.

Regarding perception, the AS needs to work to separate perception from fact. Acknowledge those perceptions and quell fears if we can.

Further feedback for the workgroup:

Suggestions - use a Case Study format to identify the potential outcomes of the changes. Can we look at a few scenarios and look at how they would be handled under the current system in contrast with how they would be handled under the proposed changes.

Would like the Draft to include a description of why the changes were needed to the College Council. Can other committees be added and how are committees deleted?

Frustration expressed over the expectation that the AS approve significant policy changes with limited time for study and consideration. Suggestion: perhaps we need to look at topics in smaller groups and have the small group then presents to the senate as a whole prior to decision making. The goals that were suggested at the retreat are potential topics of a workgroup. One topic that needs to be discussed: planning and institutional effectiveness.

ACTION:

GT moves to give this feedback to the workgroup and request changes to the draft and another reading by the AS.

MC seconds

Unanimous approval with no abstentions

- i. **Resource Guide to Institutional Decision Making Handbook- May 2016 Draft**
- ii. **Summary of Recommendations Included in Resource Guide**
- iii. **Response to Request from AS for Clarity**
- iv. **Draft in progress of possible recommendations to Board**

b. Single Course Equivalency Re-evaluation

- i. **Draft of Possible Process for Re-evaluating Single Course Equivalencies**

There are legal concerns about single course equivalency re-evaluation: we don't have a process for re-evaluating and reviewing a faculty that already have a single course equivalency. Without a process, there is a liability issues especially related to discrimination.

*The beginning of the "Career at the district" is when an instructor's equivalency is decided. If there is a change in their qualifications, we need to have a policy on how to re-assess them. There is an equivalency committee, but they don't have time to develop a process. Suggest a workgroup make a draft procedure that the AS could then review. **The following senators volunteered to form a workgroup - MC, GT and HC***

- c. **Summary of Retreat Activities - Discussion deferred to a future meeting due to a lengthy discussion on Institutional Decision Making Process.**
 - i. **Group exercise in initial and tentative prioritizing of AS goals**

IV. New Business

- a. **Discussion of Administrative Restructure - Discussion deferred to a future meeting due to a lengthy discussion on Institutional Decision Making Process.**
 - i. **Handouts from Public Forum presented by administrator**

b. Learning Assessment Committee - AH

Email sent to All Users last spring with the following documents

developed by the committee:

- **SLO Assessment Policy** - would like the AS to comment formally on this policy at a future meeting.
- **Cycle for Assessment** - that includes Course Assessments, assessment of Programs of Study and eventual Program Review.
- **SLO Checklist** - was also developed to help faculty develop SLO's and includes suggestions for making SLO's better.
- **SLO Assessment Rubric** - designed to help faculty assess and document assessment of their SLO's.

The workgroup is asking for feedback from the AS and formal ACTION on the policy as a Board Policy.

V. Future Agenda Items

- a. IT Presentation and IT Handbook Introduction**
- b. Update on Enrollment Management Process from CBT workgroup**
- c. Report on ASCCC Curriculum Academy from Gamble Madsen**
- d. Integrated Planning CBT workgroup**

Meeting Adjourned at 4:22pm

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Kragelund MSN, RN