

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes November 17, 2016

Present:

Heather Craig (President)
Lynn Kragelund (Secretary)
Sunny LeMoine(ASCCC Delegate)
Jacque Evans
Susanne Muszala
Adria Gerard
Amber Kerchner
Elias Kary
Kathleen Clark
Alfred Hochstaedter
Mark Clements
Robynn Smith

Absent:

Glenn Tozier (Vice President)
Sandra Washington
Merry Dennehy
Abeje Ambaw
James Lawrence
Student Representative: Dan Schrum

Visitors:

Carol Karian, Dept Chair ECE
Leila Jewell, Physics Dept.
Michael Gilmartin
Alison Shelling
Jon Knolle
Rosaleen Ryan

Called to Order at 2:32pm

I. Opening Business

a. Public Comments/Welcome

No public comments

b. Approval of Draft Minutes from November 3, 2016 (2:35-2:40)

No alterations to the minutes

II. Reports

a. President's Report

ACJC recommendations that may be coming

AAAG - voted for faculty prioritization done online and the rankings were made for 9 positions. 8 of the 9 are replacement positions

Board Meeting:

Vice President of Advancement - role for grant writing and the foundation president, was approved. Becky Johnson will be acting as a professional expert in this role. Concern expressed about the role being a Vice President position. The decision to make this role a Vice President was a surprise for faculty prompted questions regarding trust in and transparency of the administration.

Director of Marketing - this position was also approved.

Discussion: When was the decision made regarding the new position and the choice for a VP? Many faculty expressed concern at the board meeting. The Board did not make many comments about the decision other than the feeling that a VP title would be beneficial with fundraising.

Visitors from ASCCC - came yesterday and gave good feedback on the equivalency committee, the role of AS, restructuring issues, etc.

Discussion: The visitors stated that the AS Director can have direct access to the Board. The MPC Board communicated that they want the MPC president to bring Senate issues to the board. The AS president also gives a report at every board meeting. Can we have a more informal way to discuss issues with the board, not in the form of a report? Concerns expressed about the lack of open communication with the Board.

TrackDat Training - Two more sessions will be held in the next week. The sessions are to gain feedback on the system. Also, look for training during Flex Days

Emails - please see emails on the following topics:

- **CTE committees**
- **Faculty award for an adjunct faculty member - email coming soon**

b. Committee on Committees Report

Encourage the faculty from your department to join a committee, there is a need for more volunteers. Need members for PIE, Learning assessment committee, and ASAG, need volunteers for 9 hiring committees. For hiring committees, it is ideal to have someone from outside of the discipline and ensure equity for these committees.

Discussion: How sure are we that the 9 positions are going to be funded? Several times hiring committees have gone through the whole process and then no one was hired due to lack of funding. Can we have interviewees teach for actual students? That might be difficult to arrange and also leads to inconsistencies between interviewees. Can the AS re-visit the hiring process? AAAG also has had a recent discussion about hiring. This is definitely under the AS purview.

c. ASCCC Liaison Report on Fall Plenary Session (Sunny LeMoine) - See report

Discussion: Pathways idea: 3 CA community colleges already use this model and presented at the Plenary. There will be a pilot project that CA community colleges can apply to be a part of to implement the Pathways model. The project will be announced in December and schools selected next spring.

III. Unfinished Business

a. Academic Senate Bylaws Discussion

Talking Points

Current Bylaws

Discussion: Membership currently does not include "counseling". It does have three senators from student services, supportive services, and College Readiness/Upward Bound. Student services will be counseling by default because they are the only faculty in that dept. There are three At-Large senators: SM, HC, MD. Can we add Trio and EOPS to the College Readiness/Upward Bound. Can we then change Student Services to "Counseling"?

Should the At-Large positions have more specifications? The proposed language on the talking points would be good.

The qualifications statement that excludes faculty that have moved on to supervisory or management position. Will attempt to clarify who would be unable to serve on the AS due to supervisory role.

President's Term: agreed to elect a president well in advance of the beginning of their term so that they can have time to train. What about having the VP as the president elect? This would limit the presidency to one year terms? Not necessarily, the President and VP could agree to extend the president's term.

Agendas: Need to post a hardcopy agenda? Agendas will be posted in the administration bulletin board. Can we include a statement about all the ways that an item can get on the agenda (exec. Committee, email the president). A written submission to the president is not required to be placed on the agenda. If the item requested is not put on the agenda, the requestor will be given a written response. Would like to have the minutes available to the senators as soon as possible. Are the executive committee meetings open meetings? It is not a public meeting, but the senators can attend. There are Brown Act rules around this issue, especially if 30% of the senate attends. In that case, the meeting must be an actual meeting.

Voting: Under what circumstances should the AS vote on something? 1. What is AS purview? 2. At one point in the agenda can we have an action item? The action items must be on the agenda according to Brown Act. When the voting is close, can we agree to have more discussion on the issue? We can review policies again if there is an issue.

b. Revised Draft of Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency Process and Equivalency Guidelines Documents

Discussion deferred until the next meeting due to a few more edits, and need to list as an Action Item.

Draft of Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency Process

IV. New Business

a. CTE Committee and Resource Allocation Process

About Strong Workforce Funds

Why a call for action?

Unofficial process for allocation of equity and 3SP funds

Michael Gilmartin: The state has designated a consultant to each Community College for assistance with this initiative. This will be a data driven program using data to justify the use of the funds. Data sources are currently available and include: wage tracker, salary surfer, etc. Some colleges have faculty only writing the report, others have a dean heading the effort. The committee wants faculty input, but the process of data collection and the report writing for the application is very time consuming. There are various improvements to CTE programs that would qualify for funding: increased enrollment, increased diversity.

Would like all CTE faculty to fill out requests on a one page request form: [Strong Work Force](#) request.

The CTE committee will look at all the requests and evaluate them. Would like to send out the requests to faculty this next week and get them returned in early December.

Discussion: Would like to hear more ideas about using data creatively to create a plan. This is a great start! Concern over funding's use for the new faculty positions proposed? Which programs are most likely to get funding under this Initiative? How much of the funding is really available for programs for these requests? These ideas make a difference for faculty to consider when making a request. The request is a short form so that faculty can make requests quickly and find out if they are viable before putting lots of time into a proposal. There is a lot of support for spending funding on the Dean position due to complexity of this process.

Can the AS subcommittee work on the process of allocation for funds? This could be seen as a pilot for a process that we formalize in the future.

b. Discussion of Possible Roles of Senate in Administrative Restructure as it applies to 10+1

Discussion deferred due to lengthy discussions on previous topics

c. Faculty and Student Services Collaborative Committee Presentation by Amber Kerchner and Suzanne Muzala

Discussion deferred due to lengthy discussions on previous topics

V. Future Agenda Items

- a. Proactive Discussion Regarding Accreditation Standards (guest Catherine Webb)**
- b. Review of Process for Formation of New Campus-wide Committee and/or Sub-committee**
- c. Update on Integrated Planning from CBT workgroup**
- d. Update on Enrollment Management Process from CBT workgroup**
- e. Understanding the roles of CAC and Senate in curriculum decisions**
- f. Review of Process for Deciding Maximum Class Size**

Meeting adjourned at 4:36pm

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Kragelund MSN, RN