



## ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING MINUTES

**Thursday, November 10, 2011**

**Present:** Mary Asher-Fitzpatrick, Paul Carmona, Guillermo Colls, Dan Curtis, Greg Differding, Donna Hajj, Lauren Halsted, Nancy Jennings, Jesus Miranda, Brad Monroe, Angela Nesta, Mary Sessom, Patrick Thiss, Michael Wangler

**Proxy:** Seth Slater for Barbara Pescar

**Absent:** Reem Asfour, Michelle Garcia

*The senate minutes are recorded and published in summary form. Readers of these minutes must understand that recorded comments in these minutes do not represent the official position of the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate expresses its official positions only through votes noted under "Action."*

### **Call to Order**

Michael called the meeting to order at 2:05pm

### **I. Approval of Minutes**

**MSC (Monroe/Hajj)** to approve the minutes from October 27, 2011.

1 abstention

### **II. President's Report**

#### **A. Announcements**

Michael announced that Jesus Miranda would be the faculty note taker and that Mary Asher would be the note taker for the next meeting. He also added an agenda item to the Committee Reports stating that Donna Hajj would be reporting on the Voluntary Senate Fund.

Michael shared an update from the Community College League of California (CCLC) that summarized the current state budget situation. When adjusted for inflation, state funding has dropped to levels last seen in the mid 1990's, and more cuts are expected for the 2012-13 fiscal year.

#### **B. IPRPC Follow-up**

Michael reported that based on input received, the Instructional Program Review & Planning Committee (IPRPC), made some changes to the rubric for ranking full-time faculty positions. The "special circumstances" box at the bottom was removed, and replaced with a 4<sup>th</sup> column that will be reserved for "other conditions" not found in the first 3 columns. The 4<sup>th</sup> column will be scored based on each individual discipline's unique situation, and will capture all of the "special circumstances" that were in the box that was removed. The program review process, including the scoring rubrics, will be reviewed by the IPRPC and the Academic Senate during the spring semester.

### **C. ASCCC Fall Plenary Update**

Michael provided an update on discussions and actions taken at the ASCCC 2011 Fall Plenary.

One of the main topics of discussion was the CCC Student Success Task Force recommendations. State Chancellor, Jack Scott, along with other members of the task force held a “town hall” panel discussion to hear feedback on the recommendations. The video of this panel discussion can be found here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-LfDzAH82pw>

The Statewide Academic Senate took action on several resolutions related to the task force recommendations, which can be found on the ASCCC website:

[http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Adopted%20Resolutions%20F2011\\_1.pdf](http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Adopted%20Resolutions%20F2011_1.pdf)

The task force met on Wednesday, November 9<sup>th</sup>, and a summary of their actions provided by State Senate President Michelle Pilati is provided below:

#### **Categorical Consolidation - Removed**

Prior to the meeting recommendations 8.1 (consolidation of the categoricals) and 4.1 (tying course offerings to education plans, de-funding all noncredit outside of career development or college preparatory (CDCP), restricting state support to courses in a student’s education plan) had been identified as topics to begin with. After a brief discussion, it was decided that 8.1 would be modified to encourage collaboration between categorical programs (“de-siloing”) and the proposal to consolidate would be removed. It was stated that any gains achieved from the proposed consolidation were not great enough to justify the effort involved in achieving this. The goal is to get all areas of the college to work together and focus on student success – a goal we all can agree on.

#### **De-Fund Non-CDCP Noncredit - Removed**

The discussion of 4.1 began with a proposal to modify the recommendation related to noncredit. One member asserted that statute should not be amended to defund any noncredit area and offered to revise this recommendation. It was not clear what the final language would be, but it was clear that the drastic action of ceasing to fund all non-CDCP noncredit will no longer be a component of the recommendations.

#### **Differential Funding for Courses Not in a Student’s Education Plan - Removed**

As the SSTF members discussed 4.1 it was apparent that the language could be read a number of ways. It was not clear what tying apportionment to student educational plans would really mean and how it would be monitored. It was proposed that funding could be limited to courses that exist in a “program of study”. But it was then noted that this would not permit the introduction of stand-alone courses or the development of new programs. While it was not clear how this issue was resolved, the recommendation to require student to pay “full freight” for courses not in their education plan was removed. The concept of permitting the mixing of community service and credit remained; the expectation is that this will be modified to be consistent with the Academic Senate’s proposal to permit community members to register for courses, pay full cost, and not earn credit.

#### **Chapter 1**

The discussion about this chapter focused on the importance and value of working with K-12 and the interest in seeing K-12 standards raised.

#### **Chapter 2**

The need for faculty involvement in selection of an assessment and any matriculation-related technology was noted. A discussion about cut scores ensued. It was not clear what the final decision was – but the proposal to have a common cut score for the first “college-level” course resonated with some members. The reason for varied leveling of courses below college level seemed to resonate with all members. The Chancellor stated that common assessment had to be mandated and that to not do so was unfair to students. In summarizing the decisions made about 2.1, the Chair stated that the language would reinforce the role of faculty and that common assessment would be mandated. The issue of a common cut score was left undecided. Technical issues were discussed for the rest of Chapter 2, with no major changes.

### **Chapter 3**

The general concerns with all elements of Chapter 3 were discussed. No substantive changes were made.

### **Chapter 5**

As written, Chapter 5 includes ESL as “basic skills”. The concerns expressed about this were noted and the language will be revised. Given that the Academic Senate and others support the California Community College’s (CCC) “taking over” adult education, it was suggested that this might be a recommendation. One member expressed concern about this, questioning whether or not the CCCs were any better at adult education than K-12 and questioning the wisdom of taking something on that might ultimately be an unfunded mandate. It was not clear how this would be addressed in the next iteration of the recommendations.

### **Chapter 6**

There was a brief discussion of Chapter 6 and a reminder of the commitments made at the Academic Senate Plenary Session. The bullets under both recommendation 6.1 and 6.2 that would give the Board of Governors or the Chancellor’s Office the authority to mandate activities for Flex Days was removed in favor of a statement that the Chancellor’s Office could recommend and encourage a focus for flex activities.

### **Chapter 7**

There was little discussion of this chapter.

### **Alternative Funding – Language to be Modified**

Recommendation 8.3 was described as “enormously divisive”. Despite the unqualified opposition of some groups, a proposal to somehow modify the language of this recommendation was discussed. The concept was to not have a new funding formula, but to have a “hold harmless” mechanism for colleges that opt to engage in innovation that might reduce the usual apportionment received. It was not clear what this would mean or how it would work. After a vote on this contentious issue that supported keeping this ill-defined proposal in the recommendations, one supporter suggested that it should be revisited due to its contentious nature. To this observer, it was not clear how this was different from 8.2 – which provides funds to support innovation.

Additional information and updates can be found on the 1143 page of the Academic Senate website (<http://www.asccc.org/1143>).

### **D. District & College Council Updates**

Michael provided an update on the status of the college critical hire list that was recently updated and brought to the Institutional Effectiveness & Resource Council (IERC). The list includes the following positions for hire during the current fiscal year:

- Administrative Secretary for Business Services
- Associate Dean of Specially Funded Programs
- Counseling & Assessment Center Supervisor
- Custodian
- Instructional Lab Assistant- Writing Center
- Full-time faculty member- Water/Wastewater

The process for final approval of these positions includes one more read at IERC, approval by Chancellor’s Cabinet, and final approval by District Strategic Planning & Budget Council (DSP&BC). This list should be approved and ready to move forward by the December 5<sup>th</sup> DSP&BC meeting.

### III. Vice President's Report

#### A. SOC Committee Appointments

Nancy Jennings reported on new faculty appointments to the following committees:

- Clerical Assistant in Exercise Science: Patrick Thiss and Donna Riley.
- Technology Planning Committee: Kim Dudzik, Steve Weinert and Brian Josephson.

### IV. Committee Reports

#### A. Voluntary Senate Fund

Donna Hajj reported that the Senate Voluntary Fund had raised \$633 to date. It was suggested that she send out another reminder letter, which she will do before the Thanksgiving Holiday. She also announced that the drawing for the See's Candy would be at the December 8<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting.

#### B. Online Teaching & Learning Committee Report

Angela Nesta, member of the Online Teaching & Learning Committee, provided an update on recent committee work, including information about new Blackboard procedures and the Online Course Compliance Survey.

With regards to Blackboard, the District Information Systems Office is working on a process for archiving old course materials and removing the old containers. Faculty will be notified one month in advance of any removals, and can request that a container remain active to accommodate students dealing with incompletes.

Angela also shared the committee's proposed Online Course Compliance Survey. She gave examples as to where the classes might not be compliant and said help was available to make the classes compliant. Michael suggested having a Professional Development Workshop regarding this issue and Angela said she would check into this.

#### C. Senate Awards Committee Report

Nancy Jennings, member of the Senate Awards Committee, provided an update on recent committee work, including discussions about the nominating process for awards offered by the Statewide Academic Senate.

Nancy Jennings provided a brief history of the committee saying it had been around since 1990 and that the first award was given in 1991. Nancy commended Chuck Charter, the Chair of this committee for 21 years, for his hard work over the course of the award nominations and presentations.

Nancy stated that there were currently two local awards – Teaching Excellence Award and the new Outstanding Faculty Award - and that anyone can nominate a faculty member. She then explained the process for nomination and voting. Nancy announced that there were 39 nominations this year for the Teaching Excellence Award and then read a partial list of the past recipients.

Nancy listed the Statewide Awards and asked that if anyone had someone they wanted to nominate to please send this information to Chuck Charter. She then announced that the Senate Awards Committee recommended this year's Award for Teaching Excellence winner, Tim Pagaard, be nominated for the Hayward Award.

Michael asked the Senate to consider moving this to an action item.

**MSU Differding/Thiss** to move to action the nomination of Tim Pagaard for the Hayward Award.

**MSU Colls/Thiss** to nominate Tim Pagaard for the Hayward Award.

Michael will work with Tim to complete the application and submit to the State Senate by the deadline.

**V. Action**

There were no action items.

**VI. Information**

**A. Peer/Manager Faculty Evaluation Form**

Michael shared the latest version of the Peer/Manager Faculty Evaluation Form. There were several questions related to the self-evaluation component, including whether or not this section would be mandatory. The Senate Officers will clarify the language and bring it back for action at the next meeting.

**B. Honor's Program**

There was a preliminary discussion about starting an honor's program at Cuyamaca College. Several pros and cons were discussed, and it was agreed that a task force would be convened to make a recommendation about whether or not to establish an honor's program at Cuyamaca.

**C. Accreditation Evidence Writing Guidelines**

The writing evidence guidelines for the 2013 Accreditation Self-Study were shared with the Senate, and are available on the college's Accreditation website:

<http://www.cuyamaca.edu/in/accreditation/default.asp>

**VII. Announcements/Public Comment**

Lauren Halsted encouraged Senators to attend the next Governing Board meeting where AFT's contract proposal will be sunshined to the Governing Board.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50pm

Recorded by Joy Tapscott