



ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, April 26, 2012

- Present:** Reem Asfour, Paul Carmona, Guillermo Colls, Dan Curtis, Greg Differding, Nancy Jennings, Jesus Miranda, Brad Monroe, Angela Nesta, Donna Riley
- Absent:** Mary Asher-Fitzpatrick, Michelle Garcia, Donna Hajj, Mary Sessom, Michael Wangler
- Proxy:** Nicole Keely for Mary Asher-Fitzpatrick; Pat Newman for Mary Sessom; Seth Slater for Barbara Pescar
- Guests:** Kathryn Nette, IPRPC Co-Chair; Pat Setzer, Curriculum Committee Co-chair; Jodi Reed, Professional Development Committee Co-chair; Alicia Munoz, Basic Skills Committee Co-chair; Lucinda Hollands, Robin Steinback, and Patricia Santana as representatives for IPRPC

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 Wangler was absent so Nancy Jennings called the meeting to order at 2pm.

I. Approval of Minutes

(MSU) Differding/Miranda to approve the Senate meeting minutes from Thursday, April 12th, 2012.

II. President's Report

A. Announcements

Information was provided about upcoming events and activities.

Nancy announced that Michael Wangler would not be attending the meeting due to his attendance at a Geography conference. She asked someone to volunteer to take the faculty notes for the meeting and Seth Slater volunteered. She then stated that the tentative Senate meeting scheduled for May 17th had become necessary and if Senate members could not attend to please provide a proxy. She then added that some of the agenda items would be taken out of order during the meeting to allow those presenting to leave the meeting early.

B. Elections Update

Results of the Part-time Faculty Officer-At-Large Election were announced.

Nancy asked Angela Nesta to provide an election update for Part Time Officer-at-Large and Angela stated that Seth Slater had won by 25 votes. Angela congratulated Seth and said he would be assuming his position during the Summer 2012 semester.

C. District & College Council Updates

Updates were provided on discussions and actions taken at recent District & College Council Meetings.

Nancy asked Pat Setzer to give a quick DCEC update and Pat gave a description of the committee charge and added that they had been inundated with BP's to approve to the point that they had not been able to address anything else. He stated that the alignment process between Grossmont and Cuyamaca that had come to the Senate previously had not moved out of the initial committee review. Pat stated that they had thought they were close to an agreement but were meeting with a lot of opposition from Grossmont. He stated that there were objections to Cuyamaca's capacity to develop new courses that didn't necessarily have to be aligned but that these courses provided an alternative pathway to prerequisites and Grossmont felt they should be allowed to prevent our college from providing those types of classes. He then gave examples of this. Pat also discussed some things that Cuyamaca wanted to do which might infringe on some issues with Grossmont and added that he thought at present they were at an impasse for approval of the alignment process. He finished his report by stating that there would be continuing meetings to address these issues.

Jesus Miranda reported that IERC's report would go to the President's Cabinet, and it would include information from Student Services, Instruction, and Administrative Support. He stated they wanted to be clear this was a new process and then he reviewed the process. He showed positions that were in the recruitment process and showed delayed and pending recruitments. He said these positions had been approved but delayed due to budget issues. Jesus then showed new priorities and outcomes from the new process. He stated that they had decided to honor the rankings and if future funding became available the delayed list would be taken into consideration. He said that program review would be redone each year, and the committees were trying to streamline the process, but since everything was in flux, the President's Cabinet could make different recommendations. Jesus again mentioned that their priorities would change based on established and current priorities for the college from year to year. Jesus ended his report by stating that his information would be sent out to the Senate by Michael.

D. ASCCC Spring 2012 Plenary Report

Information was provided about discussion and actions taken at the Statewide Academic Senate Spring Plenary.

Nancy discussed the Spring Plenary and said it was really interesting adding that they would be putting information together that will help community college budgets. She said that Michael had mentioned that there were some items that had posed contentious debate towards the end of the Plenary, but the items the Senate had discussed previously and wanted to pass had in fact passed.

III. Vice President's Report

A. SOC Committee Appointments

Nancy Jennings reported on new faculty appointments to committees.

Nancy announced a SOC appointment of Jeri Edelen to the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee.

IV. Committee Reports

A. Instructional Program Review & Planning committee (IPRPC)

Kathryn Nette, IPRPC Co-Chair, provided an update on committee work, including IPRPC's final report with rankings, full-time instructional faculty and classified staff position recommendations for 2012-13, and committee discussions about future IPRPC processes.

Nancy introduced Kathryn Nette who presented on behalf of IPRPC. There were also several members from the committee present: Lucinda Hollands, Robin Steinback, and Patricia Santana.

Kathryn distributed handouts regarding faculty rankings, the faculty ranking rubric, and IPRPC Recommendations for Faculty Hiring, and stated that one of the jobs of IPRPC was to take over the 'rank of hire' list for the following year. She said it was a challenge this year because as they started the committee, a number of positions were already in process. She said the committee ranked a list of 10 positions, discussed positions that were initially in process but were pulled back, and decided to put forward 5 positions – Water Wastewater, Spanish, Economics, American Sign Language, and Reading. She said the positions that were ranked between 5-14 were essentially a new list for this year. She added that this was the list endorsed by IPRPC, which had been submitted to President's Cabinet to be integrated with campus-wide staffing lists to produce a master list.

Brad Monroe asked Kathryn to give an overview of the process and Kathryn stated they had developed a rubric and ranking sheet, which was used in the first review, adding that some factors in ranking faculty positions could be quantified but others could not. Using the information disciplines provided and the rubric the committee developed, IPRPC scored each faculty request rank the top 15 positions.

Kathryn noted that it was very important for people to fill in their request forms with as much detailed information as possible, so the committee members did not have to hunt down more information to fill-in the blanks. She added that the process was not radically different from AMP but that the rubric provided better guidance.

Pat Setzer asked if the list included all positions, and Kathryn said it did not include all positions. She said if 25-30 positions were requested, it was difficult to rank positions at that point as each position had some sort of justification. Pat Newman asked questions about order, and Kathryn said the order was the same as last year. There was further discussion on the Senate floor that Kathryn helped to clarify. Brad Monroe expressed concern about the faculty being more involved in the process to be able to address the committee and ask questions directly. He said it would be great to have a 30-minute time period to meet with the committee as was customary with the AMP process. Patricia Santana added it was optional for faculty to be present for 10 minutes, but Brad said more of a discussion would be better. Kathryn stated that a 30 minute time block of discussion would take too long.

Brad Monroe commented that they had done a great job but suggested to split off the work load and to look for ways to modify responsibilities to include more faculty participation and to take off some responsibility from the committee. Brad added that some schools assign an adhoc committee with faculty from disciplines that were not requesting positions, who are detached from the process and could make hiring recommendations. He said that in this manner, faculty could present their programs to the adhoc committee. Kathryn stated that being part of the discussions allowed for more information to be gathered than was possible through reading reports, but she said she didn't know if the committee would have the time to give every discipline the 30 minutes suggested.

Patricia Santana stated it was the first time the committee had done this template but suggested that the initial report should provide enough information so a 30-minute presentation would not be needed.

Brad Monroe responded by saying that sometimes what you write may be clear to you but not necessarily clear to others adding that the feedback provided from the previous process was very valuable. Pat Newman agreed with Brad, and said she felt very disconnected from the current process. Kathryn Nette then stated that this process was new, and the committee had to balance getting things done with the time that was available. Pat Newman said it was scary giving this to just one committee stating that it could affect the future of a department. Donna Riley said it was too bad they couldn't hire off this new list and research whether the process was working.

Nancy Jennings then stated that the purpose of Kathryn's presentation was to discuss the new process after trying it out for a year. Kathryn wanted to get feedback from the Senate on how the new process was going; therefore, the feedback that had been provided during the meeting was appreciated. Kathryn added that the committee's feedback on discipline reports would be transparent and posted online. She said disciplines would be getting a report back with more valuable information than they would receive from AMP.

More comments were made from Senate members. Donna Riley said that the potential for growth within the discipline was really important. Angela Nesta asked that justification for the process be submitted as bullet points for clearer understanding. Robin Steinback said that data used for faculty ranking was identical from the past and based on a year that is larger than the previous year because of the statewide budget reductions.

Kathryn added that they would revisit this in the fall and make sure that nothing huge had happened. She suggested the Senate read the handout regarding IPRPC Recommendations for Faculty Hiring where she said they had made some recommendations for operating in the future. She said that sometimes things change so fast within the College that the priority of requested positions change based on College needs, and that positions would be reviewed and re-ranked every year unless a position was in full process.

Kathryn finished her report by stating that budget times were tough and that they would have to make very hard and unpopular decisions during ranking, but she said the committee had a good group of people who could remove their discipline hats and set aside their own needs to look at the college's overall needs when making decisions. She asked that the Senate continue sending her feedback and concerns.

Nancy thanked Kathy for her presentation stating that Michael would be sending out documents to the Senate for review.

B. Curriculum Committee

Pat Setzer, Curriculum Committee Co-chair, provided an update on recent committee work, including finalization of the Curriculum Board Packet for the spring semester and the 2012-13 Catalog.

Pat Setzer showed a list of all the courses that had been added. He said that English 99 which leads to English 120 was now approved and that it would be coming back to the Senate and the Governing Board for approval. Pat addressed several other courses and also went over course modifications and alignments. He then reviewed course deletions and degree and certificate additions. He also reviewed transfer degrees and said there were now 4 transfer

degrees and pointed out Math 96 which was a class that provided a single semester of statistics. He said this had generated a lot of controversy with Grossmont but what they found most controversial was that they were afraid that our courses will no longer articulate in the accelerated classes, but then they found that these had been approved and were favorable towards acceleration. Pat stated that he had attended a workshop for implementation of 'Curricunet', an online curriculum system, which is run district wide and would apply to both colleges adding that now all curriculum processes would be paperless (or close to paperless) which was a big but more efficient change to the curriculum review process.

Professional Development Committee

Jodi Reed, Professional Development Committee Co-Chair, provided an update on committee work, including planning for Fall 2012 Professional Development Week.

Jodi Reed stated they were going to continue to try and minimize the overlap of workshops at the Fall Convocation, have the classes for 3 days, and continue with online attendance since they had received such good feedback from the previous convocation. She said it allowed more people to attend each class and provided greater energy. However, she added that departmental meetings were held at various times which might prevent people from attending some of the workshops. Jodi stated that they also planned to continue the new afternoon convocation tradition followed by a wine and cheese party which provided a nice welcome back to faculty and staff.

Jodi announced the fall semester theme 'From F's to A's' which would focus on student success. Jodi gave an example of the messaging where words like 'fearful & frustration' could be changed to 'able and awesome'. She added that they would also be focusing on teacher success and wellness issues since the current budget issues were causing stress. She said they would have workshops on academic integrity as well as a panel to go over student services and disaster preparedness. Jodi stated there would also be a focus on SLO's and Accreditation where Tony Zambelli would have a panel to discuss SLO's and departmental encouragement.

Jodi said at their next meeting they would be looking at ways to reduce the number of people who were getting their pay docked. She said they would be encouraging the use of Blackboard and that they would be sending out reminders regarding Blackboard. She said the goal was to have the District put them in automatically, but stated that an agreement was needed with Grossmont, and Michael would be taking this issue to the District Committees.

Nancy thanked Jodi for her presentation and said it was wonderful to have no overlap on workshops and she loved the new convocation structure. Nancy also noted that she appreciated the information that Sandy continued to send out.

C. Basic Skills Committee

Alicia Munoz, Basic Skills Committee Co-Chair, provided an update on committee work, including development of the college's 2012-13 Basic Skills Plan.

Alicia Munoz gave her report for Basic Skills stating it would be an update from her previous Senate report in September. She said she wanted to preface the report by illustrating the trend in Basic Skills which was focusing a student completion agenda, adding that this would change community colleges as we knew them. She said 6-7 years ago, the State gave money to community colleges based on the number of basic skills courses they had, with colleges receiving at least a minimum \$100,000. She said that this year constituted the fifth year of the basic skills initiative grant. She said when funds were first given, colleges were told to innovate and to 'think outside the box'. Now colleges are asked to report on outcomes.

Alicia said that in October colleges had to prepare a different report, not based on how the money was used, but to report on two areas that had received top funding and indicate how those areas had influenced ARCC data. Alicia added that the AARC report was a public accountability report for community colleges. She also stated that Cuyamaca College's ARCC data looked favorable. She explained that the college had decided to leverage all their funds to support tutoring and first year experience. She then showed a graph that tracked the persistence rate of students who moved from one level to another, and that Cuyamaca showed high persistence rates and was a leader in its peer group.

Alicia stated that now the state was requiring information on what measurable outcomes impact student success. She then went over the figures regarding effectiveness components stating that it would behoove the college to work with the writing and math centers. She said that BSI funding would eventually disappear so activities that demonstrate successful student outcomes would need to be institutionalized. She also said the state has asked colleges to disaggregate student data by demographics to look at issues of equity.

Nancy thanked Alicia for her report.

V. Action

A. BP/AP 6620 – Naming of Facilities

The Senate entertained a motion to endorse BP/AP 6620 - Naming of Facilities.

(MSU) Monroe/Differding to endorse BP/AP 6620 - Naming of Facilities.

Angela asked how the prices were determined and Nancy stated that Michael would need to answer this question. Greg Differding said they compared this to other institutions. Brad Monroe asked if there was a price for grounds and Nancy showed the document to answer further questions.

VI. Information

A. New and Revised Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (Chapters 4 & 5)

The following BP/AP additions and revisions will be presented as a 1st read: BP/AP 4020- Program, Curriculum & Course Development; BP/AP 4025- Philosophy & Criteria for Associates Degrees & General Education; BP/AP 4102- Occupational Programs; BP/AP 4105- Distance Education; BP/AP 4225- Course Repetition; BP/AP 4260- Prerequisites & Co-Requisites; BP/AP 5010- Admissions & Concurrent Enrollment; BP/AP 5075- Course Adds & Drops; BP/AP 5500- Standards of Student Conduct.

Nancy pointed out that the Senate had seen this information before but that it would be brought back as an Action Item at a future meeting. She said it had changed a bit but not dramatically. She reviewed the documents and went over the changes and suggested the Senate take time to review the documents and get any changes or suggestions back to Michael.

VII. Announcements/Public Comment

There were no announcements or public comment.

Meeting ended at 3:45pm.

Recorded by Joy Tapscott