



ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted Minutes

April 29, 2013

Board Room 626

3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

1. Call to Order

Acting President Jaimez called the meeting to order at 3:07 pm.

2. Roll Call:

LaNae Jaimez, Acting President

Nick Cittadino, Kevin Brewer, Dale Crandall-Bear *ex-officio*, Joe Conrad – *ex officio*, Erin Duane, Tracy Fields, Katherine Luce, Teri Pearson-Bloom, Melissa Reeve, Ken Williams

Connie Adams, Admin Assistant

Absent/Excused: Abla Christiansen, Amy Obegi, Scott Parrish

Guests: Jowel Laguerre, Annette Dambrosio, Tom Warren, Diane White; Lue Cobene

3. Approval of Agenda – April 29, 2013

Motion to approve – Senator Cittadino; Seconded – Senator Pearson-Bloom;

Discussion: Acting President Jaimez asked to have 8.3 follow 8.1 to accommodate both Accreditation items in succession. Passed as amended - unanimous

4. Approval of Minutes – March 18 and April 15, 2013

Motion to group both sets for approval – Senator Cittadino; Seconded – Senator Brewer

Discussion: The inaccurate “middle college” phrase under 8.1 in the April 15 minutes was removed.

Passed as amended – unanimous

5. Comments from the Public

6. President’s Report

Middle College Update: The Vacaville Unified School District will begin their middle college this fall. Fairfield is in process of developing a planning agreement that may be presented to the Senate on August 8 or shortly thereafter.

Priority Registration: Barbara Fountain, Director of Admissions, will address the priority registration issue with the Senate on May 6. It involves state mandates to allow priority to new high school graduates. Acting President Jaimez asked for data to show how that will impact students.

Task Force on Committees: Director Fountain will also discuss the Task Force on Committees as related to removal of the Academic Senate President as a member, as well as others, from the President’s Cabinet. The rationale for the change, not officially made, is a move for more efficiency with meetings. It is a voting member position on the President’s Cabinet.

Commencement Faculty Marshalls: Acting President Jaimez thanked Dr. Conrad, Senator Parrish, Senator Reeve, and Vice President Cittadino for volunteering to serve as Faculty Marshalls at graduation.

SLOs: Last Friday Acting President Jaimez met Interim VP White to clarify the expectations for student outcomes, including what is meant by a sampling of faculty to assess their courses and policing of the quality of SLOs. Extensive discussion ensued and questions on what the process would be to decide who will be doing the sampling and where information will be kept. Senator Reeve raised concern about the possible punitive intention, partly due to the fact that notices were sent out that some faculty hadn’t done the work, even though she had submitted assessments for their courses. More specific criteria are needed and Acting President Jaimez opined it should be up to the departments to decide. Interim VP White stated there was no punitive intention, noting the district has the responsibility, as Accreditation Liaison Officer, she has responsibility to report out what she has and hasn’t found and there should be more than a sampling or it becomes subjective evidence. She also stated: it needs to be broader and deeper; many campuses have SLO senate subcommittees that would make these decisions collectively; the senate, administration, and school coordinators play a role; if other questions come up, research and recommendations can be had; for due diligence

Dean Peter Cammish was asked for a report; if there are ever questions of what is coming out of Interim VP White's office, she would appreciate the professional courtesy of addressing those questions herself.

Comments/Questions: The question was raised if everyone has to use the same method of assessment in the same class. Dr. Conrad pointed out courses have criteria for success, whatever tool is used should address that criteria, and individual instructors can choose their own tool. Clarification of expectations was requested including if a subset of faculty can assess a course. The report that Dean Cammish generated was about the lack of faculty assessing, not the courses assessed. Interim VP White responded that the ACCJC is interested in breadth and depth and those issues have to be taken up going forward. Last fall deans and coordinators discussed this but it fell behind. The ACCJC is looking for more robust assessment. Most Senators agreed that: it needs to be decided by faculty: it doesn't have to be done in every course; shared assessments aren't needed; clarity is needed going forward but work shouldn't be needed retroactively. Conversation last fall did not mention that the methods of assessing courses needed to be changed and the recent notification caused panic in Senator Reeve's department that the work done was not acceptable. Interim VP White replied that, if ACCJC just wanted to see a sampling, they wouldn't care about faculty evaluations in the sampling but they do. SLO was specifically cited in the College's "show cause". Given the simplified form, she doesn't see it as a huge hardship and asked everyone to be mindful of those things on the horizon. Administration needs to legitimately address issues as the College moves forward. Senator Reeve stated SLOs were cited after "show cause".

Program Review: Acting President Jaimez is waiting to hear from administration regarding plans and expectations on bringing Program Review up to par before the fall ACCJC visit and she will bring clarification to the May 6 Senate meeting.

Spring Plenary: Acting President Jaimez and VP Cittadino attended Spring Plenary. There were interesting DE and ECE items as well as a lot of debate and discussions on many topics to consume and think critically about before voting on resolutions. From a leadership perspective and to understand what the state Academic Senate is about, it is very worthwhile for interested senators to attend.

7. **Superintendent/President's Report**

SLOs: The Accreditation expectation is that every faculty will do SLO assessments based on Recommendation 7 and ACCJC expects, especially in self-evaluation of faculty members, reporting about what they have done. S/P Laguerre just returned from chairing an accreditation team at another institution and he reminded senators that being asked two and three times to improve the same items is a big concern. He reviewed many assessment reports and noted that it's all about making learning more relevant for the students. Learning improves for students in classes where assessments are done and the educational playing field needs to be made even for all students.

President's Cabinet – removal of Academic Senate President: S/P Laguerre explained: when he arrived here, Academic Affairs and Student Services were merged under an executive vice president; Professor Marc Pandone argued that the change necessitated having the Senate President on the Cabinet to present the interests of Academic Affairs, which was agreed to; the current vice president position is only for Academic Affairs and major discussions are now taking place with Student Services to decide if a chief officer position should be in place; something will change by fall 2014; the process is sometimes questioned by Accreditation visitors who were finding the same people on many committees which raised the concern of who is making decisions; the Task Force on Committees, working to make things easier by having less meetings and more efficiency, suggested the President's Cabinet revert back to having just a few members; the 10+1 Committee was created to give the Senate and its President direct input into decision making and, with the new process, items with changed formats will flow back through the Academic Senate prior to approval

S/P Laguerre noted that his experience has been similar here and at other colleges in the spring when there seems to be more challenges with discussions and arguments that can take people away from what needs to be done by losing sight of important things. He asked that Senators, as elected officials with more importance than they may think they have, ask him questions directly when they hear something to dispel rumors and get the facts. It is important to pay attention to things that may upset people and he is obligated and willing to respond by text, phone call or face-to-face. He asked everyone to not let emotions get in the way, especially leaders. Contact the deans, the Vice President, and the Superintendent/President as needed to ensure a better end of semester and to keep things in check.

8. **Information/Discussion Items**

8.1 Accreditation Subcommittee – Annette Dambrosio, Accreditation Coordinator

Coordinator Dambrosio worked as Coordinator last year and is recently back this year as Coordinator through 2016. She reported that College recommendations were reduced from nine to four, which was good, except for reissued warnings. The current recommendations are Equity, Distance Education, SLOs, and Code of Ethics (COE). COE will

be reported as completed. The Accreditation Team will start checking to see that the College has done what was needed. Student Services have worked hard to get equity at the centers and ACCJC will follow up on that as well as things that were to be done from the 2010 report. Everything needs to document evidence and it is an ongoing process to stay on top of it as things change. The College needs to get off warning and Coordinator Dambrosio eventually hopes to establish standing committees for all standards to keep moving forward even after the current Follow-Up Report. She requested input on how the Senate wants to be part of this process. She has looked at what is in place and is in the process of meeting with staff, faculty, and administration regarding who has been working on recommendations. Requests for others to join in the work, including over the summer, will be sent out. It would be helpful to have the Academic Senate President to serve on a steering committee, as was done in the past, and maybe include all signers of the report at a minimum, without having too many or redundant committees.

Comments/Questions: Acting President Jaimez expressed openness on how to make this work; other colleges often have an accreditation subcommittee; the Senate can consider adding a subcommittee and then decide, or let the committee decide, how it would operate. Coordinator Dambrosio suggested that all signers, to include the Senate President, serve on a Steering Committee. Dr. Conrad pointed out that Senate subcommittees don't require senators as members and other faculty help write the report. Senator Reeve suggested the Senate first look at each standard to see which committees already exist and maybe include reporting to the Accreditation Committee as part of their duties. That could refocus energy of some groups already working on those items and recorded activities could be fed into the self-study process.

8.2 Peer Review – Tom Warren

Acting President Jaimez introduced Professor Warren as the topic presenter and proponent and noted she has been seeking faculty to cover the other side for a balanced perspective. No one has responded to her request. Professor Warren distributed a handout of the AB1725 legislation and SCFA Contract language pertaining to peer review. AB1725, which became part of the Ed Code, mandates faculty peer review. That legislation established faculty in an extremely valuable and important role in evaluations. Professor Warren pointed out that this is a requirement, not a choice, and the SCC contract doesn't match the state mandate or the CTA contracts he obtained from 40+ other community colleges. He opined this would be the most significant reform in his 36 years here and the benefits would be numerous, offering opportunity for collaboration with peers. Professor Warren suggested the Academic Senate review contracts for ideas on how to design a policy.

Comments/Questions: Senator Pearson-Bloom suggested it might be most productive for Professor Warren to take his research to Sandra Rosenberg, chief negotiator for the union, since a contract change would involve union negotiation. Acting President Jaimez will look into the possibility of the Senate making a recommendation or resolution. Professor Warren noted that the Napa College Senate President stated she and their CTA representative were willing to come here and share their peer review experience. Peer Review is especially important for faculty working toward tenure. Although tenure is not part of senate business, the topic came up at Plenary, and Acting President Jaimez noted the Senate could have a position on that. Senator Pearson-Bloom opined it would be very timely for the Senate to have a position now and she volunteered to write a resolution to support peer review and bring it to the May 6 meeting.

8.3 Proposed Accreditation Timeline

An Accreditation Timeline document was distributed and noted as "draft only". Due to the September 2 holiday, the Senate agreed to schedule a regular meeting on September 9 at which time the draft will be discussed. The final draft will either be voted on at the September 19 meeting or a special meeting will be scheduled on September 23 for that vote, if needed.

Coordinator Dambrosio noted that something close to the published version would be voted on but approval would be somewhat conditional if changes are needed. The main task for Senate review is to ensure content truth.

In summary, the agreed Accreditation draft timeline involving the Senate includes: September 9 discussion; September 16 action; a special approval meeting on September 23 or 30, only if more discussion is needed.

8.4 Senate Reps – School Reorg and By-Law revision

This topic was discussed extensively at the last meeting and following another brief discussion, Senators agreed to: keep in place two representatives from each school, including the new School of Behavioral & Social Sciences, with the exception of one representative from the new small School of Health Sciences; the two centers would not have their own representatives at this time, although that could change if/when they become independent; ensure Fire Science and Aeronautics are represented by the School of CTE/Business. The Reorganization with the required Bylaws revision will be voted on at the May 6 meeting.

8.5 Fall Senate Flex meetings

On Thursday, August 8, the Senate meeting will be held from 9 am – 12 pm and the joint Senate/Ed Admin meeting will be held from 1 pm – 4 pm. The latter will include discussion on hiring priorities.

9. Action Items

9.1 DE Course Review Proposal

Motion to approve – Senator Reeve; Seconded – Senator Cittadino; passed – unanimous.

9.2 K-12 Admissions Policy

Acting President Jaimez requested a breakdown from Dean Cammish on how K-12 admission students are doing. She is waiting on a response but from information she could access, which does not include GPA data, it appears that they tend to do better overall than regular students. Some Senators expressed a need for more clarity and more specific information in areas of the written document. Suggestions were also made for applicants: to explain why they want to attend classes here; to be interviewed, take the English assessment and take advisory courses, if they have a 2.0 GPA. Acting President Jaimez will forward the request for revisions. Tabled for revisions.

10. Reports

10.1 Subcommittees

10.1.1 Basic Skills – Melissa Reeve

10.1.2 Curriculum – Joseph Conrad

10.1.3 Distance Ed – Dale Crandall-Bear

10.1.4 Program Review – Amy Obegi

10.1.5 10+1 Committee – Kevin Brewer

10.2 Treasurer

Reports were all deferred due to time constraints.

11. Action Reminders

12. Announcements

The final meeting of the semester will be held next Monday, May 6.

13. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn – Senator Pearson-Bloom; Seconded – Senator Reeve; passed – unanimous

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 pm.