



ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted Minutes

October 6, 2014

ASSC 1421

3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

<p>1. Call to Order</p>	<p>President Michael Wyly called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm.</p>
<p>2. Roll Call</p>	<p>Michael Wyly, Mark Berrett; Sabine Bolz; Thomas Bundenthal; Nick Cittadino; Lue Cobene; Dale Crandall-Bear <i>ex-officio</i>; Joe Conrad; Erin Duane; Les Hubbard; LaNae Jaimez; Amy Obegi; Narisa Orosco-Woolworth; Andrew Wesley; Ken Williams; Connie Adams, Admin Assistant Absent/Excused: Curtiss Brown <i>ex-officio</i>; Catherine Cyr; Susanna Gunther <i>ex-officio</i>; Terri Pearson-Bloom Guests: Annette Dambrosio; Jim DeKloe; Sandra Rotenberg; Leslie Minor; Svetlana Podkolzina President Wyly welcomed Andrew Wesley and Narisa Orosco-Woolworth, newly elected Senate adjunct representatives.</p>
<p>3. Approval of Agenda</p>	<p>President Wyly noted the following: no reports/discussion for Items 7, 8, and 10.5 – S/P Laguerre, IVP White, and Dean Fountain are unable to attend today’s meeting. Moved by Senator Cittadino and seconded by Senator Cobene to approve the October 6 agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously</p>
<p>4. Approval of Minutes</p>	<p>Moved by Senator Berrett and seconded by Senator Cobene to approve the August 25th meeting minutes. Motion carried unanimously. Moved by Senator Duane and seconded by Senator Cittadino to approve the September 15th meeting minutes. Motion carried unanimously.</p>
<p>5. Comments from the Public</p>	<p>No comments</p>
<p>6. President’s Report <i>Plenary & Institutes Funding Requests</i></p>	<p>President Wyly presented the following report. Information regarding funding requests will be shared in Item 10.6. Earlier today the funding petition submitted by President Wyly as requested by the VPs was emailed to the Senate.</p>
<p><i>Shared Learning and Prison Ed concerns, including forthcoming summaries of concern.</i></p>	<p>President Wyly was charged by the Senate to summarize both agendized conversations regarding Shared Learning, including any cited Senate issues and concerns. Agenda items 10.3 and 10.4 will allow time for follow-up discussion. President Wyly will share summaries in draft form with the Senate and the Distance Ed and Curriculum subcommittee chairs. Additional pertinent input will be included in draft summaries. Sandra Rotenberg asked Senators to also share concerns with SCFA to facilitate discussion at the table. President Wyly suggested it might be best to cc all faculty at that point. A brief report from Curriculum Chair Curtiss Brown will be sent to the Senate. The Committee will include the proposed DE Correspondence Course form for action on the October 14 agenda. Please encourage colleagues to review the form and three other documents provided at the last meeting and via email last week.</p>
<p><i>Taskforces – Update:</i> a. <i>PT & Emergency Hiring</i></p>	<p>President Wyly reminded Senators that the recommendations of the Policy Committee were accepted unanimously by Senate vote. He was charged with putting together a taskforce; VP Jaimez, IVP White, President Wyly, and an HR contact (not yet named) have been assigned to the taskforce. The first meeting will be held on October 17th to look over the recommendations and develop proposed policy. The draft document will be presented to the Senate for review.</p>

<p>b. <i>HS Outreach</i></p>	<p>Last summer, President Wyly proposed to S/P Laguerre the development of a taskforce to give some sense of purpose to the various efforts at high school outreach. S/P Laguerre agreed a taskforce would be useful and discussion with him and IVP White took place at the last 10+1 meeting regarding who would serve and what they would do. On October 1st the decision was made to include representatives from each school, an academic dean, and Jose Ballesteros, who was charged by S/P Laguerre as the point person for HS Outreach. Shemila Johnson, Outreach and Public Relations Manager, asked to sit in for information purposes. President Wyly will provide a summary of that meeting, showing the current representatives and he will work to solicit appointees from representative faculty bodies.</p>
<p>c. <i>Faculty Dev Process & Funding</i></p>	<p>Work in process. See <i>Meeting with Fac Dev</i> item below.</p>
<p>d. <i>Self-Assessment (Senate & Subcomm)</i></p>	<p>President Wyly said it would behoove the Senate to develop some method of self-assessment and then pilot the self-assessment process. Professor Ferdinanda Florence had pointed out the need for some method of self-evaluation and we agreed to work to combine self-assessment activities with the current charge of the President to put together handbook for the Senate and subcommittees. This would be a way for the Academic Senate to assess itself and then ask Senate subcommittees to work with the assessment process without duplicating a process that may already be working for some committees.</p>
<p><i>Meeting with Fac Dev Committee & Subcommittee Chairs for SSTF planning</i></p>	<p>On October 6th and October 20th at 5:00 PM, the Distance Ed, Basic Skills, and Curriculum committees' chairs/coordinators will meet to begin creation of student success planning. They will discuss what might be included at Spring Flex Cal to prepare for various student success initiatives.</p>
<p><i>Program Discontinuance Concerns update</i></p>	<p>The Senate previously discussed program discontinuance concerns where the appropriate process had not been followed, primarily with courses in programs that are not being scheduled. President Wyly will work with Senator Berrett, who was on the original committee that developed current policy, to navigate these issues.</p>
<p><i>3SP Update (Due October 17)</i></p>	<p>President Wyly provided by email a number of documents approved in some fashion by the Academic Senate last year. Of the four documents, the least developed is the 3SP plan which was submitted to the Senate in May. Although it shows fairly well what we do, it doesn't state as clearly what we plan to do in the next academic year. In requesting the latest iteration, President Wyly spoke with IVP Diane White about the plan being more developed. The State Academic Senate suggested that most colleges seem to be struggling with how to define their plan. President Wyly will work closely with the Curriculum Chair, VP Jaimez and others serving on the 3SP Committee to develop more detailed plans, including already vetted activities that are being done but are not reflected in the plan, e.g. HS Outreach. The idea is to allow for inclusion what is being done and not to change the approved plan in any substantive way. Due to the abbreviated submission timeline, President Wyly proposed developing the plan as much as possible. He will continue to encourage everyone to engage in a robust planning process over the year in order to be prepared in advance for submission of the next annual 3SP plan. VP Jaimez pointed out on September 15th, the Senate supported combining the Student Equity Planning Committee, the Student Success and Support Program (3SP), the Academic Success Center (ASC) Taskforce, and the Cohort Default Prevention Taskforce committees but that hasn't yet happened. President Wyly will request to have it placed on the next Shared Governance agenda. The combining of committees should also be reflected in the 3SP Plan.</p>
<p><i>Reminder: AB86</i></p>	<p>President Wyly reminded the Senate that AB86 had been discussed extensively at past meetings, the AB 86 Committee is developing a plan, and it should also be represented in 3SP. AB86 Faculty Chair Shawn Carney has been invited to the October 20th meeting to present current progress of the AB86 plan and will hopefully have a draft to share with the Senate previous to that meeting. The draft could go through some changes before submission to the Chancellor's Office on October 31st but it will provide everyone</p>

with the planning ideas. President Wyly hopes that Professor Melissa Reeve, also involved in the AB86 group, will attend the meeting as well. A well-developed plan is due to the State by December 30th. Any concerns about the draft need to be addressed now, before the more developed December iteration which will be brought back to the Senate as an action item. The final iteration will be submitted to the Chancellor's Office in March; however, any changes made from December to the end of March should be minor. Professor Jim DeKloe pointed out the need to remind the District that AB86 will require implementation of an MOU between the District and the Faculty Association.

Peer Review, background and set-up for discussion item

President Wyly provided background information that led to today's Peer Review agenda item. Discussions began again last spring and at the May 10 + 1 meeting, S/P Laguerre, President Wyly, VP Jaimez, IVP White, and FA President DeKloe met in an effort to develop a plan for peer review language. Plans for a summer taskforce with Senate and Faculty Association (FA) reps was stalled when the FA was unwilling to have conversations, due to negotiations taking place at that time that did not result in contract. President Wyly expressed to S/P Laguerre the need to involve the Union in peer review conversations.

At the beginning of this semester, FA President DeKloe and FA Representative Sandra Rotenberg approached President Wyly with the desire to move forward with the Senate to create some peer review language. President Wyly suggested to FA representatives and the Academic Senate the first item to work on was common goals to collaborate in the development process in order to work in the same direction. President Wyly invited FA reps to today's meeting to share their goals for peer review. There is no defined calendar. President Wyly encouraged Senators, once rationale for the FA goals is presented in Agenda Item 10.1, to contribute their thoughts about goals. To actualize the spirit of collaborative peer review plans, the Senate needs to take information to constituents to ensure all faculty are part of the process and faculty forums could be scheduled. President Wyly suggested one goal that is likely to occur later would be development of a faculty taskforce with representatives from the Academic Senate, the Faculty Association, and reps from across campus so all schools are represented equally in the conversation.

Accreditation Report Update

Accreditation Coordinator Annette Dambrosio announced the good news that the Midterm Report was sent to everyone, and she felt confident it was ready for print (short of final editing, to include reading word for word). She worked very closely with everyone who contributed to the Report, and the Academic Senate, Shared Governance, and the President's Cabinet approved the Report to date. Without substantive changes, the Report now reads much more clearly and includes added elaboration where further development was required for clarity. . Anything that couldn't be substantiated was deleted. Coordinator Dambrosio then provided important background information regarding the approval process of the report. On September 26th Coordinator Dambrosio received a text stating that the Midterm Report be sent immediately to the Board of Trustees. She replied that it was not possible as she had intended to send a much more complete Report out on September 29 in preparation for the October 1st Board. She also explained she doesn't work on the Report as a whole—at the time, she was working on the 42 individual narratives and 9 Recommendations. Nevertheless, the Board still wanted an updated copy on September 26th. She told the Governing Board on October 1st meeting that she was blindsided by the request as she was still waiting for portions of the narrative and evidence to be submitted by some individuals.

On Friday, Oct. 3, Coordinator Dambrosio stated that she sent an email to the Board via Judy Spencer, S/P Laguerre and IVP White to remind them that a more complete report would be submitted by her on October 6. Nevertheless, she received at 8:30pm on October 5, an email from IVP White addressed to herself and Trustee Young in which IVP White informed her that she had asked various narrative authors to work with her on the September 26th version over the previous weekend, and she provided to Coordinator Dambrosio two additional versions of the report, a "Master" Report and another version edited by AVPHR Larson. The accreditation Coordinator stated that these newer versions contained conflicting edits in part and additional changes which she felt made no sense; for example, one comment stated that there was no apparent connection to equity when discussing SCC's multicultural events as

well as the narrative on the staff hiring process. Coordinator Dambrosio reported also receiving an edited version of the September 26 Report from Trustee Thurston, Chapman, and Young (nothing substantive and some conflicting directives). Furthermore, Coordinator Dambrosio received another email from IVP today stating that if the Midterm Report was not issued by noon, then preparation would begin to issue the "Master Report" that had been sent to her.

Coordinator Dambrosio expressed to the Senate her concern that the processes in place at SCC pertaining to Accreditation was violated and that she worried at a lack of transparency. She asked Senators to take a look at the Report for errors or misinformation. Finally, she argued that it is a misuse of BoT authority for the Governing Board to act as an editorial board for SCC's Accreditation Report thereby making her work as Accreditation Coordinator "impossible" when, at the last minute, the Midterm Report is being edited by "committee."

Senator Cobene asked how confident Coordinator Dambrosio is that the draft she created will be the one sent to ACCJC, and she replied that, if it is sent as is, it is solid, but, if an alternative report is sent, that would be nothing short of disastrous as our processes would be invalidated. President Wyly said that he had a candid conversation via phone with IVP White and he received assurance that the draft Coordinator Dambrosio sent today is the one to be shared with the Board. Senator Cobene said late administrative involvement has taken place in formal drafts before, and he questioned if there is some mechanism to handle that. President Wyly shared with Coordinator Dambrosio, IVP White, and S/P Laguerre, and he will share again, that should there be substantive changes, he will withdraw Academic Senate support until the new version is reviewed. Moreover, he was assured by all parties there would not be substantive changes and the report sent out today would be forwarded to the Board. President Wyly invited all concerned faculty to attend the special meeting this Wednesday at 6:30 PM. The meeting was called because the Board did not approve the Accreditation Midterm Report at the last meeting.

Coordinator Dambrosio stated there is much work to be done with evidence once the Report is approved. President Wyly reiterated, given all the concerns, he received appropriate assurances, and we need to see where things go from here and encourage attendance. If the draft were to be substantially changed, President Wyly would likely call a special Academic Senate meeting because it is clearly unwanted for the process to be in the way of deadlines. Coordinator Dambrosio thanked all those who worked hard on this Report.

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

No report

**8. Interim Vice
President's
Report**

No report

9. Action Items:

No Action Items

**10. Information/
Discussion Items**

Dean Leslie Minor asked if she should excuse herself from this part of the meeting. President Wyly noted Senate meetings are open and are also one place where Peer Review could be vetted with administrative counterparts without actual negotiation. It will benefit everyone in the long run to have input from everywhere.

**10.1 Proposed
Goals for Peer
Review – Jim
DeKloe & Sandra
Rotenberg**

Faculty Association (FA) President Jim DeKloe reported that the FA had been discussing a peer review process all of last year. He and President Wyly both have the opinion that it should be a faculty driven process, and it is appropriate for the Academic Senate to take the lead. However, to avoid problems from Senate efforts to develop a process that will ultimately be presented to the FA, President Wyly invited FA representatives to collaborate with the Senate. FA President DeKloe acknowledged that the FA for a long period of time has had many concerns about the idea of peer evaluation; the culture within the teachers' union has been that evaluation has been the purview of administration and faculty should not evaluate faculty. That objection has largely evaporated. If there is enthusiastic support now, the FA would like to engage in a process that is done in a way that improves instruction as long as a professional

development element is at its core. FA representative and chief negotiator Sandra Rotenberg distributed the Union goals for peer review, and President DeKloe read the faculty contract article on evaluation that reflects the thinking of the FA. Any process that emerges should have at its core a process that improves instruction and student services. The book, *Drive*, for example, provides intrinsic motivation of faculty, autonomy, mastering and purpose. The FA is trying to make that the core of negotiation with the District, to engage in interest based bargaining to have a process for faculty and administration to embrace at the end.

FA President DeKloe shared that, rather than developing a faculty review process in a vacuum, he would like to engage in a process that the Senate has been having with the establishment of a Faculty Development Committee and make it part of professional development. Each faculty member should be asked where, in the next few years, they can improve mastery of subject material and their craft. The process would have peers help with that to look at instructor plans, give suggestions, help with the plan, and work with instructors to help improve their teaching. He asked the Senate to consider that as the core philosophy behind a peer review process. Faculty members who are part of that 3-4 member committee would benefit as well through the shared collaborative learning between faculty members. FA President DeKloe read bullet points from the ASCCC Faculty Evaluation guidelines. He suggested "mastery of subject material and mastery of teaching" would account for professional development Flex Cal credit for faculty undergoing a review, faculty members helping each other, and faculty members on the committee. Rotenberg pointed out there should also be some type of iterative process for evaluating Peer Review itself, maybe a review every three years. Professor Svetlana Podkolzina expressed concern about additional workload being added every year, and she opined faculty aren't ready for peer review yet.

Senator Bolz said that she has learned the most from her students' formal and informal evaluations and secondly from colleagues; she always appreciates collegial sharing. She likes the idea of peer review to develop each and every faculty to put potential into some kind of manifest form but also had concern about writing more reports. She added she was hearing about faculty monitoring and regulating each other, which is a different form of management. What we can do for one another is support teaching and learning and look at how to bring out the best in all of us.

President Wyly summarized: workload would need to be addressed in some way and there are various proposals possible on how to address that issue; there is acknowledgement that this process would essentially separate qualitative assessment of what is going on in the classroom by discipline faculty from easy to measure oversight criteria that could be determined and tracked, such as showing up to class and having office hours.

Senator Wesley queried how faculty from other departments could evaluate mastery of subject matter. He noted diversity in teaching styles and materials could also make evaluation difficult. FA President DeKloe responded to Senators' concerns: acknowledging the process would need safeguards to alleviate issues in order to make it through Academic Senate and Faculty Association approval. He pointed out that Peer Review was mandated by 1989 legislation. He has seen successful Peer Review in other colleges. Faculty could have the primary choice of who would be on the evaluation committee. Usually reviewers would be faculty in the same subject area but teaching methods can also be evaluated by other faculty and sometimes it can be very beneficial to have someone from another department offer input. First and foremost the purpose of review needs to be about professional development. The review committee would say an instructor should attend a particular conference, for example, that would help in their field. The instructor would then construct a plan as justification to attend the conference. Senator Berrett pointed out faculty are currently being reviewed by deans who may have no background on what an instructor teaches.

President Wyly noted there are faculty not pleased with the current process. If the Academic Senate and Faculty Association can come to an agreement on goals, then we can look to the State for Peer Review best practices to bring to the table. Goals can be used as the initial filter of what will and will not serve faculty at Solano Community College. When a process is in place, concerns can be vetted and result in a much better plan than having a process imposed on us. President Wyly emphasized that he reminded S/P Laguerre that proposing a process without consulting the Senate is a violation of the Ed Code. President Wyly's understanding is that an administrative proposal for Peer Review was withdrawn.

FA President DeKloe addressed Professor Podkolzina's point about added duties, saying he also has concerns about that and it will be important to find a way to move forward without adding more burden by finding ways to spread out the effort. However, he doesn't want to see that concern derail the process. Senator Obegi worked at a college that invested more early on in the process and checked back in on ways that are supportive but not overwhelming every year. DE Coordinator Dale Crandall-Bear expressed support for the FA goals, the need for excellence in performance, and how to move forward. Virtually nothing for faculty development is done here. Also, evaluations with deans hasn't been helpful. To have the opportunity to discuss with colleagues where you want to go and how to do things would be exciting.

Dean Minor offered that goals should be very robust in the beginning formative year and about the culture of the College as well as content, in order to ensure new faculty succeed. Peer Review is a great way to build relationships across campus as a forced conversation that becomes very valuable about teaching. VP Jaimez added that ASCCC offers a training for faculty to be peer evaluators. FA reps agreed that reviewers have a key part to play and training is very important.

President Wyly encouraged everyone to bring this information to constituents to begin discussion of these ideas, and to be especially vigilant that dialogues are as transparent as possible with clear and candid communication. A digital copy of the goals will be emailed to the Senate. In terms of next steps, Senate could use the goals to set very clear guidelines and charges for a taskforce and find language to conform to these requirements. Other considerations can be brought to the table. If the Senate opts to move forward, the FA could be provided with language they may want to bring to the table and also make it clear if there is language that is not negotiable to be an all or nothing document. Items such as workload could be highlighted as part of an iterative work with the FA but not the process itself or it would need to come back to the Senate. President Wyly will continue to agendize this item for discussion to have as robust of conversations as we desire. The FA reps thanked President Wyly for inviting them and reiterated the goal is to end up with a process they can take to the table. FA President DeKloe sees what is in common with problems coming across his desk every day is that new faculty are not mentored well. The result of formalizing that mentorship process would be a goal at the core of the professional development process. There are faculty who go above and beyond paying for their own professional development and improvement is needed at the College. The Faculty Association looks forward to working with the Academic Senate. President Wyly directed Senators to take this information back to their constituents to help fabricate a plan along with the FA.

**10.2 DE Course
Review Proposal –
Dale Crandall-Bear**

DE Coordinator Crandall-Bear reported there was a slight modification in the Course Review process whereby the instructor would no longer need to choose two colleagues for the review. Of the 180 sections that needed to be reviewed, 150 have been successfully transitioned to Canvas. The modification came from faculty feedback. If the DE Committee did reviews it would be more consistent. There was an uneven quality to the reviews that this modification should solve. Since the bulk of course shell reviews have been completed, there will be fewer submitted and the DE Committee will be able to do those reviews. The Committee would also review pilot courses to transition them to final status. Senator Cobene asked if any potential problems were noticed before they might become bigger problems. Coordinator Crandall-Bear replied that really is more about professional development but the Committee would also launch workshops on how to do things better. Senator Cobene asked if any changes could be reported back to the Senate. President Wyly suggested including a broader self-assessment strategy. Senator Cobene didn't want to create more work but would like to see how things worked and where something might have not worked. President Wyly said that if the assessment process the Senate develops works for the Senate, it could be used for other committees. Professor Podkolzina acknowledged that Coordinator Crandall-Bear did the majority of reviews and was very instrumental to the process, which would not have been accomplished without his effort. She also reported she solicited opinion from her division (math doesn't have many online courses) and got quite a few negative responses about the review being done by the Committee without the option to choose colleagues. President Wyly reported initial feedback he received was more about having an appeals process if the Committee objects to something or rejects the course shell. Coordinator Crandall-Bear said that was developed in the first round of 157 when 4 course shells were rejected. In each case, the Committee was very conscious of enumerating what caused the rejects and in all 4 cases the courses were resubmitted and approved. The Committee is structured similarly to the Academic Senate with

10.3 Follow-up Discussion, Prison Project

two representatives from each school. Two deans are also on the Committee but only faculty members do the reviews. President Wyly noted this will be placed as an Action Item on the October 20th agenda. Any concerns or lingering questions should be communicated to Coordinator Crandall-Bear. DE will have one more meeting to consider input before the next Academic Senate meeting.

President Wyly placed this item on the agenda for follow-up discussion after the Kamber Sta. Maria and S/P Laguerre presented information on the Prison Project at the last meeting. President Wyly reminded Senators this is an effort to establish a Distance Ed type modality relying on correspondence to potentially offer classes to federal inmates in Solano County and State prisons at a later date. The emphasis of the previous and today's discussion is the development of a process for course approval. The Senate charged President Wyly with putting together a summary (forthcoming) of concerns from Senators and constituents.

Senator Berrett asked how many methods of contact are required for Distance Education. Coordinator Crandall-Bear replied that 7 to 8 methods are listed and the Committee recommends using 4 to 5. Methods for contact with inmates are more limited, basically to written memorandums back and forth between instructors and students. Course feedback sheets would be the main method of contact. There is no allowance for technology with the prison, only written communication and the option of instructor visits. Quality of communication would be important. President Wyly noted there would be specific tools in order to supplement this contact, many of which could also occur with pen and paper, such as a discussion board. Dean Minor pointed out the same course outline has to be taught, just with a different modality. Senator Berrett stated there needs to be a way to ensure courses are taught as well with this different modality that is also measured differently. Dean Minor noted that, in terms of SLOs, if students meet outcomes it isn't necessarily measured differently. In terms of best comparison, one is online and the other is pen and paper. The prison does allow some video and in-person coursework. Pencil and paper served well before technology.

President Wyly noted one of the concerns is for the Curriculum and DE Committees to vet carefully whether sufficient methods of contact are stated. Coordinator Crandall-Bear reiterated the focus needs to be on quality of contact. In online classes there are different methods to achieve quality and instructors make the best use of tools available and correspondence courses would follow the same idea. President Wyly will ensure this concern is in the summary.

Senator Obegi noted the effort involved to create new courses and asked if there is any assurance of enrollment numbers. Dean Minor replied the Director of Education at the prison reported that 71 inmates have submitted paperwork and the application process is still open. The numbers would make a difference on how many courses we can offer. Dean Minor can be contacted for answers to questions. President Wyly said discipline specific conversations should happen with colleagues and if a particular discipline takes issue there is no need to start the process. There is interest in some areas to justify creation of the process. Senator Cittadino noted since the Governor signed a bill to allowing teaching at State prisons there will be other methods, not used here, that could be applied. Dean Minor stated the prison would convey our materials. President Wyly stated answers are needed to what kinds of materials can be used and how to make them available to inmates. Senator Cittadino felt research would be the most difficult component, unless provided beforehand. Dean Minor responded that instructors will have to be vigilant about what kind of research to assign. President Wyly reiterated that the apparatus for correspondence courses has to be built and if a discipline doesn't think a course can be taught through that modality, they won't submit it. The College has been in dialogue for over two years and at the last visitation the beginning of fall term, the prison organizer said if the College didn't commit to begin in Spring 2015, it won't happen. That is the motivation for the proposed aggressive timeline. However, there won't be a timeline if there is no curricular process but, once that process is in place, decisions are local. From there the process could proceed more quickly, presuming faculty are engaged and willing to initiate the process. Senator Cittadino suggested looking at providing a program of classes, rather than just individual unrelated courses. Inmates are interested in getting degrees and it might be good to look at the PACE Program. President Wyly replied that would assume all general ed instructors are satisfied with the process. President Wyly asked Senators to email additional concerns by Friday for inclusion on the summary.

<p>10.4 Follow-up Discussion, Shared Learning</p> <p>10.5 Waitlist Pilots – B.Fountain</p> <p>10.6 Status of Petition for ASCCC Institutes and Plenaries</p> <p>11. Reports</p> <p>12. Action Reminders</p> <p>13. Announcements</p> <p>14. Adjournment</p>	<p>President Wyly suggested this item be tabled since it is not as pressing as the Prison Project. He asked Senators to email any lingering concerns by Friday and he will provide a summary of issues to date. Moved by Senator Cittadino and seconded by Senator Williams to table Shared Learning discussion. Motion carried unanimously.</p> <p>No report</p> <p>President Wyly shared by email his fairly robust request for funding for this academic year to send full teams to both plenaries, the Academic Academy, Accreditation Institute, and Leadership Institute. Three vice presidents were to review this request together but the only reply he has received so far was a quick reply from the VP of Finance offering less. President Wyly made it clear that is not the approach he is willing to take at this point. He is looking for a commitment from the College to staff teams to these events. He spoke with IVP White regarding his concerns and he plans to speak with S/P Laguerre when he is back on campus. As of now he has impressed upon S/P Laguerre and IVP White the need for commitment to fall Plenary now before the cost increases. President Wyly hopes to have a reply by tomorrow. He sent the written request a month ago and had put in verbal requests since June and received promises that these are mission critical institutes and, of course, would be supported as always.</p> <p>11.1 Subcommittees No reports 11.1.1 Basic Skills – Melissa Reeve 11.1.2 Curriculum – Curtiss Brown 11.1.3 Distance Ed – Dale Crandall-Bear 11.1.4 Flex Cal – Chuck Spillner 11.1.5 Program Review – Amy Obegi</p> <p>11.2 Other Committees No reports 11.2.1 Assessment -- Gene Thomas 11.2.2 Equity – Shirley Lewis 11.2.3 10+1 Committee – LaNae Jaimez</p> <p>Program Review needs a student representative and could use another representative from Health Sciences. Senator Giambastiani resigned, leaving an open position for a rep from Liberal Arts.</p> <p>The next regular Senate meeting will be held on October 20, 3:00 – 5:00 pm in ASSC 1421.</p> <p>Moved by Senator Cobene and seconded by Senator Williams to adjourn the meeting. Meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.</p>
--	---

--	--