



Academic Senate Committee Minutes

NOVEMBER 29, 2016

11:45 AM - 1:00 PM

BR 214

NOTE TAKER	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY CAREE LESH & ANGIE ARIETTI		
ATTENDEES	Josue Arredondo	Garibay, Adrianna	Rempt, Andrew
	Beach, Randy	Hecht, David	Shaffer, Rob
	Bowlin, Stephen	Hopkins, Kesa	Soto, Corina
	Brenner, April	Hubert, Elizabeth	Speyrer, Michael
	Buehler, Lukas	Lesh, Caree	Stuart, Angelina
	Caschetta, Todd	Lynch-Morissette, Emily	Taffolla-Schreiber, Candice
	Cliffe, Karen	Martinez-Sanabria, Maria E.	Tolli, John
	Cuddy, Luke	McAneney, Danielle	Tyahla, Sandy
	Davis, J.D.	McDaniel, Cynthia	Van Stone, Mark
	Detsch, Steven	McGee, Tony	Vargas, Ysenia
	Durkin, Melanie	McGregor, Cynthia	Vicario, Marie
	Edwards, Diane	Mossadeghi, Yasmin	Whitsett, Jessica
	Fielding, Richard	Platt, Brad	Williams, Janelle
	Figueroa, Surian	Posey, Jessica	Yoder, Leslie
Gardea, Jaquelyn	Quintana, Pablo	Yonker, Susan	
GUEST/S	Tim Flood	Shawna Hutchins-Williams	

NAMES IN RED INDICATE AS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

1. Call to order; Approval of Agenda (Action Item) ANDREW REMPT

DISCUSSION	A motion was made to approve the agenda and was seconded.
Approval of agenda. M/S/C. Unanimous	

2. Approval of Minutes from 11-22-16 (Action Item) ANDREW REMPT

DISCUSSION	A motion was made to approve the agenda and was seconded.
Approval of minutes. M/S/C. Unanimous	

3. Public Comment (Information Item) ANDREW REMPT

DISCUSSION	Randy noted that the Curriculum Committee will discuss the DE moratorium this Thursday and what forms/processes will need to be completed for a new class to be included as a DE class. You may be asked to provide comments during finals week on what they develop.
	The Chess Club is having the end of year tournament tonight from 3:00-6:00 in room 513. There are awesome prizes, and everyone is welcome.
	Angie Stuart thanked the entire faculty that have supported the Accreditation process.

4. President's Report (Information Item) ANDREW REMPT

DISCUSSION	Andrew Rempt passed out green "United" buttons that the ASO has purchased to share the message that this campus and those wearing the buttons are a safe place/person.
	Presidential forums are tomorrow. All three candidates will have open forums tomorrow in student union east. They will be recorded for later viewing if you cannot attend. Please come and ask questions of you future President.
	Randy Beach, Steve Detsch and Eric Moberly have volunteered to be on the Veterans Credit Committee, as requested last week by Patti Larkin.

5. SCEA Report (Report) ROB S. SHAFFER

DISCUSSION	Nothing to report.
-------------------	--------------------

6. APR (Information Item) SUSAN YONKER

DISCUSSION	The process went well this fall. This year 16 program reviews were accepted and 9 were sent back for modifications. 8 of the 9 reports that needed modifications have been re-submitted. Most of the modifications were quick things that did not take much time. There have been no complaints about the new forms to date. Only three faculty members were able to complete the eLumen. Data was supposed to have been validated in the summer, but the validation was not done properly
-------------------	--



so we are still waiting for that to be completed properly to use the most current live system. We should not have the SLO Points validating data. This should be a responsibility of the researcher.

Significant changes were made to the form from 2014, and this seems to be a more simple streamlined process. Susan thanked Emily for all of her work and for the ATC connection she brings to Program Review.

7. BP 2515 Role and Scope of The Academic Senate: 10 + 1
AP 2515 Role and Scope of The Academic Senate: 10 + 1
(3rd Read/Action Item)

ANDREW REMPT

DISCUSSION A motion was made to approve the BP and AP, and was seconded. Changes to last week's version were passed out on hard copy. The motion passed unanimously.

8. AP 2510: Shared Planning & Decision Making (2nd Rea/Action Item)

ANDREW REMPT

DISCUSSION A motion was made and seconded to approve 2510. A senator wanted something added about adding Technology to this AP. Andrew and Randy found some other P&P that cover concerns on the technology. The motion passed.

9. Academic Senate Plan for SLO Reorganization (Action Item)

ANDREW REMPT

A motion was made to approve the SLO Reorganization and was seconded. Angelina Stuart passed out a plan for SLO reorganization. We have discussed this before and is reflected in Senate minutes. Angie noted what we want to do and that the SCEA will negotiate work load. This has 2 Coordinators one for CTE and one for non-CTE. This also includes 25-point people and the LOCR Committee. The committee will share results and recommendations and give them the Senate President to take to SCC for discussion. This need to be brought into fruition by January.

Non-credit will be taken care of by the disciplines.

DISCUSSION The CC has on its agenda to form the LORC committee this week, but there may be some changes depending on the conversation at Curriculum.

Nothing in this document affects every single instructor, all this does in create and infrastructure. Union and Senate are working together to come up with something workable for faculty and accreditation.

Points should be devoted to academic matters and not technical concerns.

The motion passed.

10. Enrollment Management Plan and Resolution (Action Item)

ANDREW REMPT

A motion was made to approve and was seconded.

Andrew has been in contact with several Senate President and the IEPI (Chris Wells) and there is great concerns about the district imposing on 10+1 by opening class max for negotiations. Chris Wells stated this was premature and violates shared governance and is a risk for our accreditation. We need to have an enrollment management plan and look at efficiency, but we should not make changes in a hasty manner; that does not follow shared governance.

The Senate is not saying no, we are asking the District to honor campus processes. Criteria and contract language must be considered. Then senate should be responsible for looking at what classes might fit this paradigm, and plan how it might be implemented.

Waiting for this to be discussed in spring is ok for accreditation because we can submit a supplemental report to ACCJC in the spring, and the enrollment management plan can go forward.

DISCUSSION It was requested that if we move forward with this, each department or discipline needs to be polled for input on what classes in their areas might work for this.

Tim Flood noted that the reason for putting this on the table is not to go around the Senate, but if and when large classes are allowed, we have the ability to negotiate fair compensation for faculty when it occurs. This is not a front burner item for the District. It is important to start the dialog. The District has no interest to take responsibility from the Curriculum Committee.

The order of operations is a little out of balance, and the Senate has never asked the Board to take something off of the table.

There is precedent in our contract for how to go about changing a class maximum. If there are 15 faculty teaching the same course there needs to be a vote of all of those faculty members. We need to assure that this happens on the senate's timeline. A senator asked that the District back up their actions with their words here.

The shared governance process has not been followed and this is the crux of the problem. This resolution asks this be taken off the table until the process is followed.

Comments from the Senate included the below:

We need to know what we want before we negotiate it.

If faculty take a large class with the idea that will offset a smaller enrolled class how will that work? It is premature to negotiate this until these types of things can be worked out.

We also still need to realign programs to help improve student success, and we need to look at this as a college.

Many departments are split. Those who want it want more money and to have a TA. This will mean adjuncts will lose work. Part-time faculty are not in favor of this. This is a big thing to be handled so quickly.

Reading is not in favor on increasing class size. What is our commitment to basic skills students? Are we still committed to the "community"?

We need to create a master list of classes that are workable and those that aren't. We also want to see data on how well large classes serve students.

A suggestion was made to let negotiations move forward and see what they can come up with.

In the second whereas it was suggested that the Curriculum Committee comment about "extensive vetting" be removed.

If this is negotiated and voted down, we have wasted tons of time and resources.

A motion was made, seconded and approved to extend for 5 minutes.

The Curriculum Committee is on this and are thinking about it, but need more time. Faculty have not been respected when asking to lower class max for professional reasons, so if we are going to do this it has to work both ways.

The motion passed unanimously. This will be read and the December Governing Board meeting.

A motion was made to extend for 15 minutes to discuss the EMP, was seconded and passed.

Cynthia and Chris Hayashi were thanked for working on the EMP.

Realigning the catalog needs to be taken on by the campus as a whole, from the VP's on down. What changes can be made, what innovations can be put into place. Can CTE monies be used to make programs more competitive? We are not talking about eliminating jobs, but realigning things to be more innovated and help students complete certificate and degrees. Doesn't student success drive our decision making process? It seems recommendation 14 is fundamentally in opposition to this. IEPI told us that we need to look at our schedules and efficiencies. The Budget Committee gets recommendations and then they find the money to make things happen. Changing class max will require curriculum changes and that is a huge and long-term undertaking.

If we move forward with this we should ask that we be above 50%. Tim noted that we are at 52.9% and that we should talk to classified staff who are so overworked, and are feeling this.

Being at 50% is a floor and not a ceiling, so 52% is not something to be proud of. There are many things we can do to decrease our gross inefficiency and we need to trim the low hanging fruit before we increase class max.

We should focus on program realignment on opening day.

ANDREW REMPT

ANDREW REMPT

Adjournment

DISCUSSION The meeting was adjourned at 1:00

The next Academic Senate meeting: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 from 11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in L 246.