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| Southwestern College Academic Senate Executive CommitteeAgenda |
|  | DATE: 9/24/2015 | 1:30 P.M - 3:00 p.m. | Room 104B |
|  |
| Facilitator | Patti Flores-Charter, Academic Senate President |
| Note taker | Caree Lesh, AS Communications and Research Officer |
| Voting attendees | Randy Beach, IPROC; Caree Lesh, Research Communications Officer; Andrew Rempt, President-Elect; Susan Yonker, Vice-President; Karen Cliffe, Curriculum Chair; Richard Fielding, Presiding Chair, Janelle Williams, Staff Development Coordinator - Blue = absent |
| Non-Voting | Frank Post, SCEA President; Leslie Yoder, At-Large; Scott Richison, At-Large; Rebecca Wolniewicz, AOC Co-Chair/At-Large |
| PLEASE Read | Minutes: August 12, 2015, September 10, 2015, DRAFT Online Teaching Certification Course, 5-year Fiscal Plan Parameters and Assumptions |
|  | 1. Larger Role in Accreditation2. **Elevate Curriculum, Instruction, Student Services, Library, and Tutoring as priorities**3. SSSP inclusion of Basic Skills and Assessment faculty4. Institutionalize use of Consent Calendar |

## **Agenda Items**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **TOPIC** | **PRESENTER** | **ITEM****TYPE** | **TIME ALLOTTED** | **Action** |
|  | Call to order; approval of agenda, minutes  | Flores-Charter | Action | 5 minutes |  |
| M/S/A agenda, M/S/A Minutes – approved a bundle of 8/12/15, and 9/10/15.  |
|  | APR Revisions  | Flores-Charter | Discussion/Action | 20 minutes |  |
| The committee is hoping to streamline the comprehensive form and take out redundant and non-critical items. One paragraph in the Chancellor’s Office Program and Course Approval Handbook covers program review, and it is minimal, requiring it happen on a regular basis with regular procedures. There is no recommended model. Rebecca suggested we also look at what is required by the feds in accreditation. Standard IIA is instructional programs and services. Professional development is in another section.  The purpose of program review seems to be in debate. Some see it as a historical archive and some as a way to improve the program. Patti explained that it is both and was designed to meet the needs of each program’s review of itself and plans for improvement. Back in the late 90s when we reorganized PR, the intent was to have a template that had optional items in Component V. Instead, all items in the template have been seen as mandatory. The review process is overly critical and we send back many more APRs for changes than we should. It was suggested we only use the data we need to and keep the discussion of data meaningful and not answer all questions just to have a response. We have really made it way longer than it needs to be. Some APRs are 60 pages long. We can always have an optional box so anyone who wants to can beef it up. Susan suggested removing the Staff Development section. Rebecca suggested if we do not do that we just attach everyone’s SD proposal for the year. We need the program review forms to be sent to faculty pre-loaded with data. The committee did agree that they want the data online as soon as possible.Component 5 is the focus right now. Susan would like to take out the executive summary. We have been using the current plan since around 2000, but it was time to review it and try to streamline and simplify it. Susan melded our forms with San Joaquin Delta’s. We could bring the new plan and the old plan to the Academic Senate and let them vote on it. Really the problem is with Criterion 5. It was decided that Program review is really historical archive and a way to evaluate and plan. SLO data is already in eLumen, so it is redundant to add it again to section 5. Each year we do a snapshot, that is the historical piece of what we have accomplished. We could link eLumen to the SLO component. The Academic Senate can change anything that is approved by the committee. Frank suggested Susan let the committee know they are creating more work than needs to happen and the Senate will not be happy. Patti agreed to come to the APR and be the heavy hand. Whatever the committee decides will then go to senate. If faculty do not do the program review the Dean has to complete it.  |
|  | DE 1. Training and Grandfather Options2. CMS Blackboard Ultra and Canvas Demos | Flores-Charter | Discussion | 25 minutes |  |
| A training proposal is out. The next discussion is about verifying proficiency to see if a faculty member can have models eliminated from the training. The DE committee is very open to input. We need to confirm if this will be certification for the state, and that those who are trained here will not have to do another required training. The system-wide committee adopted Canvas as their platform. It is cheaper than BB and it is planned that the state will get a very discounted cost for Canvas, and the cost will be picked up by the OEI. Average costs to each college will be $20k vs $200k for Bb. Several colleges have started with Canvas and we will see how class migration goes. Bb, has come out with “ultra” which also requires data migration. More will be coming on this. With the cost savings we can use money for training and conference stipends and also more tech support. There will be a timeline for training identified. Most colleges are doing a 2 year timeline, but Patti is suggesting 3 for us since we have so many online and hybrid classes and over 200 faculty teaching. The concept is that as people are trained they will become trainers to there can be more classes offered. A lot of the training is about resources for teachers. The union needs to negotiate this. The request is for 10 hours a week for 6 weeks. Can we do reassigned time for training for 3 units? Frank said probably not as the college is not happy with the amount of reassigned time now. Patti will ask Tracy if this training will cover the expected requirement of the state for certification. Frank hopes we will have a plan for this by 10/20. We may need to take a vote electronically. We need to work out a plan for how we will accept training outside of the college. We are not talking about grand-parenting those who have been teaching here online here for years. Susan requested that negotiations not cut of 60 hours unless the committee is informed. The training at OEI is 120 hours, so it has already been halved.  |
|  | Curriculum Committee1. Health Requirement2. Sample Assignments3. Courses/Programs not updated4. Program Unit Bloat: Strategy CTE Update | Cliff/Flores-Charter | Information | 10 minutes |  |
| There has been no word on the Health since the first senate meeting. We discussed procedure for the committee. Sample assignments are required in PCAH. Karen did a good job of describing it and the issue has been worked out, but it was not collegial. There are a lot of courses that have not been updated. We need to decide how to get this information out to faculty. GCCCD did get a recommendation on this, so we need to be prepared for this happening to us. Administrators also need to make a statement that if courses are not reviewed with in a certain timeline there will be ramifications. Unit bloat is where programs require 50 or unreasonable high numbers of units for certificates or programs. CTE is looking at this closely. They will probably be a model for the rest of us. There is a federal voice that says a certificate should take one year or less, and an associate’s degree in 2 years or less.  |
|  | 7120 HR Hire Procedure | Flores-Charter | Action | 10 minutes |  |
| Passed over due to time. |
|  | Grievance and Order Committee Members | Flores-Charter | Recommendations | 10 minutes |  |
| Mia needs members for this committee. Mia sent names forward. Please send Patti your ideas for faculty who would be good on this committee. Student and administrators are included on the committee. It is a hearing and it is very organized. The time commitment is about an hour for training and hearings are an hour. Susan volunteered. Nicole Goedhart was also suggested.  |
|  | VPAA Vote of Confidence | All |  |  |  |
| Passed over due to time. |
| 6. | Budget Update | Flores-Charter | Action | 10 minutes |  |
| The budget deficit is going down, but Maria is not happy yet. We really owe Maria a debt of gratitude. In the 14-15 and 15-16 there are 71 vacancies and salaries total over 3 million that we are not spending. Elena has also been helping, and is working with Patti and Maria. Patti sent a letter to the Board cc’ed to us. Nish said quarterly reports were meaningless at the budget meeting. Patti noted to Jim Austin that Brahmbhatt was the one who brought us the 5% pay cut we never needed, so he is not trusted. The books were closed last Saturday. There is a glitch with the solar panels and SDG&E so we don’t know what we are saving or if we are saving.  |

**Next Academic Senate Meeting: October 8, 2015**

Future Topics:

FHP Replacement and Emergency Hires