|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Senate Committee Minutes | | | |
| october 25, 2016 | | 11:45 AM - 1:00 pm | L 246 |
| note taker | respectfully submitted by Caree Lesh & Angie Arietti | | |
| Attendees | ~~Josue Arredondo~~ | Gardea, Jaquelyn | Quintana, Pablo |
| Beach, Randy | Garibay, Adrianna | Rempt, Andrew |
| Bowlin, Stephen | Hecht, David | Shaffer, Rob |
| Brenner, April | Hopkins, Kesa | Soto, Corina |
| Buehler, Lukas | ~~Hubert, Elizabeth~~ | ~~Speyrer, Michael~~ |
| Caschetta, Todd | Lesh, Caree | Stuart, Angelina |
| ~~Cliffe, Karen~~ | Lynch-Morissette, Emily | Taffolla-Schreiber, Candice |
| Cuddy, Luke | Martinez-Sanabria, Maria E. | ~~Tolli, John~~ |
| Davis, J.D. | McAneney, Danielle | Tyahla, Sandy |
| Detsch, Steven | ~~McDaniel, Cynthia~~ | Van Stone, Mark |
| Durkin, Melanie | McGee, Tony | Vicario, Marie |
| ~~Edwards, Diane~~ | McGregor, Cynthia | ~~Whitsett, Jessica~~ |
| Fielding, Richard | Mossadeghi, Yasmin | Williams, Janelle |
| Figueroa, Surian | Platt, Brad | Yoder, Leslie |
| ~~Flores-Charter, Patti~~ | Posey, Jessica | Yonker, Susan |
| GUEST/s | Angelica Suarez | Kathy Tyner | Tim Flood |
| Names in red indicate AS Executive committee members. | | |  |
| **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. An amendment was made to add two agenda items. One was a first read on the accreditation report. Also a 2nd Reading of the AP P 4102. The amendment was accepted and approved. Dan Borges is not able to come today. | | | |
| **Approval of Minutes from 10-18-16 (Action Item)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | A motion was made to approve the agenda and was seconded. | | |
| Approval of minutes. M/S/C. Unanimous | | | |
| **Public Comment (Information Item)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | If you are managing or are involved in a budget, please keep a close eye on it because money seems to be shuffling around, disappearing, and not matching our records. David has sent an email to Tim Flood, Kathy Tyner, and Michael Odu to set up a meeting to discuss some of these issues.  The deadline for program review is a week from today at midnight. Susan is having two workshops that are scheduled for this week; one is tomorrow from 1-3 p.m. in Room 445 and Thursday from 1-2:45 p.m. in Room 422 or 423, so please come if you have questions. Susan will send out the email again for those who need last minute help. | | |
| **President’s Report (Information Item)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | Friday is the Enrollment Management workshop from 10:00 a.m. -1:00 p.m. The President and several VP’s will be there to answer questions. Questions can be sent to Andrew ahead of time or people can write down questions while we are there. Administrators will be able to answer how they came up with the 17.5 number when we have been around 14.  The Enrollment Plan was sent earlier this week, please review it before Friday. A good part of Friday will be to come up with ideas that are not in the plan. | | |
| **SCEA Report (Report)** | | | Rob s. shaffer |
| discusson | Our main concern is we are working on expediting getting to the negotiations table. We have sunshined, but the district has not. We need to get to the table right now to better address accreditation items. | | |
| **Portal and Email Update (Information Item)** | | | Borges/davis/gonzalez |
| discusson | Removed from agenda. | | |
| **SLO’s (Action Item)** | | | andrew rempt |
| discusson | Rob Schaffer and Andrew Rempt have been discussing SLO’s all semester. There are accreditation issues and also workload issues. The DEFT situation was solved when the Senate and the Union Executive Committees spoke as one and that was tremendously powerful.  Andrew asked for a small group of faculty to come together (Not Executive Committee Members) and write a statement on SLO’s and where faculty stand on SLOs**. A motion was made and seconded to create a small work group to create a faculty position (accepted friendly amendment changed faculty to Academic Senate) on SLO’s.** We need the Senate to make a statement; we do have a policy we can draw on. Based on a meeting, it is clear SLO’s are being used in program review in planning in all sorts of new ways.  Even if we do not stay with ACCJC we will need to do SLO’s.  The Senate and Union have different purviews. A faculty position sounds like a joint position between the Union and the Senate. It was suggested that the Senate statement suggest how we would like to handle SLO’s.  In May, a new contract was negotiated that includes the current agreement on SLO’s that was overwhelmingly approved by faculty. When we returned in fall, several administrators decided we need to do more. If you read our new contract language, it does mirror what was requested in the ACCJC report.  Angie Stuart noted that there were other areas of the accreditation report where SLO’s were discussed, but were not addressed in negotiations.  Some faculty are very concerned about the integration of using SLO’s for budgeting decisions and possible funding based on SLO results. SLO’s should be separate from funding to not encourage bars to be lowered for students.  Faculty control SLO’s. Administration has inserted the term SLO into a number of areas. We need to make it clear as a faculty how we will implement and use SLO’s. We as a Senate need to make it clear what SLO’s should do.  It is true that budget decisions are being made on actions that need to be taken based on SLO results. If the SLO results are pointing out a problem that could be fixed then you can use this to get needed items for students to be more successful. The plans we make on SLO’s should drive the budget. We are collecting data, but not using it for program improvement.  How the data is collected is key. More flex for SLO’s does not do faculty any good. People are stretched too thin and we need to be compensated for work.  Accounting has one of the longest lists of SLO’s and all faculty input the data. Some are suggesting doing 1/3 of SLO’s each year on a 3-year cycle. They have found they use SLO’s to change how they prepare for lectures. Negative results allowed accounting to ask for funds for tutors. They actually used SLO’s to help improve the program.  A motion was made to extend for 5 minutes, was seconded and passed.  The reason why we need a Senate position is to determine the responsibilities of faculty and putting data in a software system may not be a faculty responsibility. We need to have the conversation about the data and how to improve teaching.  If we are going to be using data, it has to be collected and it has to be correct. Even if we have a data entry person, faculty has to get the data together. We want to do the work and not overwhelm the faculty. Faculty have many responsibilities more important than data entry.  It was suggested that each discipline be able to handle the data in their own way. Using eLumen had led to less that accurate data. Across the colleges are struggling with eLumen.  A motion was made to extend for 3 minutes and was seconded, and passed.  Bob Stretch is our eLumen person right now and was going to do data entry.  The committee might include a role of institutional research.  **The motion passed unanimously**. We are looking for 4-5 people to put this paper together. Please send Andrew an e-mail if you would like to be on the committee.  David Hecht and Candice Taffolla-Schreiber volunteered to be on the committee. | | |
| **AP 4610 Instructional Service Agreement** **(2nd Read/Action)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | **A motion was made to approve AP 4610, was seconded**. It was clarified that this is to be able to provide classes to a business or outside agency. Credit courses must be offered to the public, even if they are at a private company. Andrew believed this has to do with the fact we are a state funded institution. If the company works through contract education then they can have just employees. We need to be sure that this is written in a way that we are not violating Title 5. Section 14 and 15 means that we cannot not be double dipping, collecting money from the state and the company who has paid for training. It was suggested that this might also refer to Title 5 and accreditation standards. We do not claim apportionment for contract education. Some of the concerns here may be addressed in other policies and procedures. **The motion passed unanimously**. | | |
| **Resolution Recognizing Patricia Flores-Charter** **(2nd Read/Action)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | **A motion was made to approve the resolution and was seconded**. This was cleaned up and reformatted.  A friendly amendment to pass SLO Coordinator to the second whereas, and that we change differently able to disabled. The friendly amendments were accepted.  **The motion passed unanimously.** We will present this to Patti next week and read it at the Governing Board meeting. | | |
| **1st Draft of the Accreditation Report (Information)** | | | angelina stuart |
| Discussion | Angie shared with us the 1st Read version of the Accreditation Follow Up Report. You can go to About SWC and accreditation is on that drop box. You can find all updates on there, including this version of the Follow-Up Report. Please tell your faculty how to find this and ask them to read a section that is of importance to them. Recommendation 6 and ACCJC Recommendation 1 address SLO’s. Please send suggestions, comments and questions to Angie Stuart. The Accreditation Team is still working on tracking down some of the evidence and we now have a consultant (Bob Pacheco) working to help each workgroup with their narratives for the report. Recommendation 2 and 4 have to do with DE, so you may want to look at those. Tracy was thanked for her very hard work on this.  Enrollment Management is a big part of our accreditation effort, so please go to the Enrollment Management workshop on Oct. 28th. The College District needs to address Enrollment Management as part of Recommendation 14. | | |
| **AP 4102 Career and Technical Education** **(2nd Read/Action)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | AP 4102 –  **A motion was made to approve Procedure 4102 and was seconded**. This went to the CTE Committee, which is a very large committee, and they did heavily edit the P&P. Marie stated that there was full agreement at the CTE meeting. The role of the regional consortia is not in this P&P. **The motion passed unanimously**. | | |
| **Adjournment** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 | | |
| The next Academic Senate meeting: Tuesday, October 28, 2016 from 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in L 238 N & S. | | | |

[10-25-16 Voting Record](https://portal.swccd.edu/Committees/AcaSen/Standardized%20Document%20Library/10-25-16%20Voting%20Record.pdf)