|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Senate Committee Minutes | | | |
| november 15, 2016 | | 11:45 AM - 1:00 pm | L 246 |
| 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 | Vicario, Marie |
| Durkin, Melanie | McGregor, Cynthia | Whitsett, Jessica |
| Edwards, Diane | Mossadeghi, Yasmin | ~~Williams, Janelle~~ |
| ~~Fielding, Richard~~ | ~~Platt, Brad~~ | Yoder, Leslie |
| Figueroa, Surian | Posey, Jessica | ~~Yonker, Susan~~ |
| Gardea, Jaquelyn | Quintana, Pablo |  |
| GUEST/s |  |  |  |
| 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. A motion was made to add an agenda number 5 as a time sensitive item to discuss the top code alignment project for 5 minutes. The motion was seconded and passed. The agenda was approved unanimously. | | |
| Approval of agenda. M/S/C. Unanimous | | | |
| **Approval of Minutes from 11-08-16 (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 | Tomorrow night is VAMP from 7:00-9:30 p.m. at the Industry. Ask your students to come out and support our local writers. | | |
| **President’s Report (Information Item)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | Tonight is a Governing Board meeting and a reception for Humberto Peraza for his last meeting. There is reception for Humberto in L 238 at 4:00 p.m.  On Thursday at 4:30 there will be a protest on campus over the recent election. It will start at Mayan Hall at 4:30. Police will be present and those with classes in this area should move their class if possible. There will be a small peace keeping police force there. There will be a command center in this room in case anything goes awry.  Next week you will be begged to add a meeting on the 29th because we need it for accreditation. Andrew will also be asking us to meet on 1/31/16, mostly for accreditation meeting items including the final read of the accreditation report. | | |
| **SCEA Report (Report)** | | | Rob s. shaffer |
| discusson | Trumps victory directly affects our union. It is now likely Friedrichs will go forward and we will lose fair share dues. It is likely this will happen in the next year and a half. We will be planning to reach out to our members and discussing strategies that will work to keep information open and members involved.  Negotiations begin this Friday at 2:00 p.m. The district has opened up SLO’s, sabbatical language and salaries related to large lecture classes. We opened with salary, part-time issues, and lab lecture equity. Their team is the 4 VP’s and an attorney. | | |
| **Code Alignment Pilot Project (Discussion Item)** | | | Marie Vicario |
| discusson | This is part of strong CTE efforts and is in conjunction with the Chancellors office. The Chancellors Office wants to make sure that data funneled from all community colleges are coded the same so they are comparable. This will become a state level project in the future, but right now, we are in a 15 college pilot cohort. We need someone to be paid an hourly stipend to participate over the next two months.  A motion was made to approve the Pilot Program for Top Code alignment. The pilot requires local senate approval, so this is why we are adding it as a time sensitive item. This is important for us to make sure our top codes are properly assigned and comparable to other community colleges. The goal is to clean up TOP codes across the state. There is money coming from the state to pay for this. We have already received $50,000 to support this effort and pay the curriculum expert $67 an hour plus mileage. The motion was approved unanimously. | | |
| **ATC and Other Issues (Discussion Item)** | | | morissette/mcfall |
| discusson | A big problem we have on the college right now is that we have a bunch of blocked websites, which is in violation of the first amendment. In order to keep computers available for students who needed to do school work, sites such as Facebook and LinkedIn were blocked in the library and other computer labs on campus. Now that most students have a device, we really do not have a legal leg to stand on to ban or block websites. It was noted that SWC cannot be sued if a student has explicit material open in the library on a campus computer.  At this time, if you request a website be blocked to one staff member, the website is blocked. It is also not applied equally to all computers, so some can access YouTube and some cannot Internet proxy sites are also used to hide the native URL, thus some sites on the list continue to be accessed through proxy. It seems to be a losing battle. We need to find out if we are receiving funding from the Child Protection Act. If we are, then we have some legal capacity to ban some sites.  We need some sort of vetting process to control the list of banned websites. It was suggested that we uniformly apply what web-site will not be accessible. Technically we can block sites until someone officially asks us to stop blocking them. It was suggested that district lawyers be in charge of this, however, our lawyers seem to have a reactive approach... The list used to be vetted through Bob Edlebrock. The classified staff doing this no longer wants to perform this task, and it does have curricular implications. We need to be sure we have enough computers for students who need them. Policy/Procedure 3720 is on Computer and Network Use, so this needs to be looked at. There is also an Academic Freedom policy (BP 4030) and a few others that will impact this.  Emily worked on 3720 and it does cover a lot of this, but not all of it. We need to distribute that policy. We may also want to look at other campus policies. It was requested that the ATC put this on their agenda to be discussed. YouTube and Facebook are now available for use. | | |
| **Cultural Competency Committee (Discussion Item)** | | | andrew rempt |
| discusson | When we discussed the graduation requirements a few years back there was an attempt to add a cultural competency to the GE patterns, but it was not added. We need to look at what we do as faculty to create a more culturally literate classroom. An advisory committee to look at this topic and present recommendations was suggested. Cultural competency could help us look at how to present curriculum in a way that is more sensitive to our students, that would then improve retention. It is important to discuss cultural competencies to including ethnic diversity and all underrepresented groups. It was suggested that this committee be focused on how to infuse cultural competency into all aspects of teaching. This would help us all evolve our classes.  Corina Soto volunteered to serve on this committee.  The committee could be a wonderful resource to gather information and new resources for our teachers. If we could get a group of people committed to this, we could help all departments do a better job. April Brenner volunteered to serve on the committee.  A motion was made to extend for 3 minutes, was seconded and passed.  The English department is already a good resource for this and a focus on Staff Development could be useful and now is the time. It is suggested someone who teaches intercultural communication should be asked to participate. Andrew will get the committee going. | | |
| **Enrollment Management Follow-up Part Two (Discussion Item)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is an initiative which comes out of the Chancellor’s office to assist colleges in meeting accreditation recommendations by providing advice, funding and support. This group has been very helpful to SWC in addressing two specific areas: Financial issues and Enrollment Management. Class max increase does not seem to be coming from faculty but being very heavily front loaded by administration, which is troubling. The Senate’s number one 10 + 1 responsibility is curriculum so for the District to take this to the negotiating table rather than working with the Senate is not appropriate. The Academic Senate has primacy on all academic and professional issues but in this case, we have not been included in conversation. The Senate is open to discussing this, but the Senate feels the need to discuss this before something is negotiated by the District. A senator suggested that this decision needs to be made by departments, not a one size fits all plan. What may be appropriate in one discipline may not work in another. Some faculty are in favor of this and some aren’t; class maxes are mixed across campus. Adjuncts do not seem to be in favor of this and we must remember we are a community college, not a university. There was concern mentioned about how large class sizes would affect our South Bay students, the large majority of which are underprepared for such large college classes. The idea of large class size seems to be Grossmont College model. SCEA is not going to shut off conversations about this. A motion was made to extend for 5 minutes and was seconded. The motion passed with one no vote.  The Academic Senate President stated that the Senate and SCEA have to come up with a plan that will work for faculty since the Governing Board in the end approves curriculum approved by the Senate’s Curriculum Committee. There is definitely a need to pay attention to our student success rates and retention. Faculty also need to look at realigning courses and at our program viability. As faculty, we need to get honest about our programs. It was stated that the SCEA contract is explicit about class max and that we should keep the language as it is in the contract. | | |
| **BP 2515 Role and Scope of The Academic Senate: 10 + 1****AP 2515 Role and Scope of The Academic Senate: 10 + 1 (1st Read)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | Please read this. There are no changes but we need to review it. A suggestion was made that we need a mechanism on how we determine what falls under the 10 + 1. We cannot make it 100% fool proof, but we can improve what we have. Andrew passed out 10 + 1 cards so everyone can have it for their wallets. | | |
| **Adjournment** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 | | |
| The next Academic Senate meeting: Tuesday, November 22, 2016 from 11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in L 246. | | | |

[11-15-16 Voting Record](https://portal.swccd.edu/Committees/AcaSen/Standardized%20Document%20Library/11-15-16%20Voting%20Record.pdf)