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| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Senate Committee Minutes | | | |
| november 8, 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 | ~~Vargas, Yesenia~~ |
| ~~Edwards, Diane~~ | ~~McGregor, Cynthia~~ | Vicario, Marie |
| Fielding, Richard | Mossadeghi, Yasmin | ~~Whitsett, Jessica~~ |
| ~~Figueroa, Surian~~ | ~~Platt, Brad~~ | Williams, Janelle |
| Flores-Charter, Patti | Posey, Jessica | Yoder, Leslie |
| Gardea, Jaquelyn | Quintana, Pablo | Yonker, Susan |
| GUEST/s | Everett Garnick |  |  |
| 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. It was requested that item 8 be moved to 6 because the speaker needed to leave early. The rest of the items will move down accordingly. This motion passed unanimously. | | | |
| **Approval of Minutes from 10-25-16 (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 | SLO’s being controlled by the Curriculum Committee is an issue. We do not want to lose our voice on that topic.  Dr. Eddie Moore will be here Thursday – check out your e-mail for details.  Susan Yonker was thanked for doing a great job on program review. YAY! | | |
| **President’s Report (Information Item)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | The district will sunshine next week and SLO’s are on the list. The Curriculum Committee is not in charge of SLO’s, but there may be a sub-committee started to discuss them. The Curriculum Committee will not be telling faculty what to do with them. A workgroup has been formed with Jetta Posey, Carol Stuardo, David Hecht and Candice Taffolla to create a comprehensive statement on SLO’s and how faculty want to handle them. The statement will be debated with the full Senate and we will have an official Academic Senate statement on SLO’s. | | |
| **SCEA Report (Report)** | | | Rob s. shaffer |
| discusson | The district finally sushined with SLO’s and class max on the list. They would like to get to the table on the 18th, but they did not put forward a date on Friday, which is when we have historically negotiated as most classes are taught M-Th. | | |
| **Resolution Recognizing Patricia Flores-Charter (Presentation)** | | | andrew rempt/caree lesh |
| discusson | The resolution was read and Patti was thanked for all of her service. | | |
| **Portal and Email Update (Information Item)** | | | DAVIS/GARNICK/GONZALEZ |
| discusson | There are still several moving parts to the long standing project with the goal of getting students to be able to use a SWC Portal. The portal will allow all web services to be accessed on one page. If you have different logins to the different webservers, this would allow you to login one time to access all services. The push this semester was to get students to set up their e-mail so they do not miss out on anything because all official communication is now going to the new e-mail account.  Swccd e-mail cannot be forwarded at this time, but they are working to fix it. It is suggested student do not forward due to technical and confusion issues.  Originally the plan was to migrate over summer, but then they decided that it would be better to do it mid-semester. There is never really a good time, so it was decided that after fall start during a 3-day weekend to run the account start up. Faculty were concerned that it happened suddenly and faculty were concerned about how to reach their students. Students at this time MUST use this e-mail system. It was reported this e-mail is safe, even though it uses student ID numbers, because of an identify management system that was put into place. Students go to gmail.com to login, but this will change in January. There is a link on our website at the top right hand corner. 18,000 accounts have been created so far. It was suggested that this be more central on the website, please contact Lillian and ask this be more prominent.  Students need to understand what it is important to have separate accounts, or how to handle forwarding or merging e-mail.  Implementation was discussed at ITC and some group Kathy Tyner put together that meets once every 6 months to talk about web-advisor changes.  We have wanted student e-mail for years because it is a collegial thing to do and at universities they get this and are expected to check it daily.  Faculty would have had great ideas how to implement and market this had they been given the chance. It would be a good idea to come back to senate with more information and to help us help students to be more professional in e-mail communications.  A motion was made to extend for 4 minutes and was seconded and passed.  It was recommended that ITC work more closely with ATC to work on technology issues, such as the portal. Faculty can really help with marketing, see around corners for implementation and generally work together for the betterment of students. Students need to create an account prior to registering for classes.  We also have a problem with a list of banned websites. This is very inconsistently applied; some computers allow access to Facebook, while others don’t. | | |
| **BP/AP 4260 Prerequisite Draft (2nd Read/Action)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | A motion was made to approve BP and AP 4260, and was seconded. This policy and procedure on the website are over 20 years old, so this needs to be updated and we need action on it today. Realize this codifies what we have been doing. The old numbered policy was a mix of policy and procedure and this is broken out into distinct procedure and policy.  This also discusses content review and statistical validation of pre-requisites. Content review and statistical validation is currently needed to add a pre-requisite. Policy and procedure discuss pre-requisites not adversely impacting any group. When we move to content only for Math, English and ESL we will be required to do a disproportionate impact study.  **The motion passed unanimously.** | | |
| **AOC Membership (Discussion Item)** | | | andrew rempt/Susan yonker |
| Discussion | The AOC template was up for revision, and Susan was the only faculty member to be at the meeting to discuss this. The discussion was about two people from each group, faculty-classified, etc. Tim Flood wanted to know if he got a vote and noted that the Administrator’s union does not represent VP’s. It was decided that three people would represent every category of employee. Therefore, the Senate President will appoint three faculty members.  Several committees are in need of faculty members. If you would like to be on a committee and really make a difference, please contact Andrew.  IRPC is in charge of academic program review and other reviews on campus. It has members from all constituent groups and it decides how SLO’s will be merged into program reviews. This committee is in need of two faculty members. | | |
| **Enrollment Management Follow-up Part One (Information Item)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | We had a good meeting last Friday and faculty were able to ask great questions of Tim Flood and Kathy Tyner. The summary was passed out. We are updating our plan for accreditation. We need to decide how much responsibility we want to have on the plan.  One theme of the faculty meeting was a need for data. We want to make data driven decisions. We would like as much data as there is to offer so we can look for patterns. It was pointed out that some of the data we want is available at other colleges. For example, if we want to see the outcome of the block schedule, we can look at other colleges who implemented it before us.  Faculty compensation was also a major theme, along with more information on how FTES is dispersed. It was suggested that the Vice President of Academic Affairs and others cherry pick classes that will be offered. Faculty also wanted more information on the “newly popped up 17.5 number”, specifically where it came from and if it is a goal we would like to pursue. We need a formal statement about how faculty feel about additional students in classes and large lecture classed. Faculty want to be able to interact with students directly and build retention through student contact. To give someone an incentive to have a less successful class is not to the benefit of students. We use money to build programs for extra contact, such as embedded tutoring, and then diminish contact with larger class sizes. It does not make sense We should not replace teachers with tutors. If we do this, we need to consider.  A motion was made to extend for 5 minutes, was seconded and passed.  This feels like a business model that reduces the role of faculty and replaces adjuncts with non-teaching, high turnover low wage positions. We are not a business.  We often make decisions that sound like a good idea with no data behind it and that is often not good for our students.  If we are going to do this, we should spend 60% of our budget on faculty rather than 50%. The FON and 50% are meant to be minimums.  If this happens, we need a way to notify students they are in a higher-level class max, that this section is not equal to the other sections. We do not want to create two unequal experiences for students. Since this is a university model to have large lectures, maybe we allow only student who meet college level reading and writing access to the large lecture classes. This may help success rates in the large classes.  A motion was made to extend until 1:00 and was seconded. The motion passed.  We need to decide if we are interested in large classes and if so how to implement them. We need to decide if we want to take students over the class max and how compensation may work if we agree to these two items. We also want to look at streamlining degrees without losing jobs and this needs to be done with faculty and administrators working as a team. | | |
| **Adjournment** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 | | |
| The next Academic Senate meeting: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 from 11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in L 246. | | | |

[11-08-16 Voting Record](https://portal.swccd.edu/Committees/AcaSen/Standardized%20Document%20Library/11-08-16%20Voting%20Record.pdf)