



**FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 13, 2010
APPROVED**

PRESENT: Laurie Lema (President), Marva DeLoach (Library), Rick Godinez (San Ramon Campus), Jane Brecha (Math/Computer Science), Ralph DePew (Physical Education, Athletics and Dance), John Thomas (English), Craig Gerken (Physical Science/Engineering), Peter Churchill (Business Education), Catherine Machalinski (Biology and Health sciences), Becky Opsata (Applied and Fine Arts), Buzz Holt (Social Sciences), Barbara Hewitt (Representative-at-Large), Lisa Orta (Faculty Development Coordinator), Raine Dougan (Counseling), Doug Dildine (Part-time Faculty Representative), Len Grzanka (Part-time Faculty Representative), Ann Patton (Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary)

ABSENT: Keith Mikolavich (Vice President), Absent (ASDVC)

GUESTS: Susan Lamb, Despina Prapavessi, Obed Vazquez

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 13, 2010 AGENDA AND THE MINUTES OF MARCH 30, 2010.

It was MSC to approve the agenda of April 13, 2010, as amended. All in favor. Approved.

Minutes not ready.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lema announced Keith Mikolavich and his wife are the proud parents of a healthy baby boy.

4. APPOINTMENTS

None

5. TUTORING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Council members reported no feedback from their divisions on the proposed charge and membership for the Tutoring Advisory Committee.

Freytag said he thinks it is important Council approve the chair by the Senate as it is a Faculty Senate committee. He asked if the co-chair should also be approved by the Faculty Senate Council or set criteria for the co-chair position. Lema asked Council their thoughts on having a co-chair. She said this seems to be a trend in new college committees.

Holt asked if vice-chairs would be better. He explained the difference is not necessarily dividing duties but the vice-chair steps in when needed. He suggested the committee select the vice-chair.

Council agreed to be consistent with other Senate committees in the membership approval process. Council also agreed a vice-chair on a committee of the Faculty Senate should be approved by the Senate Council. Council discussed who should select the vice-chair on a Faculty Senate committee. Council agreed the committee chair should be a faculty member. Freytag suggested the committee nominate a vice-chair and then they come to the Faculty Senate for approval. Grzanka suggested student members serve on the committee. Machalinski responded that students on committees often don't attend and they are not really knowledgeable on the committee's work, or they have a narrow agenda. Churchill suggested there be a place for a student in the membership and the ASDVC can choose to appoint someone or not. Lema cautioned if we include a student in the membership, they usually don't attend regularly so when they do attend they are not prepared, or the representative changes. Hewitt asked if there is a policy that states the Faculty Senate must include certain constituencies on their committees. Lema responded that if it is a Faculty Senate committee, faculty has the final say on the charge and membership of the committee. Council agreed to include a place for one student on the TAC and agreed to let the ASDVC decide if they will appoint a representative. Hewitt said she hoped the TAC will advocate through the Program Review Process support for tutoring. Walker said the committee would like to see that each department and program gets better statistics to support their program. He said the committee feels that as a result of not having to make budget decisions that will promote more cooperation within the committee. Lema emphasized this committee needs to have a thorough understanding of the data. Freytag suggested it be in the charge for the chair to give a report to the Faculty Senate Council. Lema agreed that chairs of Faculty Senate committees should report to the Senate Council at least once a year. Council members questioned why the coordinator membership on the TAC was listed separately from the rest of the membership. Council agreed to list the membership in one list and not separate it out. Council also agreed the recommendations for the order of the bullets under charge and function should be re-ordered. Lema thanked Walker for his input and said the Council complete the approval of the revised TAC this semester to ensure the TAC can begin its work in the fall.

6. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

A. Council reviewed the following DVC policies and procedures:

DVC Procedure 4001.03 Unit and Enrollment Guidelines.

Lema told council the changes include updates of titles listed in the procedure.

It was moved to approve the changes. Motion seconded.

DVC Procedure 4001.01 Standards of Scholarship

Lema explained the changes align the DVC procedure with the District Procedure that was approved last fall.

It was moved to approve the changes. Motion seconded.

DVC Procedure 4001.02 Grades

Lema said there are minor changes in terminology.

It was moved to approve the changes. Motion seconded.

DVC Procedure 4004.01 Attendance

Freytag said he has had students go on field trips for his class and other instructors have not allowed them to make up the work they missed. He said this is where it should be worded to clarify the procedure.

Council discussed what is meant in the procedure by "not penalized" and situations where this might apply.

After discussion Freytag said he will write up wording to clarify this.

Council agreed they need more time to discuss this with their divisions.

B. Lema reported the College Council discussed accepting the Integration Council recommendations, including the personnel inclusion on page three.

Lema informed Council while she was attending the ASCCC Accreditation Institute; she realized we have a lot of work to do to educate everyone on the accreditation standards. She said individuals working on accreditation standards and college-wide committees should be trained and knowledgeable about all the accreditation standards. Gerken asked why this is more complicated than just saying the accreditation standard says we have to do it this way. Lema responded that sometimes people don't understand the standards and may have agendas that are in conflict with the standards. She added that even if someone has served on a standard committee do they understand the other standards and how all they all interconnect. She said she thinks conversations on college-wide committees would improve if people were more educated about accreditation standards and academic and professional matters. Orta asked at what place in the process the training should would take place. She said Staff Development has put trainings together and people don't come because it's not required. She suggested the trainings should take place at the first meetings of the year of the committees.

Lema said she will talk to the College President about this in Consultation.

Holt said he is concerned we have a growing number of essential committees and we are running out of people to serve on them. Holt also suggested some of the training could be on paper so people can do it on their own time. He said those that do understand could come up with a paper to have committee members sign off on. Lema added that there is another survey coming out and faculty should evaluate which committees are really essential.

DeLoach agreed there is a need for training and added that there are other areas besides accreditation that people need to know about. She said she has been on committees with people that think they know about these things but they actually don't.

7. PLENARY RESOLUTIONS

Lema told council the Spring State Academic Senate Plenary Session is taking place later in the week and they will be voting on resolutions.

Lema pointed out several resolutions that faculty should read and send her feedback. She said some of the resolutions need to be reviewed by specific areas.

2.02 Accreditation Standards -Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to promote local board policies requiring that accreditation documents be made available to the college community within 48 hours of receipt. – Council agreed on a yes vote.

2.03 Vote of no confidence – Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges vote no confidence in the leadership of ACCJC; and

Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with its Consultation Council partners to send this no-confidence vote to Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (CRAC), the U.S. Secretary of Education, and the President of the United States. Council agreed on a yes vote.

2.04 Accreditation Options etc Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges conduct research as to the options available for peer review and accreditation other than the ACCJC and make the results of this research available by Spring 2011. Council agreed on a yes vote.

4.01 Transfer Degree – Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to seek a change to Title 5 requiring colleges to offer a transfer associate degree that consists of a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis as locally defined, a transfer general education pattern (e.g., IGETC or CSU GE), and a minimum of 60 transferable semester units; and
Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges include in Title 5 language the provision that any local requirements for the degree are to be governed by existing Title 5 language on graduation requirements. Council agreed on a yes vote.

8.02 Counseling-Student Ratio Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to change Title 5 to define the minimum number of counseling faculty required based on

the recommended counselor to student ratio (1:370) cited in the Academic Senate adopted paper *Consultation Council Task Force on Counseling* (2003).

Dougan said she will discuss this one with the Counseling Division.

9.02.01 Honor GE courses Amend resolve: Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage colleges to honor GE courses from any California community college. The majority of the Council supports keeping local control

9.04 Defense of physical education Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with faculty in physical education/exercise science to develop responses and action plans for addressing criticisms and concerns from the Legislature and others about the quality and necessity of these courses and later convene other faculty discipline groups that feel threatened by the Legislature or other groups. DePew will discuss this resolution with the PE Division.

9.07 Maintain Authority for Determining Basic Skills Coursework

Resolved, That local senates examine their colleges' credit and noncredit basic skills programs and offerings with regard to their actual student populations and effective basic skills strategies, recognizing the important role of credit and noncredit basic skills development as essential to equitable outcomes for our diverse student populations; Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California community colleges make clear to the Chancellor's Office, the Board of Governors, and external agencies that attempts to dictate basic skills offerings coupled with disproportionate cuts to credit and noncredit basic skills work disenfranchises our diverse student population at the core and will permanently damage the future workforce and transfer populations necessary for California's economic health; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California community colleges work with its partners (i.e. CCCCCO, COS, CIOs, and BOG) to make clear that attempts to dictate basic skills offerings are beyond their authority and the detrimental to the welfare of the students.

6.03 Further Research on the 50% Law Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the 50% law be left unchanged until such time as a more appropriate percentage can be identified and appropriately justified that seeks to accomplish the goals delineated in past resolutions and as determining an appropriate percentage that would be inclusive of all faculty would not remove the existing disincentives associated with the hiring of instructional support and student services faculty; and Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges explore and potentially advocate for Title 5 changes that integrate minimum faculty to student ratios for counseling, library, and other instructional and student support faculty.

13.02 Understanding Student Accumulation of "Excess Units" Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with other community college constituencies to research and develop an understanding of the causes of student accumulation of "excess units" for the determination of ways that such unit accumulation can be appropriately minimized.

13.03 S10 Research and Publish CCC Districts' Current Expense for Administration Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with its faculty union partners to research and publish faculty to administrator ratios and current expenses for administrators of California community college (CCC) districts; and

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community investigate and determine if a need exists to propose Title 5 mandates on faculty to administration ratios or a cap on CCC districts' current expense for administration by percent.

Lema explained approved Resolutions direct the effort of the State Academic Senate. She reminded Council resolutions may get amended at the Plenary Session. She told Council if they have any additional feedback to send it to her feedback by this Friday evening.

8. INTEGRATED PLANNING

Despina Prapavessi, Faculty Senate Representative on the Integration Planning Council said they need another faculty member and asked Senate Council to forward any recommendations. She stressed how important the Integration Planning Council is to the future of the college. She said she wants to have close and constant contact with faculty on the work of the Integration Planning Council. A draft of the Timeline for Developing the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan was distributed to Council. She explained the Integration Planning Council will not be determining the planning process for the strategic plan. There will be a separate planning team that works on that. She told Council there will be a Forum to gather feedback on the final draft of the Strategic Plan.

Freytag asked why they don't just distribute the plan and get feedback, why the forum? He wondered about the usefulness of discussion after the plan is done. Lema asked Council if they feel college-wide forums are useful. Orta said it is not really a good channel for communication. Lema asked what are the options for broad dissemination and conversations about plans. Prapavessi asked if it would be best to start with broad groups and take the information into small work groups, or have small work groups develop and plan and then take it to a broader group for feedback.

Machalinski said broad surveys don't really help. She said we need a group to develop a starting document to which people would respond. It could then also be discussed at the Senate meetings.

Opsata said if a forum is where people think they are getting all the information and a decision will result from the forum that is a problem. A forum is best if it is done at the beginning of the process and the work group then takes the input back to work on the document. Laurie said in some of the Flex activities because they were optional participation in these forums, the input was taken from whoever attended and it was used as data. This is not a clearly defined process.

Council viewed a proposed revised Integrated Planning flowchart. Lema explained she and Prapavessi with input from Wieden worked on the revised draft. Prapavessi shared a couple issues she has with the diagram mainly on the arrows that show connections, but the over all cycle reflects the process we agreed to in our accreditation work next semester.

Opsata asked if Annual Reports and Program Review is the same thing. Lema responded that the Program Reviews include annual reports. So maybe they should be in the same box in the diagram. Lamb agreed.

Hewitt said College-wide Action Plans should be included in the box with Annual Reports and Program Reviews and the rest of the process should be diagramed with a straight line down from there.

Gerken commented that the arrow for college-wide goals that cuts through Student Learning makes it appear as if it is getting in the way of Student Learning. Lema said she is not sure why there is a direct link, and thought college-wide goals should come through Program Reviews. Hewitt said the accreditation standards should also be included in the box with Action Plans, Annual Reports and Program Reviews.

9. KENNEDY-KING AWARD

Lema informed Council the Kennedy King Scholarship awards Dinner is coming up. She told Council last year faculty contributed \$300 out of the Voluntary fund which goes towards the scholarship and an advertisement is placed in the Dinner Program. She asked Council if they would approve contributing \$300 again this year.

It was MSC to approve a donation of \$300 to the Kennedy-King Scholarship Award out of the Faculty Senate Voluntary Fund. All in favor. Motion approved.

10. VICE-PRESIDENT OF INSTRUCTION

Lamb had no report.

11. TASK FORCE ON SCHEDULING

Lamb informed Council there was not an urgency to approve the Task Force on scheduling but it needs to have done its work prior to adding any classes to the schedule. Council agreed to develop a charge and membership to approve for this Task Force.

12. TASK FORCE ON PROGRAM REVIEW EVALUATION

Council recommended a few changes to the charge of the Task Force for Review of the Program Review Process as follows: The task force will evaluate the Instructional Program Review content and process. Strengths and areas needing improvement will be identified. The task force will make recommendations to improve the Instructional Program Review content and process.

Council agreed the membership should include the members from the Task Force on Development of a Program Review Process with the addition of one faculty member from the Integration Council.

**The question was called to form a Task Force for Review of the Program Review Process. All in favor.
Motion approved.**

13. PROGRAM REVITALIZATION/DISCONTINUANCE

Council viewed a flowchart of the proposed Program Revitalization/ Discontinuance Procedure. Several Council members thought the flowchart was confusing.

Machalinski asked if the Task Force makes recommendations to a program, who has the authority to agree to the recommendations? Vazquez explained the decisions to make changes will start with Program Review Outcomes and the process will move out from there to the appropriate people and bodies to provide funding or whatever else is needed to implement the recommendations.

Freytag asked about the box on the side of the Program Revitalization to Task Force Composition part of the process.

Vazquez explained it is an expansion of what is required in terms of meetings needed in this process.

Machalinski said the way the process is written, the only participant from the department is the Department Chair. She said there should be other faculty from the department that the program is housed in, and the membership should include 1-2 department representatives instead of just program faculty. Lema added that in a program involved in revitalization, they should have the program faculty included.

Freytag proposed including Program Faculty in addition to department faculty.

Lema asked who are the advisory committee members that are listed in the membership. Vazquez said there are some areas that have advisory committees and they should be included in the discussions such as CTE programs. Holt said areas and programs are organized in many different ways. He said we need consistency in how we organize the instructional programs in order to effectively implement this process.

14. BUDGET

Lema told Council she has requested the Budget Survey results from Leivas. She said Leivas said the survey could be distributed but he wants to make sure the comments are put in context in terms of what the budget committee can and cannot do. Lema said she will send out the survey results and will invite Goralka, the faculty representative and vice-chair on the Budget Committee, to a Senate Council meeting.

Council discussed that some of the comments made in the survey could be very divisive and even hurtful. Lema said she will send the survey content to Council members as background information.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,
Ann Langelier-Patton
Administrative Secretary*