



**FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING
SEPTEMBER 13, 2011
UNAPPROVED**

PRESENT: Laurie Lema (President), Beth McBrien (Vice President), John Freytag (Corresponding Secretary), Nicole Hess-Diestler (Representative-at-Large), Ed Trujillo (Applied and Fine Arts), Tom Barber (English), Ruth Sison (Library), Theresa Flores-Lowry (Physical Education, Athletics and Dance), Peter Churchill (Business Education), Buzz Holt (Social Sciences), Craig Gerken (Physical Science/Engineering), Catherine Machalinski (Biology and Health sciences), Rick Godinez (San Ramon Campus), Lisa Orta (Faculty Development Coordinator), Doug Dildine (Part-time Faculty Representative), Len Grzanka (Part-time Faculty Representative), Ann Patton (Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary)

ABSENT: Maria Dorado (Counseling), ASDVC Representative (TBD)

GUESTS: Susan Lamb, Obed Vazquez,

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

1. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 13, 2011 AGENDA AND THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 30, 2011.

It was MSC to approve the agenda of September 13, 2011 as revised. All in favor. Approved.

It was MSC to approve the minutes of August 30, 2011 with corrections. All in favor. Approved.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

3. COUNCIL COMMENT

Dildine commented about future meetings, part-time stipends and the budget. He asked to see line by line budget expenditures. He said it is his understanding that the other colleges' senates do not pay for Curriculum Chair. He would like to see what we are paying for and what the college should pay for.

Keating said she and faculty in her division are concerned about WebAdvisor. Faculty could not access it at the beginning of the semester. The system is designed for average load not peak load, which is why they have tracking problems and the system is practically unusable at the beginning of the semester to the point where the college president had to advise faculty to use the system during off hours. A system that we use for registration, roster management, and student communications simply must be designed to handle peak load. We have the same issues every semester. It seems the District Office addresses it when it happens and then puts it aside until it happens again the following semester. Also when using the Insight Portal faculty experience unnecessary delays for about a minute per page, and the system tries to load a non-existent resource. It has been brought to the attention of the District IT and they have not done anything about it. Now that Insight is connected to the WebAdvisor portal, WebAdvisor was already having issues with not being able to handle the load and now with the Insight Portal, it seems they did not prepare for the additional load on an already overburdened server.

Freytag reminded Council of the Styrofoam issues that were addressed last year through a joint resolution of the Faculty Senate, Classified Senate, and ASDVC and he was hoping there would be no further issues. It has come to his attention that although the college food services has taken steps to adopt the resolution, they made a decision to replace the Styrofoam containers in the Crow's Nest to another plastic container that also is not biodegradable. While he is not sure if this is because food services is not aware that these plastic containers have the same ecological problems as Styrofoam, or not, he hopes there will be further conversations to let food services know this is not in compliance with the intent of the resolution.

Hess-Diestler said she discovered last week a student who had been attending one of her classes is not on the roster. After speaking with the student she found out there was a zero missing that should have been entered by admissions. It was actually another student in her class that she kept dropping. This morning when delivering her drop roster, she overheard this was happening to another student. She said the student was told admissions must have left off the zero. The student said he was not that student. He was then told admissions could not fix it and he had to get a late add and it was the last day to add. She said it seems that the person that discovered the mistake is left to deal with it. She said the person responsible for that error should bear the burden of fixing it. She said the burden should not fall on the student when it was not his mistake.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Trujillo reminded faculty a lot of the student clubs need faculty sponsors and also for faculty to encourage students to join the clubs.

Lema announced a memo came out from the College President that we will be hiring 6 full-time faculty members this year. She said the announcement will go out soon for departments to fill out the request for a faculty hire.

Lema reminded Council the election for part-time faculty representative on the Faculty Senate Council is open until this Thursday, September 15. She told Council to remind their part-time colleagues to vote.

5. APPOINTMENTS

Distance Education Task Force

Cheryl Carter

Student Disciplinary Appeals

Dorrie Mazone

Faculty Development Committee

Vesna Rodic – Part-time rep

District-wide Professional Development Committee

Lisa Orta

Institutional Planning Council

Mauricio Najarro

District wide Curriculum (online) Management System Task Force

Mario Tejada

Jessica Barksdale

Foundations for Student Success

Rita Delgado

Pam Hawkins

Jane Brecha

College Council

Nancy Deason

It was MSC to approve all the appointments listed above. All in favor. Approved.

6. IPC AND STUDENT EQUITY

Lema reviewed that this item had been discussed at a previous meeting and it is an action item on today's agenda.

Machalinski said she heard a concern from a couple faculty in her department. Their concern is the lack of data in the proposal. She expressed additional concern about increased work for the departments and the lack of resources to do what will be required in the plan.

Lema asked Machalinski to clarify if their concern was about the IPC and SEC working together to develop a plan, or is their concern the data will be part of the Program Reviews and evaluations.

Machalinski said they are supportive of having a Student Equity Plan but they are concerned about the time involved and there is no money. They also feel some of the things that affect student success, they have no control over.

Keating agrees with Machalinski's concerns. She would like to know the overall goal.

Trujillo said he shares the same concerns. He thought the planning group was going to provide more information before Council makes a decision. He would like to see models from other colleges.

Freytag also agrees with the concerns. He asked if Council votes to not endorse this process, what suggestions Council has for what direction the planning group should take. He said it seems the goal is misdirected. He said the data is all available and maybe it should be handed back to the departments. He said looking at the data there are some obvious solutions.

Lema cautioned Council that a no vote today could send the wrong message about faculty support for student equity. She suggested inviting Prapavessi and Akiyama back for more discussion before voting.

Holt said he supports what we are trying to do but we cannot change the world. He said there is a need to put more into the front end supporting students before they come to us.

DeLoach said there are too many questions that have not been answered to vote on the process at this time.

Machalinski said there is a broader question of is this required and is there another way to do this?

Freytag said the small amount of data the planning group shared, showed that if students took the placement exams vs. those who didn't, there was a huge difference in student success. He asked Council, what do we want from the planning group if they come back to Council.

Barber said he is not clear what he is voting on and would like more specifics.

Lema said her understanding is they are asking for Senate endorsement for the IPC and SEC to work together on the SEP. This vote is not about what is in the plan.

Godinez suggested Council have one or two things to ask the planning group to address when they return and tell them how those one or two things will be addressed.

Machalinski said the information they received so far said areas will develop activities, goals and evaluations. She said this planning group will be developing a plan that is asking departments to come up with implementation activities.

Lema asked Council if they have an issue with the IPC and SEC working together on a plan. Council agreed they do not. Lema confirmed the concern of Council is what will be in the plan and that it will be too prescriptive about what departments need to do. She asked Council if the IPC and SEC continually came back to the Senate for progress reports, would that work.

Keating said the issue is that their end goal is to set up a process to develop activities that then are going to be evaluated. She said that is an action they are requesting. She is ok with them coming up with suggestions but she does not support them coming up with things faculty are required to do.

Dildine said if we had an evaluation for student placement that was quick to administer, and quick to analyze, we would immediately be addressing some of the achievement gap issues.

Lema will talk to the IPC and SEC reps about Council's concerns so they can be prepared when they return to Council to discuss this matter.

DeLoach moved and Churchill seconded a motion to postpone the vote on this item until they get further information. All in favor. Approved.

7. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Lema reported the change on repeatability of courses goes into effect Summer 2012. The change is that students will be allowed to repeat and/or withdraw from the same course in which they have received a letter grade no more than three times. The new Title 5 regulations on credit course repeat and withdrawal, adopted by the Board of Governors, limits the number of times Community College Districts could receive apportionment for a student who has enrolled in the same credit course up to three times, with certain limited exceptions. She said it is important that students understand this before it takes effect because there is no grandfather clause.

Machalinski questioned whether our district system will be able to track this. She said students need to be informed in many ways including a student email blast.

Lema said she will bring this up at consultation tomorrow including how Admissions and Records will track this and notify students.

Diestler added that the message to students should also include information about placement tests to help them avoid having to repeat classes.

Dildine is concerned about drama courses that are repeated to learn different phases of the curriculum. Lema said the regulation does not apply to courses that are allowed to be repeated to master information and/or skills.

Lema announced at DGC there were approximately 11 procedures that were approved without having to come back to the college senates because they were not academic and professional matters and there were no substantive changes.

Lema told Council she is bringing the Honorary Degree procedure to Council because of some concerns she has. She said this came to DGC because several years ago CCC wanted to award an honorary degree and there was no procedure for doing so. She expressed concern that the proposed honorary degree procedure states that the College Council will be consulted and makes recommendations to the college president. She said this is an academic and professional matter that falls under faculty purview.

Diestler said it won't have weight if it does not go through faculty.

McBrien said it is a bad precedent for this to go through College Council.

Keating cautioned that an honorary degree is an actual degree, and it may be the awardees only degree. It needs to go through faculty to maintain the integrity of the degree.

8. SCHEDULING TASK FORCE REPORT

Lema asked McBrien to update Council on the scheduling Task Force work.

McBrien said when they met last week the task force discussed communication, content and strategies and agreed to send out an email providing information. They also spent time talking about how they will proceed with the requests for the 16 additional FTEF. They do not know how they will apportion the additional FTEF because they don't know what types of requests they will receive.

Machalinski said one of the big questions is how will they "give back" courses. Will it be the last few that were cut, or do we go back to something like the dog and pony show, or some other process for making those decisions. She said if we just give back what was cut; it goes against the goal of increasing student access.

McBrien said at this point there is no decision to return the top four classes that were cut, to the division. She agrees with Machalinski that would unravel everything they have been trying to do. McBrien said at the Deans and Department Chairs meeting the previous Friday, it was stated the college productivity goal is 17.2. Last fall it was 16.9 which had to be offset in the spring semester. As of pre-census this fall the college productivity number is 17.83. She thinks it has gone up because of the cuts that were made to the schedule which helped to increase productivity. That is why the Task Force is going to maintain a holistic approach to decisions about the schedule, which means decisions will include productivity numbers along with other factors.

Holt emphasized the Scheduling Task Force has to get the task done by this Friday to meet the schedulers deadline. He said it is part political and part emotionally influenced by several factors. Some areas are really suffering and others are doing ok. The task force is asking for ranking of courses that meet the criteria. He advocates giving the four classes back to each area. We need to help areas adjust as we will be doing this for a long time given the financial status of the state.

McBrien agrees with Holt in that she thinks all divisions submitting course requests should get some classes providing they meet the criteria. She thinks the Task Force should begin their ranking by reviewing the top ten requests per division. Trujillo said in talking about ranking criteria, he does not want to keep the status quo. He said we cannot ignore innovation even in these tight economic times.

Lema reassured Trujillo that it is not the goal of the Scheduling Task Force to ignore innovation. In fact the Scheduling Task Force is encouraging innovation.

Holt said this process is on fast track and the task force will probably only see innovative courses that have already been worked on, as there is too little time to start developing innovative courses with this short time frame.

Godinez said he has heard concern on how the term "growth" is used when evaluating the criteria.

Lema said that will be part of the Task Force discussions.

9. BUDGET PROCESS

Lema summarized the Budget Committee worked on a proposed Budget Allocation Process 5018.01. She reminded Council they were given a copy of the process, and that it has been brought to consultation because it is a 10+1 item. She informed Council Garcia was ready to accept the proposed process. She told Council that on the previous Friday, a work group consisting of at least two members from each of the governance groups met to clarify the budget process.

Keating asked Lema her thoughts on the process. Lema responded that she has some questions about the funding categories that are being referred to by the Budget committee. For example, what are one-time resources for distribution and what categories does that apply to? How would this apply to staffing? When asked about her concern by a Council member, she said her primary concern is the extent to which the budget just rolls over without room for adjustment. This is similar to what has happened to our schedule of classes which the Scheduling Task

Force has been trying to address. She gave the example of if we decided to offer more anatomy classes, would there be additional funding to buy the cadavers needed for the classes.

Orta said the Budget Committee is working on a template to accommodate these types of things but they don't have a good sense of their history because they have been rolling over the budget for so long, and the GLs don't always match the expenditures.

Machalinski asked how and when are we going to have the conversation about what needs we will actually fund within those categories. She said for example, under technology needs, when and where are we going to talk about which technology needs have funding priority?

Lema said at the Accreditation Institute she and a few other faculty attended last year, we were told that student learning and success drive program reviews, and those drive planning, and planning drives the budget. Lema is concerned we are doing rear-view budgeting which does not let planning get ahead of the budget process. DeLoach said the Integration Council is trying to set up a place to look at those goals but they are not there yet.

Lamb said at College of the Canyons the strategic directions are their goals and the program reviews are linked to their strategic directions.

Machalinski said we still need to figure out how we get from that to the conversation of what are the funding priorities within the goals. She thinks it is too broad a conversation for the Budget Committee.

Lema said in addition it is not completely clear in the process the relationship between IC, Budget Committee and College Council.

Keating said she has been attending the BC meetings for two years and has read all their documents and is still not clear on the process. She said it needs to be articulated clearly and simply. She said following the process among the committees is like a jumble of spaghetti. She commented it seems the IC is the body setting the budget and the CC approves it; and asked so what is the role of the Budget Committee?

Freytag said he spoke with Ray Goralka who was on the BC last year and Goralka said to him what we have is not a budget process but a temporary stop gap measure. Freytag said the current process is based on allocating one-time funds. He pointed out the process document states "The Budget Committee will review and revise the budget allocation process after the completion of phase three in 2011-2012". He asked why then are we having this conversation now? He knows we need to address the "spaghetti monster" now but not sure about developing the long term process at this time. What we have is in effect for this academic year.

Lema said then the question is whether Senate want to propose changes to this document or to craft a new document or approve this document and begin work on another one next year.

Machalinski said her concern is if we don't start having this conversation this year, we are just doing a fancy dog and pony show.

Holt said we are at a point now where we have to make it work, and we really need to think this through and make changes. We need to expand or collapse bodies if needed. He asked if we can approve the process for this year only.

Lema pointed out it states that in the process it will be reviewed after one year.

Churchill cautioned that if we approve this now, it will probably get rolled over and not thoroughly be revised.

Diestler called the question. All opposed with one abstention. Motion failed.

Lema said it cannot move forward until mutual agreement is reached and suggested faculty form a work group.

10. GE VOTE

Obed Vazquez reviewed with Council the latest draft of the language for the GE ballot. The first page is a narrative of the options. The second page is a grid of the potential ramifications of each option.

Machalinski said item 9 in the graph should say more clearly that some students won't get a degree no matter what. She also said there is some editorializing in the document and it should be stated more neutrally. An example is in number 4 "Accepts" should be "Align".

Gerken suggested since 6 through 9 are the same for both options that it be formatted to reflect that with one statement across both sides. Gerken also said it should be clear in the document that a degree would be 18 units of GE plus units in their major.

Keating said she would like to change the question. For the first option it says to "adopt the state minimum" and she would like the other option to say "We reserve the right to add additional units". Vazquez said faculty already has that right but it is about exercising those rights. So Keating asked if it could be changed to "exercising their rights..."

Diestler said the wording in number 9 should be more of a pro for each of the options.

Freytag said the text on the first page on transfer degrees should be clearer.

Machalinski said it should read what the ramifications are for the student.

Lema said she and Freytag will work with Vazquez and bring it back to Council.

11. VICE-PRESIDENT OF INSTRUCTION

This item was postponed due to lack of time.

12. ADJOURNMENT

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

*Respectfully submitted,
Ann Langelier-Patton
Administrative Secretary*

