Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
February 18, 2016

Present:
Alfred Hochstaedter (President)
Kathleen Clark (Vice President)
Paola Gilbert (ASCCC Delegate)
Heather Craig
Sunny LeMoine
Merry Dennehy
Sandra Washington
Glenn Tozier
Mike Torres
Mary Johnson

Absent:
Lynn Kragelund (Secretary)
Jacque Evans
Robynn Smith
Mark Clements
James Lawrence
Eric Ogata

Visitors:
Kiran Kamath
Kristin Darken

Called to Order at 2:30 pm

I.Opening Business

A. Public Comments/Welcome
Kathleen Clark
- January 5th Obama made announcement regarding [college tax credits for employers who hire students who have completed community college CTE programs](#).

- Request for place on AS website to post announcements received at CTE liaison
- [Aligning Partnerships for Student Success Conference](#) April 21-22, 2016; PG suggests that MPC should send a team of faculty to this event because the ASCCC is one of the sponsors of this conference and it coincides with the Spring Plenary.

B. Approval of [Draft Minutes from the Feb 4 meeting](#)

AH: Feb 4 minutes only posted just prior to current meeting; suggests tabling minutes approval until next meeting
Action
KC moves to table approval of Feb 4 minutes until March 3rd meeting
MJ seconds
Unanimous approval of motion to table

II. Reports

A. President's Report [Notes](#)
AH
- requests help from all Senators to us get through AS agenda on time
- reviews notes (See notes for detailed report)
- regarding CBT presentation of "Recommendations on changing the ERP system from the Santa Rosa system to one of the other more up-to-date systems." AH points out that new ERP system will be a huge expense with initial costs of $2 million and hundreds of thousands per year to maintain it.

PG suggests that CBT should give the information that they are to present prior to meeting for review by all as well as provide the analysis to explain the rationale behind their conclusions.

B. COC
AH and HC
COC recommended the following new appointments:

College Council:
- Elias Kary (replaces Elizabeth Mullins)

● Diane Boynton (end of current term)
Action
KC moves to approve
GT seconds
Unanimous approval

Committee on Committees:
● Lauren Handley
Action
GT moves to approve
SW seconds
Unanimous approval

Institutional Committee on Distance Education:
● Mary Johnston
Action
GT moves to approve
KC seconds
Unanimous approval

Basic Skills Initiative
● Adria Girard (replacing Paula Norton)
Action
MD moves to
SL seconds
Unanimous approval

C. ASCCC Delegate Report Part 2
PG
Continuation of presentation of AS meeting 12/3/15 regarding the ASCCC
Fall Plenary of 11/7/15
Fall 2015 Resolutions
Emphatically suggests that we send more delegates to these plenaries.

Topic 1 Dual Enrollment: We can now offer classes at high school
campuses without open access (as in restricting course only to high

school students), the purpose being to provide student equity (ie if stud cannot get to community college); sunsets in 5yrs; dual enrollment students will be given enrollment priority. KK states that while the bill passed on Jan 1, 2016, dual enrollment agreements should not be pursued until MPC receives a "toolkit" from the chancellor's office with templates for MOUs and clear guidelines to address liability. This toolbox is tentatively scheduled to be here sometime in February but that then it will take time to process and set up these contracts. SW expressed enthusiasm because PERS course offerings at Monterey high were previously restricted due to open enrollment,

Topic 2: Alternate to Carnegie units is being considered.

Topic 3 Board Policy and Procedures: Plenary session discussed using a service to provide templates making board policies and procedures available to the public; per PG, this means the public can comment or make recommendations on board policies and procedures.

Topic 4: In light of a great deal of hiring of faculty currently, it is a good time to consider diversity in our hiring and training of hiring committees.

Topic : In discussions of ASCCC, it was suggested that, while they are still in charge of our assessment, the teeth of this agency are "not quite as sharp".

D. Flex Day Report
HC
requests decision from AS on whether and what to planning for new April 28th flex day
flex committee is willing to do the planning but will not be planning breakfast or lunch; AH has recommended that the planning of each column of the draft flex schedule be delegated (one to the ICDE, on to the technology committee, and the third jointly to the flex committee and the learning assessment committee); Diane Boynton has kindly offered to plan a morale-building event
Discussion: This flex day was, in the past, at the end of the finals week and was not scheduled. HC points out that scheduled flex days are

documented in the participation form for that day but that, on that form, there is an option to write in an alternate activity. Other flex days are documented in the annual flex day contract.   KC requests that we be certain to understand what is legally required. MD points out that the previous end-of-semester flex which April 28th replaces was an open/unscheduled day. AS requests clarity regarding required attendance to scheduled events and alternative options. SL requests that the requirement for adjunct faculty also be determined. AH proposes that concensus of AS is to have a flex day scheduled but make it clear that individual alternative scheduling is acceptable. KK states that signed documentation of flex day activities is absolutely required by the chancellor's office.

HC moves that flex committee will schedule April 28th but that further discussion about documentation and possibility of alternatives to scheduled flex day events will be included in the next AS agenda.

Action
HC moves that flex committee should schedule April 28th but agendize further discussion as to the required scheduling of this day.
GT seconds
Unanimous approval

III. Old Business
A. Transition to Google Campus informational session
Kristin Darken and Merry Dennehy
MD: Suggested that as academics, we are in a unique position to ask questions about how we deal with technology in our lives. Part of our critical thinking should be to probe into ethical issues that may arise as we have more technology and a Google campus in particular. She called attention to 3 interesting documents:
a.   A letter from a US senator to Google asking why student data is being collected
b.   The National Council of Teachers of English just put forward a resolution asking about breaches in student security

c.   An article in the Chronicle of Higher Education reported that the UC system put in place a monitoring of all email without approval of the shared governance process.

MD asks: Are we protecting our students? Are we protecting our own privacy as well as our academic freedom? How many of us read policy prior to signing agreements with software providers?

Discussion:

MD recommends books on this topic (Dragnet Nation and Data and Goliath)

GT: Says "yes", we should be doing this. Google is unclear as to whether all Google apps are getting privacy protection. In several instances it says K-12 security is protected but there is no mention of community college. Also mentioned the tailoring of search results as something that should also be questioned.

PG: Suggests this might be discussed at a flex session.

MD: Asks that senators take this back to their divisions and find out if there is any interest.

KC: Says we should look at FERPA issues (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act)?

KD: Google is not going to cross FERPA.

AH: asks MD to draft a message that senators could take to their divisions consistent question.

KC: and include GT's concerns about searches

B. GE Area Descriptions from the Curriculum Advisory Committee

AH

GE area descriptions must be changed due to inconsistent writing and AH does not want to do this single-handedly. Sunshine Giesler and AH propose that Senate decide the manner in which this doc is edited. They further suggest that one or more Senators collaborate with a CAC person forming a team for each area. Additionally, title V parts of document will need to be updated.

Action

HC moves to adopt AH's proposal to assemble teams of 1 CAC member and 1 or more Senate members; each team taking responsibility for editing a single GE area
GT seconds
Discussion: MT comments that, while Area F is better since Senate edited it recently, it is still very different from the area descriptions of other community colleges- Area F is more flexible at other schools.
Vote: unanimous approval (9- AH, MD, SL, MT, PG, GT, HC, SW, MJ)

Meeting Adjourned 4:15pm