

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes December 1, 2016

Present:

Heather Craig (President)
Glenn Tozier (Vice President)
Lynn Kragelund (Secretary)
Amber Kerchner
Robynn Smith
Alfred Hochstaedter
Susanne Muszala
Adria Gerard
Merry Dennehy
Sandra Washington
Elias Kary
Abeje Ambaw

Absent:

Sunny LeMoine(ASCCC Delegate)
Jacque Evans
Kathleen Clark
Mark Clements
James Lawrence
Student Representative: Dan Schrum

Called to Order at 2:34pm

I. Opening Business

a. Public Comments/Welcome

RS - Can students who are helping to organize the Flex Day speakers from Iceland attend the presentation? Was told to ask the senate. There senate welcomes the students to attend!

AK - CTE reminder - the request forms for funding from the Strong Workforce Initiative are due tomorrow. It is unclear who will review these requests as a first round, but decisions need to be made quickly because the report needs to be submitted to the state by Jan. 31, 2016. The basic skills committee will review the report, but the process is unclear. Will agendaize the process issue for a meeting of the AS in the spring.

b. Approval of Draft Minutes from [November 17, 2016](#)

Minutes are accepted.

II. Reports

a. President's Report

President's Advisory Group Meeting

- Discussion about Faculty Positions especially related to retirements. Will agendaize this topic for a meeting next semester.
- Review of Board Policies, including: Campus Security – the current policy is that faculty cannot be in their offices if the campus is completely closed unless they get permission from supervisor.
- The PAG is a tri-chair format with Dr. Tribley as one of the chairs and terms will be 3 years.
- AH spoke at the meeting to express concern and dismay about the decision for making a new Vice President for Advancement position without any discussion with faculty prior to the announcement.

b. Committee on Committees Report ACTION

- Need a senator to take on the role of chair for COC
- Hiring committees – See the report above for hiring committees formed so far. Still need committee recommendations for several of the divisions. Can the AS empower the AS president to approve the hiring committees that are still outstanding? The AS agrees to allow the AS president to approve hiring committees.
 - *Discussion: The Gender and Women's Studies hiring committee is not very diverse. This is also true for the Math hiring committee. The president will ask the committee chairs to look to add more diversity to these two committees. Dean Long asked that divisions recruit community members to be a part of the hiring committees in Social Science. In the past, there have been issues with community members dropping out of hiring committees and stalling the hiring process. Can the AS approve a policy that a hiring committee continues to fulfill its charge if a community member drops out of the process? Or if any member drops out? The AS president will send an email to HR to*
 - *The presence of community members can be a disruption on a hiring committee. The AS does not have to power to keep a community member off of a hiring committee.*

ACTION

HC moves to approve the hiring committees listed on the COC report with the addition of more diverse faculty for the Math and G&WS committees.

AH seconds

Unanimous approval with no abstentions

ACTION

AH moves to empower the AS president to approve the additional hiring committees prior to the winter break.

RA seconds

Unanimous approval with no abstentions

Need volunteers for the following committees:

Professional recognition board

Planning research and institutional effectiveness - need one more faculty and would prefer a man.

ACTION

RS moves to approve the listed membership for the above committees

AG seconds

Unanimous approval with no abstentions

III. Unfinished Business

a. Academic Senate Bylaws Discussion - Will defer this discussion to a future meeting

b. Rectifying Single Course Equivalencies

For the Spring semester, instructors with single course equivalency have been put back on the schedule and will teach their courses with the expectation that they will meet minimum qualifications in the near future.

Revised Draft of Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency Process

Discussion: Paragraph describing the use of multiple disciplines to help establish appropriate minimum qualifications is felt to be appropriate and desirable for clarity. There are a few edits that are needed, and MD will work with HC on these edits.

ACTION

AG moves to approve this document with the edits proposed above.

SW seconds

Unanimous approval with no abstentions

IV. New Business

a. Instructor/Student Services Faculty Collaborative Sub-Committee Presentation

Amber Kerchner and Susanne Muzala

- Resurrection of this committee that will look at Catalog policies that negatively impact students like: Catalog rights, residency requirements especially with new online collaborative, etc. When a need for change is identified, the issue will be researched and an alternative policy developed. Any policy ideas would go through the normal shared governance process and be presented to the AS for approval. Would like support from the AS and recognition of the committee.
- Inviting more faculty membership. Next meeting is December 8 from 2 - 3 pm in the student services conference room.

Discussion: Would encourage this committee to collaborate with the 3SP program. The AS senators support this committee and encourage closer ties between this committee and the 3SP committee, Catalog committee and the AS. The AS could support the committee by spelling out the charges of the above committees and how they can compliment each other.

Will agendize the formalization for this committee as a sub-committee of the senate.

b. Discussion of Possible Roles of Senate in Administrative Restructure as it applies to 10+1

There are 10+1 issues with administrative restructuring including: resource allocation, faculty representation, faculty roles, etc.

Discussion: Union leadership would need to be briefed to make sure the AS doesn't over step into the Union purview.

Can the AS make a statement about the Administrative Restructure regarding the new VP of Advancement that was created recently? There was never a discussion or presentation by the administration to the AS about the creation of this VP role, and this is a significant change to the administrative structure. The AS president could take a written statement to the Board about this issue. The decision about the VP position may have been the superintendent's decision, but it could have been handled better with more open communication with the faculty. There was no transparency about the decision and reasons for the decision. Any broader re-structuring must include senate discussion because it is part of 10+1. The AS must be consulted, not just notified with a 10+1 related change.

The campus climate was negatively affected by this decision and the lack of transparency with this decision.

Suggestions for a statement include:

- *Why was the AS not notified of this decision before it was brought to the board for a vote?. Dr. Tribley did tell the AS about the new position, but did not disclose that it would be a VP level position. Concern over the creation of a VP position when being told by the administration we need to decrease our number of faculty. The 50/50 rule may apply to this decision.*

- *Communication – Serious concerns about a lack of communication between administration and the faculty. Inadequate communication was an issue identified during the recent accreditation visit and is an ongoing issue that needs to be addressed.*
- *Professional courtesy – the decision may have been entirely up to Dr. Tribley, but being transparent about the decision with the faculty would have been the right thing and the courteous thing to do. The shock that faculty felt with the unexpected announcement, compounded feelings of mistrust in the administration.*

Why not send a message from the AS to Dr. Tribley instead of the board? We should definitely tell him that we will be making a statement to the board about this issue. The board is also a forum to the entire college community. And in the future the board will have to approve another dean or administrator positions, and this statement can inform the board about the required AS role in restructuring decisions.

HC and some senators will draft a statement. Suggest emphasizing the why questions, communication issues, and doing what is right and courteous. Also, highlighting the accreditation team recommendation for better communication and ask the board to require communication in these instances. Avoid creating a letter that would publicly reprimand or shame Dr. Tribley for this decision. Instead, emphasize our concerns about future decisions that would be 10+1. We need assurance that future restructuring decisions will be handled differently.

c. Report on the [Acceleration Project](#) from the English Department-- Merry Dennehy and Adria Girard

Move students through basic skills consistently and more quickly. Handouts given to the senators for review and invite feedback.

Friday Feb. 24th speaker: Katie Hearn, will discuss the CA Acceleration Project.

V. Future Agenda Items

- Proactive Discussion Regarding Accreditation Standards (guest Catherine Webb)**
- Review of Process for Formation of New Campus-wide Committee and/or Sub-committee**
- Understanding the roles of CAC and Senate in curriculum decisions**

[2016 ASCCC Document on Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes](#)

[2016 ASCCC Primer on Effective Curriculum Processes](#)

[1987 ASCCC Document on Curriculum Committees and Local Senates](#)

[2009 MPC Curriculum Handbook](#)

d. Review of Process for Deciding Maximum Class Size

[ASCCC Document on Maximum Class Size](#)

e. Update on Integrated Planning from CBT workgroup

f. Update on Enrollment Management Process from CBT workgroup

Meeting adjourned at 4:26pm

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Kragelund MSN, RN