



Academic Senate Highlights March 10, 2009

Public Comments: Several persons came to speak regarding scheduling process concerns and thoughts on academic learning center. See discussion items below.

Discussion items:

Spring 2009 scheduling – an examination of the process, the impact and suggestions for future improvements: After public comments and discussion the impact of the process change centered on rumor control and time/effort spent. Rumor control: faculty reported that students saw the draft and feared that courses for completion of their programs would not be available, their programs would be cut, and that they could not have the teachers they desired. Additionally full-time faculty members were contacted by adjunct faculty with questions about IF programs were being cut, as entire blocks of course were no longer in the schedule. The short notice between the town hall and the DRAFT schedule release meant that many faculty did not hear Greg's presentation. There was not widespread understanding that the schedule was only a FIRST DRAFT.

A **suggestion for future improvement** would be to release the first draft in-house only, to allow for faculty, AVP and department review BEFORE releasing it to the community. It could negatively affect programs if rumors about program closure spread in the community from students and adjunct faculty. Initial review in-house would allow for quick correction of oversights and decreased anxiety among students and faculty.

It was **also suggested** that when a change is anticipated in a significant campus wide process that a description of the suggested change be made available through shared governance prior to implementation. That way, potential problems can be anticipated and addressed ahead of time leading to improved acceptance of change. Changing a process without letting people know how it was being changed led to a sense of secrecy that was not productive.

The second theme that emerged was the time and effort required to fix errors in the schedule after the draft was made available for review. Many of the errors would have been easily caught by involving discipline faculty in a review of the schedule as it was being developed. **Suggestions for creating a better first draft** include consideration of: the majors offered and their completion in a two year time frame; educational plans already created for students by counseling department; discipline input especially where major curriculum revisions and program evaluation has taken place; and the schedules already compiled by departments. Perhaps in the future, department chairs would be key players in compiling the first draft.

Many courses have been put back into the schedule due to faculty input. More meetings are pending to make needed adjustments. Thank you to everyone for solution oriented discussion.

These Highlights are meant as a communication tool only. They are some of the main points of the Senate meeting and should not be seen as a substitute for complete, official, approved minutes! For official minutes see the Senate website http://www.hartnell.edu/academic_senate/

Academic Learning Center: Members from the ALC spoke during public comments and a list of 13 items for consideration was submitted. A word change was suggested to decrease the alarm over the planned review of the ALC. The suggestion was made to think of this examination as a chance for "Re-engineering" in order to deliver much needed services to students more effectively. Perhaps some services can be expanded to meet greater needs. Many faculty members stated that cooperation with ALC in curriculum development has been instrumental in student success. Other colleges have done research showing that some programs represent an apparent loss up front, but a gain in FTES due to retention later. (Similar arguments have been made at Hartnell in favor of DBA cohorts). The various functions and goals for each area of the ALC center should be examined separately since the labs operate differently. "Re-engineering" should determine whether some services that must be maintained to support courses within a discipline, while others should be modified. The senate discussion included ideas for multiple criteria to examine efficacy and value of ALC programs. Role and function of the ALC should be based on division input, research data from other colleges, and data at our own institution. The task force to examine and redesign the ALC will be formed in conjunction with senate and union presidents and Dr. Helm in the near future.

Action Items:

Adoption of the Accreditation Report: The Senate adopted the accreditation report that was sent to the accreditation committee.

DBA Task Force:

The Senate formed a task force with a charge to evaluate the infrastructure, scheduling, curriculum needs, resources allocated and efficacy of the DBA program implemented on campus. The members were appointed.

Equivalency process:

The Senate adopted a process for granting equivalency for "Disciplines in which a Master's Degree is not Generally Required."