Approved 02.24.09

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
November 11, 2008

PRESENT

Larry Adams, Barbara Durham, Debra Kaczmar, David Kopp, Kelly Locke, Peggy Mayfield, Cathy Noble, Sharon Radel, Heidi Ramirez, Yvonne Reid , Ann DeJesus Riley, Nancy Schur, Steven Triano, Mary Young

ABSENT

Peter Calvert, Alejandra Gutierrez, Stelvio Locci, Melissa Stave,

GUESTS

Mary Dominguez, Jennifer Fellguth, Kathy Mendelsohn, Cheryl O'Donnel, Alison Paul, Greg Peterson, Ron Waddy

CALL TO ORDER

Nancy Schur called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

ADOPT AGENDA

Motion

Nancy Schur asked for a motion to adopt the agenda. It was MSC unanimously, no abstensions (Durham/Young) Discussion--there was a request to add two additional items to the agenda—(1) Add/Drop period and (2) Submission of textbook orders.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

PRESENTATION

Statewide Academic Senate

Nancy Schur made a summary presentation on the Statewide Academic Senate. She highly recommended going to the Leadership Institute, and if there was anyone interested to let them know. There are several statewide institutes coming up: Accreditation Institute held in January , Counseling and Library Faculty Development Institute held in February and both of these institutes are in San Jose, Vocational Ed. Institute held in March in Universal City, Leadership Institute held in June in Lake Tahoe, Students and Learning Outcome and Assessment Institute held in July in Anaheim, and Curriculum Institute held in July in Anaheim. Space is limited so she recommended that they register early. If funding is questionable, register and then work it out later. Yvonne Reid asked if she could e-mail the schedule to them. She made them aware that there are some scholarships available, but only if the school does not have funds for it and you are the only one representing the school.

The main message as a new senator was recognizing that as an Academic Senate we are a legislative body with the law behind the Senate. The Board must obtain its guidelines from the Academic Senate in regards to academic and professional matters.

As senators representing our group, we are also part of the Statewide Academic Senate body. We need to familiarize ourselves with the website, with guidelines, guidelines on how to implement topics and changes that come up, changes to curriculum, being part of the budget reviewing process, how to implement Distance Learning that is being expanded, etc.

She wanted to know if the group wanted someone from Statewide Academic Senate speak to the group. They are available for consultation and also available for education. The different topics are on the website and she would appreciate knowing the topics people are interest. The Academic Senate representatives are wiling to come and speak. She hoped by having a speaker come, it will help them to feel empowered and help them feel excited. They will inform us what the regulations and the laws are as the weight of the law is behind Acadmic Senate recommendations when it comes to curriculum and things of that nature.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Tenure Review packet was passed out.

DISCUSSION ITEMS cont'd.
Motion
Textbook Orders

Cathy Noble requested that since they were waiting for more copies, could she present her information out-of-order.
The Senate MSC unanimously to move-out-of-order. Cathy Noble informed the group that she found out that there is a ten page list of those who have not ordered their books. She would like each of them go to back to their area and send out an e-mail that if they don't use a textbook, send an e-mail to Marcie. Greg Peterson added that the bookstore also wanted to know about supplies and materials. Alison Paul also made them aware that the bookstore does not make money off of new textbooks but used textbooks so the sooner the book orders are in, the bookstore can buy back used books to create a win-win situation.

Add & Drops

Mary Dominguez handed out a draft of new registration procedures for Spring 2009. She reviewed with the group the new add/drop policy and process that began last semester and the impact it had. She met with James to try and make this a better process for the Spring semester. She asked Greg for input from the meeting. Greg added about getting our classes filled, but keeping the balance where we are not signing up 30 students above and beyond, decreasing paperwork, and the add codes. Mary explained that they had visited three schools and said the add access code is a 5 digit code that is given to a student that will allow the student to register immediately. They are checking into the add access code and using it as a pilot program for the summer. Some main points were: students can add without a faculty signature if the class is still open; changing the language on the memo, not having the staff to process drops immediately so the compromise is the Wednesday of the first week, A&R will stop processing drop rosters until the add/drop period is over; and getting students to register immediately. Mary asked for any other suggestions and concerns the faculty might see or have because she wants to be mindful of the impact it has on the faculty the first week. Nancy asked the group to look at the faculty roll that is designed in the memo to see if it will work in their department area so they could do some problem solving now and be proactive instead of reactive. A discussion followed on concerns or areas that needed clarification. Mary also made them aware that the college is going green so there will be no printed grade rosters for the Fall semester, and they will be done on-line.

Tenure Review

The tenure review draft was sent out to senators. We are looking at revising the whole process of tenure review and this is the time for us to make comments, recommendation, talk about our thoughts, what may work and what can be made better. A very lengthy discussion took place. Points of discussion that took place are as followed:

- Recently the college wide ethic statement was redone and before that the Senate adopted an ethic statement. Nancy felt someplace in there our values and ethics need to be reflected in the statement.
- Does an evaluation form exist that everybody involved in the evaluation process use and has the same set of criteria, i.e., observation, recommendations, outcomes used during the evaluation, curriculum addressed during evaluation, does the instructor use and do what is in the course outline, Is there a form coming that everyone can use and have the same set of general guideline for how you can adapt an evaluation when you go in to observe someone teach?
- Barbara Durham said she would like to see the rubric. Someone else stated that a rubric was found in 1985 that was used for a faculty evaluation that an Administrator used and the faculty did not know it existed.
- Greg Peterson informed the group that there was one in the old faculty contract that has 12 questions for the evaluations and that has been used. Some faculty did not know it existed, but Nancy confirmed it was in the contract.

Tenure Review cont'd.

- Outcomes and looking at curriculum. Kathy Noble wanted to make it clear that student learning outcome (SLO) progress and assessment is not part of the faculty evaluation, it belongs to department. It was clarified to look at curriculum and following the course outline. Nancy said there was a resolution presented and passed at the statewide conference that those two things should not be linked.
- Wanting and having questions that are more standard across the board that are asked. May need look it over and revise it to be more up-to-date.
- Peer evaluators don't know how to peer evaluate because they have not been taught. Also if they make a suggestion, it is looked upon negatively on the instructor that is being evaluated. So what are seen are glowing evaluations. This was reconfirmed by Ron Waddy who had just testified at arbitration.
- Making more of an organic peer evaluating form with the department on curriculum and outcomes because each area will be different.
- Evaluation questions should have uniformity, but develop a department level evaluation questionnaire.
- Jennifer Fellguth would appreciate clarification of the contract language of what is the process for adjunct. She is now in the position to do worksite evaluations using the 12 set questions, but when she had inquired if the adjuncts had the opportunity to do self-appraisal, professional growth, etc., she was informed that we don't do that and wanted to know why.
- Cheryl O'Donnel also brought up that the 12 set questions do not apply to all positions, i.e. lab positions, DE, counseling, etc., and needs to be looked at. People wanted to know the criteria.
- Kathy Mendelson wanted to know if the Senate was going to address the form that the students' complete as part of the evaluation. Also she brought up evaluating the DE course or evaluating the instruction in the DE course. She felt these were two separate issues.
- Cathy Noble made a recommendation. We have a shared Governance Committee that's a Tenure Review Committee which is under the Academic Senate. The draft they received came from a small number of people. She suggested that they take all the questions that have come up in this meeting and form a committee of peers, look over the draft, attend the training that Kelly told them about, and the committee address these questions and concerns. The draft is detailed, but does not address all the concerns that have been brought up. She would like to go back to a working committee and then have the committee come back to the Senate.
- Nancy stated that the draft is not a final document and the Senate should be working on it so there is a broad representation. Sharon Radel said she thought the Tenure Review Committee is looking at the Senate to answer these questions. Cathy Noble thought there is an assumption that the Tenure Committee is meeting. During discussion, it was stated that Alison Paul and Kelly Locke were the only ones on the committee (there should be 6 faculty members) and the committee is not meeting.
- Nancy Schur stated they would need to check to see if appointments had been made and if not get faculty appointed.
- The intent is to spend time working on this now while there is a broad representation and this is the time to collect information.
- Alison Paul shared some of the things that she noticed when she was going through the contract, i.e., it would be logical to use some parallel language between the full-time, part-time, and people who are on probation coming up for tenure. The process draft

Tenure Review cont'd.

was missing a number of elements that was in the current contract, such as general provisions that needed to be included or added in; inconsistencies, i.e., at one point it mentions that a person under review would be reviewed every year and at another point is skips the third year and there's no mention of the review. She felt there were a lot of pieces missing in the draft and would hope that there were representation for all areas and that the Senate would make it a priority to get members appointed.

- Mary Young added putting together a plan and what a faculty job description or expectations are and combine/merge those two documents. It has to be a membership that is active and have representation throughout the college.
- Nancy expressed that this may need to be done in steps only because in order to change the process (as we have overwhelming heard it isn't working), we need a process in place that will be dealing with details and goals. One of the goals that we have adopted in the Academic Senate is to design and write our professional standards. What do we want those professional goals to be? She encouraged them to keeping thinking about these topics and asked them to get their thoughts more concrete.
- It is important to do some clarification--when we talk about the Tenure Review Process Draft Committee and the Tenure Review Committee, they are talking about two different process. We're not talking about a committee who would be meeting and looking at the faculty who are up for tenure, but making the process more logical. We do now have a tenure process we follow until it is negotiated to something different. There is a Tenure Committee who will look at faculty and their peers, but the meanwhile we have a draft process committee who is trying to cleanup what needs to be.
- Continued to bring up, discuss, and clarify committees that are by way of contract and others that volunteered in the fall.
- Who or where is all this input going. It was Sharon Radel's perception that Kelly Locke was going to take the information and put it in contract language to take it to the union. There was an objection of one person writing it and Nancy Schur reminded them that they have repeatedly asked for faculty to help.
- Everybody read the draft and review copy that was e-mailed out, drafting more language, take down priority suggestions, and move forward at the next meeting. There were seven suggestions:
    1. Looking for department level review forms and not just the generic review form. They wanted to look at the feasibility of developing department/program specific.
    2. Evaluating process for the adjuncts.
    3. Streamline into the process for Distance Ed evaluations
    4. as well as the lab specialist because the 12 generic questions do not apply to the lab specialist rolls.
    5. Look at the forms that the students completed because in its current state it is confusing.
    6. For the peer evaluator—a list of questions or some criteria needed to be looked at when the peer evaluators were reviewing the students.
    7. Having a rubric for those peer evaluators to say this is what is meeting standards, this is not what meeting standards means, and this is exceeding standards. Something that was in hard copy so the faculty could review it, decide what column they want to be in, and what the faculty wanted to aim for.

Tenure Review cont'd.

8. Nancy Schur added we need to identify what those standards are more clearly that we want evaluated…not just the process of evaluation, but what is it we want evaluated. It isn't just about whether they stick to the course curriculum, it's about the culture and the desire to be involved with the institution and what we want of value.

- Heidi Ramirez brought up what would a peer evaluation team consist of. She thought there should be no less than 2 faculty. Larry Adam thought it was a great idea, but that would entail that you have enough faculty to fulfill that roll. Was she thinking for untenured or for everyone. She wanted to know what happens when there is only 1 full-time faculty in the area. What other alternative/solution can be used. Kathy Mendelsohn later suggested possibly handling the 2 faculty on a team, put some sort of requirement that one faculty needs to be from the discipline and the other faculty could be from the area so that you are stipulating that one has subject matter expertise and the other has teaching expertise to fulfill the roles.
- Ann Jesus Riley brought up looking at the criteria for evaluating. There is no mention of sensitivity to ethnic diversity in the classroom. She felt that should be criteria for faculty, counselors, and librarians. She was talking about people who learn visually and that kind of thing, but for the enrollment culture factors, she thinks it needs a stronger sensitivity language to the ethnic diversity in the classroom. She think the enrollment culture factors are so watered down she could say what does that mean, what are we trying to evaluate--she could say I understand the roll, but is the person demonstrating the sensitivity. Ethnic, diversity could be broader—cultural, racial—being broader is being specific.
- Ann Jesus Riley also stated we are a Hispanic (Mexican American) serving institution and she doesn't see any acknowledgement of that. She would like that language included maybe in the sensitivity diversity area.
- Steve Triano questioned when you are being evaluated and your evaluator(s) are seeing just one snap-shop of a particular class, how would you necessarily demonstrate something that specific in each class because it doesn't come up in each class. Nancy Schur felt this is when the team process is important because they need something beyond someone coming to your class and that they saw you. They need someone that can mentor the person as a faculty member, i.e., the committees you can serve on, these are the people we serve, these are the faculty responsibilities, the cultural sensitivity you need to be aware of, maybe the team involved is the standing team who deals with the acclamation issues, and a single person who evaluates the classroom.
- Larry Adams was not sure it shouldn't be a macro picture versus a micro picture. One class lecture opposed to a semester worth of work, having interaction with students, faculty, administrators, and the community in a macro sense.
- Ann Jesus Riley stated that the faculty will be submitting a portfolio beyond what is seen in the class being evaluated. The portfolio is a way of addressing that situation. A proposed portfolio turned in at the beginning of the semester, explaining what you are using before you use it and justify it at the end of the semester. Timeline was also discussed. David Kopp appreciated the portfolio idea and initiative if it is put into place or into a new process. He thought the portfolio and any collection of that material is a better assessment tool and an effective assessment tool. He stated that the umbrella of this conversation point is "what is the most effective way to elicit the richest evaluation?" It will show how the faculty is meeting the department level expectation in addition to the college's expectation. Heidi Ramirez commented getting feedback immediately so the new faculty can work more effectively with the curriculum. Steve

Tenure Review cont'd.

Triano one concern was generating a large volume may diminish the return. Another option was doing the portfolio evaluation in increments.

- Debar Kazmar felt the Senate should take a more proactive stance. When a new faculty comes in, they should know who their advisor or peer evaluator should be. They should not be scrambling or looking for their advisor/peer evaluator not knowing who they are, be given more guidance, and be given more informative to try to circumvent problems.
- Steve Triano suggested that for online materials, evaluators and not just students have access of materials that have been provided to the students. Jennifer Fellguth stated she would go one step further and that could be their worksite evaluation. That could be what the peer evaluators review.

Mary Young read from the minutes of October 14th of who were interested in serving on the Tenure Recommendation Committee. She would also like to recommend that the portfolio be submitted to the Tenure Review Committee directly after it is given to the evaluator.

Barbara Durham will e-mail the summarized recommendation and she also will e-mail them to the people she just listed. Alison Paul asked if possibly they could meet the alternate week 4-5 p.m.

Intensive Courses

Nancy Schur informed the Senate that there are some intensive courses being offered over the winter break for a 3 week intersession. Three unit courses are being offered for 6 weeks so they will continue into the first couple of weeks of class. The question to the group is do we want to ask that our Curriculum Committee devise a process by which we make a policy what courses can be offered in this format. She gave an example of how many hours a 3 unit course must meet to which flex days or holidays are within that time and no matter who may teach the class, they wanted to make sure that curriculum rigor is maintained.

Greg Peterson added detail to which they could look into changing future calendars to have four weeks. A 1 unit class for ECE could be done in one week. That one unit is the same as another one unit. If we do a short intensive program it won't be for all students, but it could serve certain students who are in between universities. We compromised with the 6 weeks for the intersession, didn't hit the target with the universities dates, and gave some students a jump start before the Spring semester. The college did offer our lab sections—business lab, fitness center, and the pool.

Alison Paul added that there are 3 unit online classes and the students are excited because they can get a head start by take 12 units in the regular semester.

Ann Jesus Riley inquired isn't it just the hours that she has to provide according to the contract and not just days/weeks of instruction. Kathy Mendelsohn pointed out that the relationship of the carnegie units and hours must be maintained. She gave an example that if she took a 3 unit course for 3 weeks, to maintain the rigor of the course, she would need to meet 48 hours a week. She also pointed out that a unit equals a unit is not necessarily correct. It is for hours, but the type of course could make the difference, i.e., keyboarding. She agreed that offering the course should not be determined whether one instructor wants to teach the course and another does not. The last item she mentioned is that we should get out of the mentality of semester.

Jennifer Fellguth stated this has big implication of growing weekend programs because that kind of paradigm will impact working people. Don't think of it just as intersession, but how do we make it more flexible and obtainable to working people to come back and take courses at Hartnell. Nancy thought it should be the discipline decisions as a discipline

Intensive Courses cont'd.

looking at a course and what route might be appropriate to offer that course. Each course is different, i.e., you can't develop the muscles in your finger under a certain time.

A lengthy discussion took place regarding a department that believed they could not offer a 3 unit course in 3 weeks. A suggestions was made regarding splitting the class into 1 ½ units and offered in that format. Heidi Ramirez passed out a resolutions handout read by Ann Jesus Riley. Discussion ensued on topics, i.e., the learning curve to process the information, what if the whole department says no to a shorter offering, students not doing the work until the last minute, being very explicit to the student, not being opposed to trying it once, faculty need to make the decisions and not management, management hearing conflicts among faculty, discipline expertise and the discipline makes the determination or recommendation, the official way for the curriculum process to which the discipline recommends and justifies, research data information that is out there, changing the college calendar, and creative scheduling.

Nancy Schur asked who would work with her on a resolution as an action item to be brought back to the next meeting. Heidi Ramirez said she would.

Student Standards & Academic Integrity Policies

Motion

Student Standards and Academic Integrity Polices was not discussed. It was MSC unanimously, no abstention (Noble/Riley) to defer this discussion to next week.

CTE Survey

Mary Young reported she is on the CTE subcommittee. She wanted the faculty to know that they will have the ability to survey the students in the Occupational Education Department in December. It may be done by the students' club. It will still happen in the classroom and Kathy Mendelsohn would like to have control and know when these survey will be distributed.

Next Agenda Items

CTE Funding/Evaluation
Best Practices
Student Standars and Academic Integrity Policies

Adjournment

Motion

Nancy asked for a motion to adjourn, MCS unanimously (Adams/Riley), no abstentions. The meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.