

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting

Tuesday, November 8th, 2011

Members present: Nancy Schur, Larry Adams, Tony Anderson, Sunita Lanka, Janet Pessagno, Melissa Staves, Jennifer Fellguth, Millicent Madrigal, Steven Triano, Elsa Brisson, Jim Butler, Mark Weber.

Guests: Suzanne Flannigan, Carole BogueFeinour, Carol Kimbrough, Ken Rand, Stephanie Lowe.

1. **Call to Order**: 3:05 pm.
2. **Adopted Agenda** at start of meeting.
3. **Approval of the Minutes**: 10/11/11 – M/S/A (Jennifer, Larry)
4. **Public Comments (non-Senators)**:None
5. **President's Report**:Nancy began her report by stating that the resolutions of the Plenary session would be sent to everyone. The Board meeting was scheduled for 29th November and 50/50 rule would be addressed at the meeting. Half of the revenue would be spent on instruction .We were short by \$30,000 since we dropped summer school .There would be a review of the expenditure. Ann Wright and Nancy reviewed the salary schedules and more reports would be coming up .Everything was more upfront.Plans to file a request for waiver were on. In response to Tony Anderson's question on how stringent were they on this,Nancy replied that they were working on it and everyone was being transparent on this. A Public Hearing Committee meeting was coming up,so it was necessary that we be aware of it.

The RAC meeting was scheduled at 4pm on November 9th.The documents populating the various committees, also the evaluation process would be discussed.Nancy made an open invitation to interested members to actively participate in it. The meeting was scheduled to meet in the old Board room in the CAB building.To Nancy's question if there were any other committee reports, Alejandra had a question regarding the scheduling of the enrolment management meeting.When was the committee meeting? Mary Dominguez was handling the matriculation policy and Nancy commented that the committee wasn't being populated consistently. There were further comments from members (Alejandra) that although they met a couple of times there was no access to materials.It was a great responsibility and there was need for more members. Millicent and Alejandra were already in and

Elsa and Jennifer could work together on it. Elsa and Jennifer were working on the adjunct evaluation process too.

6. Reports: None

7. Action Items:

A) Appointments: 1. VP of Support Operations Hiring Committee. Nancy stated that no intimation was received from Dr. Phoebe Helm in this regard. Larry reminded the senate that the body gave the Steering committee the authority to name a member to the committee. He suggested the senate make a motion to vest the Steering committee with this responsibility before the next meeting, if required. A motion to keep it between meeting time , in case there was a time sensitive issue was M/S/A (Larry, Tony) unanimously without abstentions.

B) Distance Education: Jennifer Fellguth clarified that class observations conducted to evaluate faculty for distance education followed the same principles as for the regular faculty, except that they were conducted electronically. Nancy reiterated that they were being studied carefully from all angles. Larry put forward the proposal to endorse the process. It was M/S/A unanimously with no abstentions.

C) Resolutions for Endorsement of the BSI Blueprint for success - specifically to support the Goals presented: A copy of the Resolution was sent to the members and the resolution to endorse it was M/S/A (Jennifer, Larry) unanimously.

D) Resolution on Academic Freedom: The suggestion to remove the statement on vendor and principles (“along with this prohibition.....to his students”) was approved by the senate. Larry proposed a friendly amendment. The removal of the statement, the members believed (Melissa Staves), would make it a stronger argument. The endorsement was M/S/A – opposition - Tony and abstention - Mark Weber. To table the resolution until after the next Board meeting for endorsement was M/S/A (Jim Butler, Tony)

E) Accreditation Writing Team addition: The proposal to add Barbara Durham to the introduction writing team was M/S/A

8. Discussion Items:

- A. Shared governance Committees – updates:** Nancy stated that the RAC should annually request the list of members on the committee and efforts should be made to populate it. The web page must be updated and be current. Everyone is keen on finding solutions to challenging issues and we do recognize the need for improvisations. RAC is an open forum meeting and we have four shared governance committees. Suggestions to enhance smooth functioning of the committee were always welcome. Senate representation at the RAC was important.
- B. Taskforce for Student Success:** Chris Moss had provided an overview of the 73 page document. Alejandra favored the voting in of the blueprint. In order to summarize her dislike of the task force recommendations, she shared some handouts of the recommendations. She accentuated the need to be represented and at the moment, she said, we had none. Tony suggested we push our own resolutions, and we could work on them. Members (Alejandra) responded by mentioning the paucity of time. There was mention of this being brought up briefly at the BSI meeting. Alejandra suggested that information could be shared via email, and people could be asked to log in to respond. Nancy brought up considerations such as where this would stand in terms of legislation and that it was not until March 2012, that it would be on the governor's desk for perusal. Nancy wanted to know if the senate would like to follow the Gavilan college template to which the response was (Larry) that we should not be copying anybody's template. Resolutions must be based on "Study." It was agreed that Nancy would send out a reminder to all, asking them for active participation – to providing feedback on Resolutions. The next question was what do we prioritize? Jennifer mentioned that in the past, when she was the president of the Academic Senate, they had a budget. Now, what kind of budget would we need? It could be \$800 to a \$1000. The discussion concluded with suggestions to let interested people take it up.
- C. Curriculum Committee Update on Process and Procedure:** Nancy stated that this must be made accessible to everyone. Stephanie Lowe accepted the suggestion (from Jennifer) to provide an electronic copy. Nancy also added that the committee was looking for action and this would soon be brought up for discussion.
- D. Academic Affairs Board Policies:**

1. Academic Calendar : Larry clarified that the edition should be made for our local policy was the language, about working with “Appropriate groups” were added and Nancy specified that it here it would seem to mean the unions. Questions that emerged were how far off does our college plan the calendar and what is the wish of the body? Larry proposed to move it as an action item for the next meeting, Millicent seconded it and it was unanimously supported by the members.

2. Articulation: A model of one of the colleges that was considered the best was shown to the members. There were suggestions such as this model should be sent to Laverne Cook. Jennifer proposed moving this to an action item for the next meeting and Melissa Staves seconded it – approved unanimously – no abstentions, no opposition.

3. College Catalogue: Nancy said that this was soon coming forward for recommendation. There were questions such as, “Do we have an old policy?” , “Do we have a current dangling policy?” There was one made in 1991, and MPC had one drafted in 1988. There was a current one that read like the one MPC had. Larry suggested that this item too be deferred for the next meeting. It was clarified that the one we had was from 1991 and it had guidelines. Proposal to move it to an Action item in order to review it was M/S/A (Larry, Jennifer).

E. Accreditation Report Update on progress: The first draft was coming through at the end of November. Nancy emphasized the importance of Senate involvement, so she said we would have the Senate meet on January 31st, 2012. The second draft would be coming in February and a draft of it would be made available in December to offer members time to review it. Bryan, who came in to speak of the Academic Senate’s involvement with this, made announcements regarding the time lines:

- a) The Senate gets to see the first draft in December.
- b) The second draft would be made available in April/May.
- c) Final approval process, i.e., the final self-study document would be ready in fall 2012 when it would go to the Board of Trustees.
- d) It would be current in March 2013.
- e) Presentation to the Academic Senate – April/May, 2012

Bryan mentioned that there would be several opportunities to offer feedback on this. Nancy was involved with the Writing Teams. There were six teams working on four standards. There were proposals to hold Town

hall meetings to seek greater involvement from the faculty – also, to facilitate transparency. In order to uphold the integrity of the process, it would be sent back to the Steering Committee for a final review.

F. Resolutions to Recognize Contribution to Hartnell College:

Jennifer suggested that we need to show our appreciation and congratulate Kathy Mendelsohn and Kelly Locke for their services as Curriculum Committee Chair and President of the Academic Senate. We need to confer recognition of their services. Dr. Ignacio Pando too should be honored. He was instrumental in setting up an emergency fund for needy students. The senate members expressed approval and Jennifer volunteered to follow up and work on this.

9. Announcements (Senators): Alejandra suggested that everyone participate in providing feedback regarding the Task force for student success.

10. Adjournment: 4:30 pm.