



**ACADEMIC SENATE
OCTOBER 3, 2017
LOCATION: ART 102**

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

N. Dequin, A. Rosette, J. Hooper, A. Stoykov, P. Henrickson, C. Velarde-Barros, L. Stubblefield, B. Everett, K. Wagman, L. Halper, S. Dharia, A. Delunus, D. Achterman, N. Andrade, A. Arid, J. Maringer

NOT PRESENT

B. Arteaga, K. Rose, M. Bresso

GUESTS

S. Lawrence, A. Van Tuyl, K. Moberg, P. Wruck, R. Brown, F. Lozano, B. Palmer, E. Cervantes

I Opening Items: (5)

- A) Call to order at 2:41 *due to room change*
- B) Welcome and Roll Call
- C) Approval of Minutes: September 19, 2017
September 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes
MSC (A. Delunus/C. Velarde-Barros). Motion passes.
- D) Approval of Agenda
MSC (A. Rosette/A. Delunus). Vote: 1 abstention (A. Arid). Motion passes.

II Public Commentary: (5)

This portion of the meeting is for members of the public to address the senate. No actions will be taken. Each individual is limited to one minute.
None.

III Reports: (15)

- A) Standing Reports:
 - 1) ASGC
C. Velarde-Barros introduced Brianna Everett the New VP of Records for the ASGC. She will be our student representative for the Academic Senate.
 - 2) College President (not present)
 - 3) Vice President of Academic Affairs (not present)
 - 4) Vice President of Student Services – K. Moberg wanted to share an exciting lunchtime event at the Rotary. The Rotary had Gavilan College as its program and 2 students, Leslie Aparicio and Adam Lopez (ASGC President) presented along with 2 alumni, Simone Reyes and Ryan Shook. The Rotary members were very impressed and the students/alumni did the college proud.
 - 5) Senators (please include any input regarding ongoing AS discussions)
J. Hooper wanted to discuss the emails and the English department letter regarding the 17 football players who were dismissed. The letter went out to many administrators along with the Board. She believes that this topic may fall under the Senate's 10+1

(number 5 standard) responsibilities and she would like to bring it up as a discussion item to address questions and issues. Her department has been involved with writing the letter, has questions and is still waiting for the forum to be scheduled. N. Dequin stated that they are working on selecting a date with room availability, and she will let everyone know when it is scheduled. J. Maringer stated that she post the English Department letter on the Academic Senate website for review.

J. Maringer wanted to share the scan of the solar panels installation from the Facilities & Grounds committee. L. Halper says it is planned to start 9/25/17. N. Dequin reported that many parking spots are going to be limited. She stated that they will complete the installation in phases. B. Everett stated that 160 parking spaces will be blocked out, and 45 will be available so be prepared to commute. N. Dequin stated that they have prepared several spots near the football field, so be prepared to walk. A. Rosette suggested that Jan (PIO) send an email or public announcement to all faculty & staff to encourage commuting or use of public transportation. K. Moberg stated that she would ask Jan to do that.

- 6) Senate President – N. Dequin attended the ACCJC conference and they talked about the upcoming accreditation. She wanted to welcome back Ali Arid as our part time at large representative. K. Wagman wanted to make sure she contacts Pilar for his stipend, and A. Delunas will now be the Fine Arts rep. N. Dequin met with the FLPC liaison and VP to clarify the job description since there was a miscommunication regarding the job duties. Jennifer Grohol is our new SLO liaison.
- 7) Senate VP of Academic Affairs – A. Rosette supports what Jessica is saying, and he really appreciates the initiative, consistency, diligence and thoughtfulness of the letter. He believes that it would be appropriate as a discussion item for the Senate. At that discussion, the Senate can make a decision to create an action item or resolution if necessary. He reported his involvement with the update of the Shared Governance Plan with the members of the task force: Eddie, Kyle, Sejal, Jan & Esteban. The committee will be extending an invitation Peter Wruck, since his new job title/responsibilities may fit in with the direction the task force is going. P. Wruck stated his new job title is Dean of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. A. Rosette has provided some direction for the new SLO liaison since there was some miscommunication over the summer. The Curriculum Chair works closely with the SLO liaison and the FPLC chair, Denise, supports the faculty with professional learning along with Susan. L. Halper suggests that these committee liaisons have regular reports to the Senate. A. Rosette reported that he is serving on a Curriculum task force to analyze the cause of the bottleneck of curriculum requests and to recommend a priority list.
- 8) Senate VP of Student Services (absent)
- 9) GCFA President – Ken stated that we are still in negotiations regarding our retroactive pay. We have a petition to sign, and we will be attending the Tuesday Board meeting. They are not willing to settle the contract which means our part time faculty cannot sign up for benefits as yet. The contract regarding stipends for assessing SLOs and PLOs are in agreement, so wait to complete them, but please get them done before

accreditation. A. Rosette asked about the difference between updating SLOs versus assessing SLOs every year. N. Dequin stated that the ILO task force of the Department Chairs are almost finished updating the ILOs, and we are getting very close to sharing the draft. L. Halper asked if we will get paid for assessing SLOs even though we are not obligated to do it. K. Wagman agreed, and reiterated that you are not obligated to do it.

B) Academic Senate Standing Committees (None.)

IV Information:

A) Curriculum Committee Task Force (5)

A. Rosette reported on the issues that the Curriculum Committee is having regarding the backlog (160+) of courses still in the review process and not being approved. The committee is forming a task force to look at ways to “un-bottleneck” the curriculum process. They will look into the following areas: prioritizing, the processes themselves (kickback from technical review to faculty), etc. They will also discuss the workload on the curriculum committee and how it has changed in the past 5 years. He believes that it has increased substantially. We may need to advocate for more resources such as: more release time for the chair or a stipend or more resources for the technical review. He will be serving on this task force and will bring the information back to the Senate as a recommendation.

B) Equity Committee Integrated Plan (10)

E. Cervantes reported on the 2017-1019 Integrated Plan: Basic Skills Initiative, Student Equity, and Student Success and Support Program and the Integrated Plan (SSP, BSI, Equity). The plan is due to the Chancellor’s Office by December 15, 2017. We have found five common goals such as: 1) multiple measures, 2) acceleration, 3) Guided Pathways, 4) Improved identification of and support for students for at-risk and 5) Professional Learning. He stated that they need to redo the Equity Impact report due to new analysis.

Equity Impact Report – found impact meet the needs questions.

A. Rosette asked who is leading this? Are there faculty involved? He is assuming that this plan will run through the Senate for approval. K. Moberg stated that Carla is on the Equity committee, and she is your link to the Senate. A. Rosette asked if we could acknowledge it officially that she is our Senate & Equity representative. L. Halper asked about the errors in the data in the past. P. Wruck stated that they were not able to replicate the data, so they established a new baseline. K. Moberg stated that the state needs certain kinds of data. P. Wruck explained the significant changes and how you “say it” can cause problems for example: “Low income students don’t have challenges at the college.” What it means is “low income students do not experience a disproportionate effect as defined by the legislature”. So it is not that being low income has no have effect on their education, it does, it’s that here there is not a disproportionate effect. L. Halper asked if the state will penalized us. K. Moberg stated that we were able to fix the issue by setting a new baseline.

D. Achterman asked about the itemized projects and the five goals of the integrated group, and he asked what percentage is on classroom instruction or Guided Pathways funding. The five goals may not be reflected in the current work that is happening right now, but the intention is to do that. What percentage of all the funding focuses on classroom instruction? E. Cervantes

explained that the equity funding may be 25% for academic support needs and 75% towards equity. With the Guided Pathways and new initiatives, the funding may lead towards 75% equity funding for instruction and 25% for student services. We will get a better perspective when we look at it. K. Moberg stated regarding the equity budget is that there are basically 3 distinct areas of expenses: 1) student services, 2) direct support to students, and 3) in the academic area for instructional support. Also the equity parameters do not require us to do any particular combination of things because the integration is new; however, you need to include references toward Guided Pathways because if you do not, the Chancellor's Office will question it.

D. Achterman's reason for bringing this up is that there is a lot of conversation about the need to have an impact on best practices in classroom instruction. 1) He doesn't see a lot of movement inside the classroom. For example, faculty coming to equity with ideas or the equity committee creating mandates for itself to include faculty involvement and outreach. The Academic Senate has a role and responsibility in this that we need to step up since we embrace equity fully on this campus. Carla has asked the committee to vote on Tuesday about putting aside some money towards professional development. F. Lozano is interested in what you are saying. She has been involved in basic skills for many years and it has equity embedded in it as supplemental instruction. She asked Doug to further explain what he means about professional learning and support. Doug explained that topics sharing best practices that include equity across the curriculum. Fran concluded that he means professional learning. E. Cervantes stated it is very important to get involvement from faculty, and we may have additional funding and we can target specific areas to fill in the gaps. He states that they are very aware about faculty involvement, and they have 3 to 4 openings that need filled especially our work groups. K. Moberg stated that this topic is related to the EEO plan. Since we do not have EEO hiring standards like other colleges, it is very important to have more faculty involvement on that committee too.

V Discussion:

A) Finals Schedule – Ken Wagman (10)

K. Wagman and Jan Bernstein-Chargin have been the author of the finals schedule for over 15 years. It started as an oversight, and once it was fixed, we just kept on creating it every year. He says it needs to be formalized. Basis should not be any room conflicts, fall's final schedule later final exam period but not in the Spring due to graduation. We should have some form of oversight committee deciding on the finals schedule. A. Rosette suggested that charge would be best at Department Chairs since they create the schedule. An issue is the late start term classes need the finals week, so there are currently a lot of room conflicts. How was the late start class process approved? The faculty and students need to be flexible. K. Wagman reported that we need to make the adjustment before December if we know. Ken believes that the Academic Senate may need to direct where it should go. How do other colleges create their schedule? A. Rosette asked if we even need a finals week? C. Velarde-Barros asked Ken if he knows how other colleges are doing it? Nikki suggested we take it back to our departments to get feedback and further discuss whether we need a finals week, and who should coordinate it? We need to open a discussion about it, and maybe in the 21-22 negotiations, we can change it or initiate a side letter.

B) Distance Ed – LMS savings (15)

S. Lawrence asked about using the savings that we have due to the change from Moodle to Canvas. Since the Chancellor's Office is paying to host Canvas until 2018, she is requesting that they use the \$14,000-\$15,000 to pay for tech issues such as: background support, especially evenings and weekends. The question was raised "what happens if the state doesn't fund Canvas in 2019? A. Rosette stated that the Senate has already approved a resolution when we adopted Canvas on May 3, 2016. K. Wagman reported that we might have distance education as an opener. D. Achterman stated through the Title V's Distance Education piece, they have an ongoing model of training with a cohort of 6 new instructors who teach using the OEI rubric. A. Rosette stated that even though the Distance Education Committee is an institutional committee, he says it believes it is part of the 10+1, so we will take the recommendations of the committee for both approval and information. With migration emphasis on using Canvas for online, hybrid, and shell, it may be helpful to put money toward training the general population get better in utilizing Canvas. S. Lawrence reported that we currently have over 500 classes going through Canvas with over 5000 students using the system. Out of that number, there are 120 fully online courses, and not only hybrid. From the recent student survey results, expectation from the student body is that they want some online component especially if it enhances their learning experience or helps them. It is vital to make sure that the instructor is fully prepared. The Distance Education Committee is changing it up, and they believe it is important to have institutional side, in addition, to have the ability to report and send recommendations to the Senate. Since we do not have to ask for a resolution, we would like to recommend and get input from the Senate. Can you think of as a Senate any ways we can get our budget to include this funding? A. Rosette suggested that as a supplemental side every faculty member needs to know Canvas if we they want us to use it for the desegregation of SLO data. Sabrina stated that Peter Howell and her have already been asked for training for assessment of SLOs through Canvas. If they are doing their assessment somewhere else, then it is tedious process to bring it over to Canvas, but if the college decides that everybody do their work in campus, then it becomes more feasible. L. Halper had a related question about where the money savings from the solar project will go, and could we make suggestions such as creating a revolving loan fund for a down payment for a house, so faculty can stay in the area.

C) Accreditation (5)

N. Dequin stressed the importance of our role in the accreditation process and bridging the gap. We need to start having this conversation. If we wait on the more contract issues, will it affect our accreditation? There are teams that are formed and gathering data already. K. Wagman stated the more people we have the simpler the process will be. I have been talking to full time faculty now, and not part time faculty since they are not paid for their time and contribution. We are behind schedule. M. Bresso and Ken are meeting weekly. One year from now we will need to complete our self-study, our first draft will need to be done within the next 6 months. A. Rosette wanted to follow up on full-time and part-time faculty not being asked to participate. He understands not asking the adjunct faculty to do something that is not compensated. This crosses over to negotiations and the contract. There are some things that we can do, but we need some flexibility from administration to provide discretionary funds for example, updating curriculum that only part time faculty teach. He is asking for compensation for part time faculty in his department that are doing the following: SLO assessment, IEC program review, and even attending department meetings. For them to be full participants in shared governance but compensated. As Accreditation Coordinator, ask Dr. Rose to identify some kind of funding for purposes of accreditation stipends to compensate adjunct faculty to

participate in accreditation. It is a detriment to our accreditation process not to have adjunct faculty contribute.

VI Action:

A) AP 5520, 5035, 5530, 5500 (10)

Nikki requested a motion to approve AP 5520, 5035, 5530, and 5500.

MSC (A. Rosette/D. Achterman).

Discussion: A. Rosette wanted to make sure that the “green sheet” was corrected. It should be course syllabus not course outline on AP 5500, page 3. K. Moberg stated that it was fixed. Another issue on AP 5500, was the question about switching the responsibility from VP of Student Services to VP of Academic Affairs. K. Moberg stated that the responsibility had been historically going to the instructional side of the house.

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

B) BP 5030, 5035, 5500 (10)

Nikki requested a motion to approve BP 5030, 5035, and 5500.

MSC (C. Velarde-Barros /A. Delunas).

Discussion: None

Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.

N. Dequin asked if she could add AP 5031 to the agenda at this time, but A. Rosette stated that it would need to be added to the next agenda.

VII Closing Items:

A) Open Forum: (time permitting)

B) Items for next agenda

VIII Adjournment by consensus 4:00pm

A Motion to adjourn was made by A. Delunas.

Next meeting: October 17, 2017