



Gavilan College Academic Senate
Tuesday, March 1, 2016 from 2:30 – 4:00 p.m.
Mayock House

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

A. Rosette, A. Arid, B. Lawn, S. Lawrence, B. Artega, D. Perez, J. Maringer-Cantu, J. Grohol, J. Hooper, J. Hooper, L. Tenney, D. Achterman, G. Cribb, S. Dharia, R. Lee, L. Stubblefield

GUESTS

D. DiDenti, S. Kinsella, F. Harris, W. Ellis, K. Moberg, K. Rose, F. Lozano, R. Brown, K. Wagman

I. Opening Items:

- A. Call to order
- B. Arturo opened the meeting at 2:32
- C. Motion for minutes February 2, 2016 - 1st John 2nd Blanca with no oppositions or abstentions
- D. Approval of Agenda Move to approve agenda, 1st Blanca, 2nd Gary Cribb with condensing the report section and item 4C. No oppositions or abstentions.

II. Public Commentary

III. Reports:

- A. ASGC Report
 - a. David ASGC reported on Taco Tuesday and a survey passed out. Held a week 4 meeting, last Friday at 4PM, started at 4:30, went until 9:30. Workshops were included.
- B. College President. Dr. Kinesella discussed enrollment. We were funded for last year's over enrollment of 100 FTES.
- C. Executive Vice President Kathleen Rose
 - a. Speaker tomorrow: Honor Thy Children.
 - b. Gavilan is a member of the Panetta Lecture series. Haven't participated in the past. Marc Turetzky has gathered 17 students to attend next month's lecture. Up to 20 students can attend. Contact Marc if your class is interested.
 - c. IEP report. Institution goals need to be set. A small group has been formed consisting of Enrique, Doug, Nikki and Kathleen R.
- D. VP of Student Services, Kathleen Moberg - Nothing to report
- E. Senate President report

- a. Made appointments for hiring committees including the Presidential hiring committee. There are still has concerns lingering about the Presidential hiring committee process
- b. Russell Lee has been appointed as the new at large senator filling the vacated ESL seat.
- c. Jennifer Grohol, SS representative made some changes to her schedule and is back.
- d. CTE has been an at large position for a while now.
- e. EOE advisory committee is being formed. Two faculty members will be appointed by Arturo. He will announce to the all faculty.
- f. Arturo is going to the ASCCC Spring Plenary April 21-23. Welcomes all to consider attending with him.

F. Senator Reports

- a. Senator Sejal reported on grants. Her department plans to reapply for the STEM grant.
- b. Report from LIB/IT OEI training opportunity April 29th. Sabrina sent an email out to all faculty and administrators.

IV. Information:

A. Business Services: Reorganization of Business Service

- a. Fred reported on Business Services Reorganization. Soon the department will be taking over the payroll from the county. Some re-org is being proposed.
- b. Jessica asked why the need for an armed deputy was decided for campus. Fred said it's mostly prevented. Steve K. interjected that it started a while ago with all the active shooting at other campuses. We are far away from city and wanted the safety of having someone here. Fred said we are hoping to create a station here. Jennifer asked for an electronic version of the reorg to share with dept. Gary C asked what were costs, Fred said around \$200K roughly. Fred said we've saved 100K elsewhere so an increase of \$100K. 1 shift will overlap with existing staff. John Lango asked; what does an active school year include? Fred said he would try to stretch it as much as he could but probably no one here winter and summer sessions.
- c. This was just an information item; if the senate deems it necessary, they will make this a full discussion item on future AS agendas. Senators are to ask their constituent groups for input and forward that to Arturo to consider whether we need to discuss this further as a senate.
- d. Fred Harris indicated that what he wanted from the senate was input and that there was no pressing timeline but that things should move along.

B. Bylaws Analysis Ad Hoc Group

- a. Blanca reported on the review and recommendations of by-laws. Faculty Staff Development Committee, Curriculum, Academic Senate on Feb 19th. See handout. Arturo will be sending out the handout to all. Arturo

explained the recommendations were general thoughts. Looked at other colleges for examples. Arturo would like us to come back with feedback to put together recommendations for a final recommendation/resolution. John Lango asked if the committee membership of the committees has seen the recommendations yet. Arturo said they have not seen the doc yet; he will be sending it out to them as well so they can provide further input.

C. Grants and Ad Hoc grant

- a. Arturo discussed the purpose of talking about this item. Fran Lozano spoke about the Basic Skills grant. Doug and Fran attended a session on finding out about initiatives for grant last Monday. Brought to basic skills committee. Brainstorming and there is a proposal. Short turn around time to submit. Fran realizes it's not the best way to put together a proposal but time constraints are an issue.
- b. Arturo wants to know how the senate would like to proceed. Ali asked how soon could we get information on it, as we can't move forward on an action item if we are not fully informed. Arturo has an example from another college he can send out and we can look it over and put it on agenda as an action item next meeting.
- c. Bea said it's a tough situation as to having to decide senate involvement due to the time--last minute situation. She'd be interested in finding out information about how does the focus of the potential of the grant jive with STEM, what overlap is there, what are other grants doing?
- d. Steve said we should look in the budget for the strategic plan for answers. All of the grants awarded are on short timeframes. Steve says if we offer basic skills we should go after these types of grants for our students. If the initiatives of the grants don't apply to our students then don't go for it. If they do, then we go for it. Look at grants for the opportunities that are available in the grant.
- e. Arturo wants to know if there are ways to systemize it so that we have a good process in place when these items come up. Are we going to put it on our agenda, or are we going to leave it for the Basic Skills committee?
- f. Doug spoke about institutions that go for these grants having regular processes in place. These processes include having discussions ahead of time about campus needs so that decisions can be made quickly.

V. Action:

A) Board Policy and Administrative Procedure: Motion for approval, J. Lango moved and B. Artega seconded. No oppositions or abstentions.

B) Accreditation Midterm Report – J. Lango moved, J. Maringer-Cantu seconded. No discussion. No oppositions or abstentions.

VI. Discussion:

A. College Hour Draft Resolution:

- a. A. Rosette sent out draft of recommendations. A. Rosette opened up the item for discussion. J. Lango asked what the needs of the students are. Are they using it? D. DiDenti answered that it is being used for a variety of things. But not necessarily college oriented things. Bottom line would the students rather have more classes? Or continue with college hour? S. Dharia said that her dept. is supportive but may have some reservations; L. Tenney's department is in 100% support of the college hour.
- b. When it first began, there was a steering committee, but the committee fell apart because there was no individual at the helm. They want an individual who is responsible to manage and support college hour.
- c. A. Rosette proposed co-chairing the committee with an administrative rep and possibly the Student Activities director sharing the co-chair positions. K. Moberg stated that the SA director position is currently vacant but that it is a proposed Equity position for funding.
- d. B. Lawn said that having been at Senate when the college hour was approved, the Senate never actually made a recommendation to approve the college hour. This is a good time to make a recommendation one way or another.
- e. D. Achterman –The college hour is not being steered, all support college hour. We should gather evidence and data. Is it helping students or serving the needs of the institution? Who will sanction the group research and data analysis?
- f. S. Kinsella – The students wanted it. Consider who is going to do the work of the committee. The concept of the college hour is great, but our college is too small. Which administrator and which faculty members would help the process – what would they have to give up in order to take on this task? What do we do to make it successful? Steve K. indicated that he is unwilling to assign such a position to one of his VPs.
- g. A. Rosette – We seem to have literally dumped the College Hour responsibilities on students and taken a position that they have a right to fail. If administration is truly in support of the College Hour, they have an obligation to support it not just say they support it and watch it die due to lack of resources or leadership support; if we support CH then we have an obligation to help it succeed. The board is saying that they like it. The campus says they have mixed reviews; does the institution (administration) support it?
- h. S. Kinsella asked us to convince the institution; B. Artega asked why did it happen in the first place – because students AND faculty wanted it. The question for the Senate is: are we going to support the college hour or not? Either way, the senate needs to conclude this conversation either by passing a resolution supporting the CH or defeat such a resolution. Either way, the senate needs to move on to other pressing items on its docket.

- i. L. Stubblefield asked a question – can we tie the college hour activities to the Basic Skills grant? F. Lozano stated that there are 7 objectives that you have to address – you probably could but the time limit is too short.
 - j. A. Arid said that it wasn't just for the students.
 - k. J. Maringer-Cantu said that the Disability Resource Center department supports the college hour as long as we can continue to exempt the support classes, so students have time to receive the assistance. On the draft, we want to change #5 from *reduce* the number of exemptions to *evaluate* the number of exemptions.
 - l. J. Lango suggested that we survey the students on what can we do to make it better, get data, does it work for students? A. Rosette said it was a timing thing—do more research now or have the steering committee do it? What about the steering committee recommendations? Someone is going to have to develop the survey and gather the data.
 - m. B. Lawn said that if it is one thing to talk about it as a policy issue, political/action level, conversation with administration and the president, but not ok as a senate action?
 - n. D. Achterman asked if we have someone from the Senate who is willing to be on the committee? Need more information, J. Lango said he would like to help out, but that we have a lot of work to do before we put the committee together.
 - o. D. DiDenti said that the first problem is the students have never heard of college hour –and don't know what they can do. The second obvious problem is that we are a commuter school. Currently there is one poster in the Student Union listing the activities.
 - p. R. Lee stated that we should survey the faculty also, this could be a way for faculty to become involved and have opportunities to meet. There was a college wide meeting recently but it was not scheduled during the college hour, which was a missed opportunity.
 - q. A. Rosette will send the draft with the recommendations via email and he asked for any changes to be sent directly to him soon for next meeting – respond back to him, next meeting a resolution will be an action item to approve or not approve the resolution.
- B. Administrative Reorganization
- a. There was a brief discussion. J.Lango said that the Kinestheology department is ok with changes. They do not mind being included with the Health department.
 - b. S. Dharia said that the Math department – Computer Science (transfer T in the Stem) should be moved from Business to us, and if possible, not moving into the Nursing Department. They are proposing a fulltime Stem related Dean.
 - c. J. Hooper stated that the English department is too big already and they are not interested in combining with the others, but they would like to keep the conversation going among departments. They would like to

have more education with the other departments. The English department is concerned with the Writing Center being taken away from the English department.

- d. L. Tenney asked her counseling department the specific questions, but she has not received any responses yet. Their department is in a unique position because they are currently under both instruction and student services. An issue regarding the composition of the departments in general is that counseling faculty are being hired in other areas outside of the counseling department – for example, counselors are hired in different academic areas and there is a fragmentation within our faculty groups. A. Arid stated that this is confusing for students and sometimes we do not know where we should refer the students when we ask? Who is your counselor?
- e. The ESL department is in a state of flux, when, how, not really clarified yet, putting ESL into Non-credit, what about other basic skills segments – should we separate them too? Non-credit issue – have to have a vision on how you see it working – deal obstacles. A. Rosette – Non-credit as a department itself
- f. R. Lee – grants issue – how the departments are separated
- g. A. Rosette – When you look at the reorganization, consider the workload and size of the departments. For example, the English department is large – scheduling, curriculum not as much. The Fine Arts department has 8 different programs, Program Review, Curriculum, Program Plan, scheduling, etc. The workload is different, which programs go well together, and what size is too big (FTES too big) or Programs – Think about the questions- What is the workload? Size?
- h. B. Lawn – What are the questions from last meeting & the two you added today? Could you send them to us electronically?
- i. R. Lee – The workload issue is very important – majority of students go through multiple disciplines & cohort – Student need and collaboration are very important too.

Next agenda items:

Open forum:

- a. J. Hooper reported a full house in the new study room – 100 students – students on campus, powerful event, feedback, students want more given the political climate even if it creates conflict.
- b. A. Rosette wants to hear from you about the Presidential Hiring process – weird, it was going to follow the traditional process, then it changed to nominating names and board appointing those names, the board backed off, screening committee, appoint 2 of each, help make the questions, decide on the interviews, subcommittee does the interview – board gets to decide who they interview? A. Rosette is uncomfortable, what do you want him to do? J. Grohol – In Monterey, the top three candidates gave a speech to the faculty as part of the

interview. L. Tenney – goes back to the process when Dr. Kinsella was hired – it very participatory, there was a public forum, community and campus event. This feels very closed and dictatorial. I live here, I need to be invested who the next president, communicate to Board, this message of not involving us is wrong. We do care, it matters a lot, and we want to be involved. A. Rosette – what would you like me to do, he can give a general statement as a report on the BOT agenda. A. Arid – I think you should do both. A. Rosette – he has worked with the HR director, call the board president, and resolved the nominating versus appointing part, however, there is still the part of the interviewing only by some. G. Cribb – the faculty do play a role, can we invite the board president to the Academic Senate to present the process J. Lango – he wants to know the numbers – of constituents – 6 groups – 12 in first one / 6 next; B. Lawn is not interested in participating because of the demeaning process. A. Rosette, what specifically would the senate like for him to include in his report to the BOT next week: consensus from the senate: a) that the senate feels that the current hiring process is demeaning and dismissive of faculty and that it also is limiting in hiring the best candidate; b) A. Rosette should invite the BOT's Presidential hiring committee co-chairs to come to the AS's next meeting to: 1) explain their rationale for the current process, and, 2) hear from the AS what it feels are the key attributes the next president of Gavilan College should have.

Meeting adjourned: J. Lango motioned for adjournment & G. Cribb seconded it.