MINUTES

Members Present: Bob Brown, Mark Renner, Dave Bazard, Peter Blakemore, Steve Brown, Dan Calderwood, Mike Cox, Kady Dunleavy, Marcy Foster, Philip Mancus (by phone), Laura Mays (by phone), Raul Romero, Sandra Rowan, Keith Snow-Flamer, Chris Vicory, and Kevin Yokoyama

Members Absent: Garth Johnson

1. Call to Order: Copresident Bob Brown called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Senator Foster introduced the two new Counselors, Angela Winkle and Jeroen (Jay) Dragten.

3. Approve the October 4, 2013 Meeting Minutes: On a motion by Kady Dunleavy, seconded by Kevin Yokoyama, the minutes were approved as written.

4. Action Items
   4.1 Approve October 4 and October 11 Curriculum Committee Recommendations:
   On a motion by Kevin Yokoyama, seconded by Dave Bazard, the October 4 Curriculum Committee Recommendations were discussed: George Potamianos was not available, but Peter Blakemore was able to give some feedback for any concerns. The recommendations were approved by the following roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y, Brown, S. – y, Calderwood – y, Cox – y, Dunleavy – y, Foster – y, Mays – y, Rowan – y, Vicory – y, Yokoyama – y.
   On a motion by Dave Bazard, seconded by Steve Brown, the October 11 Curriculum Committee Recommendations were discussed: Changing a discipline from speech (SPCH) to Communication Studies (COMM) did not involve a “new experience” or a substantive change, so this was just an update. For the DM 10, 11, 20 is this the course outline of record that’s being approved or the authorization form that is being approved? Senator Blakemore was present at that committee meeting, and says this is the DE form that is being approved. A Senator suggested that an extra check box might be appropriate so we know that the course is by the new DE form. The recommendations were approved by the following roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y, Brown, S. – y, Calderwood – y, Cox – y, Dunleavy – y, Foster – y, Mays – y, Rowan – y, Vicory – y, Yokoyama – y.

4.2 Approve October 11 Faculty Development Committee Recommendations, Kerry Mayer:
On a motion by Kady Dunleavy, seconded by Dan Calderwood, the FDC Funding Recommendations were discussed: A Senator asked often faculty may apply for funding, and the answer is that they can apply for every Round; the guidelines take into account that lower priority is given to personnel who have received funding in the past two years. A Senator asked about adding a column that would explain why the funding was not given, or at least that applications were incomplete. Some applications just needed a little more explanation about how it fulfilled guidelines. Funding is valid for the fiscal year, July 1 through June 30. All applications, if denied this Round, will be considered
for subsequent rounds if omissions/missing information are provided. The recommendations were approved by the following roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y, Brown, S. – y, Calderwood – y, Cox – y, Dunleavy – y, Foster – y, Mays – y, Rowan – y, Vicory – y, Yokoyama – y.

4.3 Approve Faculty Development Guidelines Revisions, Kerry Mayer: On a motion by Peter Blakemore, seconded by Dave Bazard, the FDC Guideline Recommendations were discussed: The dates should be updated. Section “d.” was also reviewed as sometimes the conference information is not available at the time the application was due. FDC Chair Mayer reported that as she went through the application process for the first time for herself, she found the process cumbersome, also. She hopes to have revisions for the committee to review in future, which will be brought back to the Senate for approval by next fall. The recommendations were approved (with date change) by the following roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y, Brown, S. – y, Calderwood – y, Cox – y, Dunleavy – y, Foster – y, Mays – y, Rowan – y, Vicory – y, Yokoyama – y.

4.4 Approve Revisions to AP 7217 Faculty Prioritization Process, Bob Brown: On a motion by Kady Dunleavy, seconded by Steve Brown, AP 7217 Recommendations were discussed: Co-President Brown explained that this second revision was the “attrition” piece, and that language was added to clarify. #14 should be plural. Program review is the start of the process, and VPs can apply to Deans. Co-President Brown remarked that this AP will be going out for a one-week constituent review, and he thanked the Senate for all their valuable input. The revisions to AP 7217 were approved by the following roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y, Brown, S. – y, Calderwood – y, Cox – y, Dunleavy – y, Foster – y, Mays – y, Rowan – y, Vicory – y, Yokoyama – y.

5. Discussion Items

5.1 Committee Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Bob Brown (Attachments)

5.1.1 Executive OK as presented; will be brought back for Action on November 1.

5.1.2 Academic Standards and Policies; with the acronyms spelled out, this section is OK as presented and will be brought back for Action on November 1.

5.1.3 Faculty Development; Section 4. B. 5.-who does the FDC report evaluations to? Also, may Associate Faculty be included as an appointed member of the committee? Review/revision by FDC before action; to be brought back in future for discussion of new revisions suggested by Senate.

5.1.4 Faculty Qualifications; Acronym adjustment and could an Associate Faculty member be included in FQC also? To be brought back in future for discussion of new revisions suggested by Senate.

5.2 Faculty of the Year and Commencement: FOY at commencement takes away from the student experience. Expanded Cabinet suggested that it could be moved to Convocation, and that faculty could address students at Commencement, but it would be student oriented, not an award. Both ideas are good, as students sometimes wonder if they got to vote or had anything to do with the award. Also, it would be great to have a faculty member get up to speak to the students, maybe choosing different people each year. The most contentious issue a few years ago was whether FOY should be an item at all. They went to separate campuses for each one, perhaps that could change and just have one. Years ago, an ad-hoc for the FOY procedure existed; perhaps we could do this again. It would then be an action item at Senate and then go to Expanded Cabinet.
Commencement should be student-centric. Perhaps we should look at the entire process of nomination and dates for honors, but also to ask for some suggestions. Kevin Yokoyama volunteered to be on an ad-hoc, as did Laura Mays and Dave Bazard. Perhaps we could have a Survey Monkey, after dialogue with constituents. It can be so complicated to do ad-hocs. Perhaps an Ad-hoc for the process, but constituent review for whether it goes to Convocation or not.

5.3 Institutional Learning Outcomes Proposal: Dave Bazard gave some background; in 2012 we were on Show Cause and one of the concerns was institutional learning outcomes. We had general Education Learning Outcomes but there were things we should have been doing institution-wide. Last year President Smith asked if we should have ILOs, not just for GE but for everything? So we started back on ILOs with dialogue sessions in spring, a rough proposal at Convocation, and took feedback to Assessment Committee and had revisions, and now the document exists as draft. One concern, communication and critical thinking are listed– they are in GEs. The proposal includes three components: the first - Is the school achieving what we claim to achieve in terms of outcome for programs, degrees and certificates? The second – From the student perspective-are they achieving their goals? Surveys for different areas are used. Fold in SLOs for courses. And third – What is our relationship with the community, locally and globally – are we developing awareness and appreciating the importance of that? We sited different ways to measure attitudes of students, ethnicities, different economic levels, and community service. And then the last part - how do we do this? The idea is that IR and the Assessment Committee would collect data, facilitate district-wide dialogue, and then summarize a report, and use the summary for planning and analyzing that data to incorporate into future ILOs. From the Senate discussion: “I like it”; is “acquire” the best term to use – maybe “achieve” would be better, perhaps “CTE licensure exams” would be best under the heading “Personal and Professional Development”; certification and licensure are found outside of CTE; student athletes could be “tapped” as a diverse, important group. They are also getting feedback from Deans and CIO by Monday. The President has approved, with questions about some of the surveys, etc. Commendations for all the work were given by Senator Blakemore who also noted that this gathers data that was already available instead of creating or the need generating new data.

6. Reports
6.1 Institutional Research Update, Angelina Hill: She went over the results of student satisfaction survey inventory reviewed last spring, sent to all spring semester students, with a three year-past survey for past data. The report does mean different things to different people. The surveys can be found on the Institutional Research website under surveys; we are not unique with these results, but our students are very satisfied with the institution of CR. We are also not alone with some of our “dissatisfied” reactions. There are new strengths and challenges. One year there is a student survey, the next year an employee survey, and then it revolves back to a student survey, etc. She also stated that there are changes in IR; they are now helping to assist with planning and they are merging IR and IT management of datatel, the web, and the operators – Information Systems (IS) is IR/IT combined. She also mentioned that you can filter survey results by site and major, except KT didn’t have enough responses.
6.2 Budget Planning Committee Update, Michael Dennis: He noted three main things; enrollments are down about 7%, which results in about $1.2 M reduction in funding. Stability funding, it may not hurt this year, but will bring down funded cap. Measure Q requests have been emailed. Q funds are not for personnel, but for institutional needs; ADA and safety are highest priority and then Annual and Strategic Plan needs, etc. plans. Last year’s budget has been balanced due to concessions by all. RCCD has a 5.3 % Reserve, currently (it should be no lower than 5, ever).

6.3 College Update, Keith Snow-Flamer: AP 4021 Revitalization and Discontinuance task force process is under way, and four of five task forces have already met. Recommendations will be submitted to the President by December 1. Also, in summer we approved the new Administrative Structure and Executive Dean Jeff Cummings has done a phenomenal job of coordinating ACCJC issues in all actions. Dean Cummings is also asking for clarification of the DE and Substantive Change Approval processes, as we all want meet and adhere to standards and ensure our students are successful. The Accreditation visiting team is scheduled Nov. 12 with Bill Scroggins and two others for one day. A Senator asked if there is a target for spring FTES? Angelina Hill may have a projection by Monday, Oct 21.

6.4 Expanded Cabinet, Bob Brown and Mark Renner: Accreditation, educational pathways and ADT degrees are being discussed. We have confirmation to commit to nine of the ADT degrees, of which four are approved and five are in process, and yes we should do more of the ADTs, so divisions should put their courses that are ready forward. Once an ADT is put in place, if there is a local degree in place that is mostly the same, we may want to look into retiring the local degree when the ADT is rolled out. There is an open house on Nov. 2. Radio ads and other marketing promotions are afoot to promote CR. A Senator suggested that Senators should be encouraging their constituents to check the C-ID website for AA Transfer degree progress. Dr. Snow-Flamer pointed out that we are mandated by SB 1440 that by 2015-16 we should have not just the nine, but several. Funding model will speak to the 60% requirement. State initiative, ok, but are we required to put all the degrees on the board? And would we be penalized because our students don’t get that far before they transfer? Is the school thinking about this, that we’re graduating very few people in these degrees; YES we’re thinking about it and we will talk about these issues. The past President is very concerned, as well as the Chancellor’s office, who fought against it.

6.5 ASCR Update, Raul Romero: We don’t have a report because the meeting was interrupted by the earthquake!

7. Announcements and Open Forum

7.1 Sabbatical Leave: Leaves have been approved; encourage constituents to get applications in for review

7.2 Program Review: PR is off and running! Encourage Senators to reach out to faculty to be actively involved in their PR activities

7.3 Honors Program: Two faculty have come forward; we encourage more people to apply

7.4 Faculty Meeting October 25: not in Board Room, but in AT 103, which should be less formal. Agenda to follow, 11:45 to 12:45 for scheduling

7.5 Counselor’s Day participation by so many faculty! Visitors were so impressed with
facilities! These are the people who talk to students. One quote heard: “This is like a real college!” Applaud Pru and Paul for setting this up. Good job! Coordination was awesome by so many faculty.

8. Adjournment: On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Steve Brown, the meeting was adjourned at 3:04 pm.
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