MINUTES

Members present: Bob Brown, Mark Renner, Dave Bazard, John Johnston (for Peter Blakemore), Steve Brown, Mike Cox, Kady Dunleavy, Marcy Foster, Garth Johnson, Philip Mancus, Laura Mays (by phone), Kevin Yokoyama, Michelle Blecher (by phone), Dr. Keith Snow-Flamer.

Members absent: Dan Calderwood, Sandra Rowan

1. Call To Order: The meeting was called to order by Copresident Bob Brown at 1:02 p.m.

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Copresident Brown made introductions, and then asked for audience comments. CR student Daniel Davis requested to speak to the Senate about CR’s policy on International Baccalaureate credits. He was told it was being worked on, and asked what the progress was; Dr. Keith Snow-Flamer is working on a draft proposal that he hopes will be addressed soon. Daniel’s concerns were about the timeline and when the scores would be provided. He was told that after Dr. Snow-Flamer delivers the draft to the Academic Senate, they will take the revisions, discuss and provide possible revisions, and then submit as an action item and take it from there. A new AP exists for IBs per Dave Bazard (AP 4235 Credit by Examination). The departments are responsible for their IB score credit determinations as opposed to going through the Senate. Suggested that he go to the departments and also clarify Board Policy on IBs. A student must complete 12 units before scores are released to transcripts, which might explain the delay he is worried about.

3. Approve the May 3, 2013 Meeting Minutes: On a motion by Kevin Yokoyama, seconded by Mike Cox, the minutes were approved without objection.

4. Action Items
   4.1 Approve Academic Senate Proposed Appointments: Bob Brown. On a motion by Philip Mancus seconded by John Johnston, the proposal was approved by a roll call vote: Bazard – y; Johnston – y; Brown – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – abstain; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Yokoyama – y.
   4.2 Approve 2013-2014 Faculty Development Funding Resolution: Bob Brown On a motion by Kady Dunleavy, seconded by Steve Brown, the proposal was explained as to the increase of $1000. Approved by a roll call vote: Bazard – y; Johnston – y; Brown – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Yokoyama – y.

5. Discussion Items
   5.1 Senate Constitution Amendment Proposals: Copresident Brown presented edits by the Copresidents and asked for further edits or suggestions; Senator Yokoyama asked about representation; if a Mendocino faculty could represent Math, Science and Social Sciences if there was already a Mendocino representative-answer is yes, that someone from DN or MC could be either a site representative or a division representative.
   5.2 Bylaws Amendment Proposals: Copresident Brown explained striking out Professional Relations Committee as being from a previous administration; Senator Bazard pointed out that this PRC came up before the time Bob explained, as there were problems within faculty,
too. If the need should arise, another committee could be considered. There are other processes in place to take care of the same sort of problem. Copresident Brown explained that each committee will be looking over their part of the Bylaws and considering any updates, revisions, etc. Copresident Renner explained that the list of divisions in the bylaws was struck and language added that would refer to the Constitution list, so that in future reorganizations we only have to change division makeup in one place.

5.3 Interim Administrative Procedure 4021 Program Revitalization, Suspension and Discontinuance: Copresident Brown gave a little background; five programs are initially in the first group going through a review process. Task forces will be put together soon. Senator Yokoyama suggested it would be nice to have it used in a positive instead of punitive manner, and that programs should be encouraged to run through the process in order to HELP [revitalize] it instead thinking of it as a negative thing. Dr. Snow-Flamer used Addiction Studies as an example; that it’s not going through the process because it’s to be discontinued, but because it’s in trouble and they want to help them find ways to help the program. Program REVITALIZATION should be the first goal. Speaking of the current five programs, Senate stand-in Johnston thinks there will be an assumption that the district will only look at those five programs; is it safe to say that no, this doesn’t mean that the district is only looking at these five? Yes, according to Dr. Snow-Flamer, all programs can go through the process. How often does the process start? Is there a timeline? Should we introduce language to clarify this? Yes, it will be rewritten for next fall based on discussions in all disciplines. Senator Mancus would particularly like to examine the language of the program analysis request form. The spirit of the AP is that this is a procedure that is absent of budget issues.

5.4 Concurrent Enrollment Program: Keith Snow-Flamer. Copresident Brown explained he, Copresident Renner and others have been looking at this all summer and that it’s a way to get high school students interested in college and CR earlier. Dr. Snow-Flamer agreed and added that it’s important to get the Senate to look at it prior to rolling it out to school Superintendents and Principals so we have support from faculty. We are currently looking at both Del Norte and northern Humboldt districts and home-schooled persons, also KT and expand to MC, so it’s a more district-wide program to motivate students to go on to college. Senator Yokoyama pointed out that under the scope it says enrollment eligibility is only northern Humboldt; language will be added to include Del Norte in all areas of the program. Dave Bazard, HSU catalog has both AP scores and IB, but CR has no IB scores. Dr. Snow-Flamer will investigate the catalog and also the “double-dipping” claims. He also clarified that the high school students need to see CR counselors/advisors while enrolled in CR classes and that the minimum qualifications for teaching the college courses will be the same for high school teachers as they are for college professors.

6. Reports; (It was agreed that as the meeting was rolling along so fast, that we would skip over 6.2 if George did not arrive in time)

6.1 Executive Committee May 13, 2013 Meeting Approvals:

6.1.1 May 10 Curriculum Committee Recommendations; Senator Bazard asked; shouldn’t Geology have an “A” mark under UC? Discussion ensued and enquiries will be made of Curriculum Committee.

6.1.2 May 10 Faculty Qualification Recommendations

6.1.3 May 10 Academic Standards and Procedures Recommendations; language under the heading “Instructor’s formal Agreement to Teach the Course as Described” was called under review. That language could be changed next time the AP comes under review.
6.2 2013 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Curriculum Institute: George Potamianos went over 7 points, some from the institute, and not in any order of priority.

1. Changing course outline because Chancellor will require quantitative number for out-of-class hours (homework). There is a specific systemic formula that may not have reality with out of class: one hour of lecture, two recorded out of class, all lab hours are zero. We will have to make that change; even though it doesn’t make sense; if someone thinks it’s wrong, they should contact the Chancellor’s office as it is not CR’s directive. The document for course outlines will change – it needs updating, already. Even though labs are our life, if it’s a lab in the curriculum then the out-of-class is zero hours.

2. We have obligated ourselves to complete 5 TMC major degrees; AJ (Police Academy), Business Administration, English, History and Political Science. We want to make sure that students can start these courses Fall 2014. We already have classes on the books; the issue has to do with the Articulation Officer priorities; whoever is responsible should prioritize the submission into the system of these courses. Chair Potamianos cannot tell someone to do this; he is simply suggesting that it would make the entire C-ID/TMC process more functional. If courses are rejected, the process needs to be repeated. Doing as many as possible would be good, but concentrate on these five first. We’re committed (mandated), but it’s an unfunded mandate. A lot of programs are concerned about this very issue - How to initialize new programs in the budgetary trouble we’re in. Question: Is there priority enrollment for these programs? If they have an educational plan they have higher priority.

3. Independent study: it’s been given to every discipline, has no course outline, so there will be different outcomes; most disciplines haven’t offered it, yet, in which case the deactivation form should be filled out and turned in. To keep the [currently unused] 40, you should be able to turn it off in the curriculum stoplight to get rid of the red, so that it’s not that it’s out of date, but that it doesn’t exist.

4. Professor Potamianos sent out the email about checking the stoplight. From all the emails, he wants to clarify that there are two columns, one is the record of record and the other is the online DE version. They just recently brought on the online piece. Do not confuse the two; if you’ve updated the regular course, the DE will still be red! Everyone is encouraged to remember to stagger the programs that need to be updated. There has been a lot of staggering going on within disciplines, which is great to see. If you remove the 40s (independent study) we actually look pretty decently compliant. People have been fairly good about avoiding the avalanche (having too many too update at one time). Ones that were yellow in April with one year left are now red in September; it’s the software program.

5. Regarding DE—a/ He is asking the committee: Is it important to have a DE expert tech person to serve on the Curriculum Committee, because there are so many new rules, regulations and requirements? The process that we’re using is pretty good; by the time things get to the meeting, the problems in course outlines have already been taken care of. It would be nice to have someone who knows the new guidelines so that when the avalanche comes… b/ There is a list of the degrees and certificates that theoretically mean students can do 50% of their courses online without getting permission to do it that way. Curriculum committee shouldn’t be responsible for having to decide which courses they are not going to approve to continue to be offered for DE – it should be the faculty who look at it and decide, not the curriculum committee. The committee could identify them and send the list out. We may need to bring it up for discussion. Faculty may have to be managed by a dean or something to coordinate what will count or not. It would be temporary until we could get permission to do it that way. President Smith is not sure we need to do that, because the ACCJC knows that we applied for substantive change, so we need to clear it with ACCJC. Copresident Brown says there is a plan to revise the substantive change proposal. Also with the new Dean
structure, what role will Dean’s play in assuring we’re compliant. Can we continue having it in the catalog? Clarify that before the ACCJC visit.

6. Repeatability was talked about frequently at the Institute; there is a handbook that they put out in pdf form, and Professor Potamianos has been sending links to those that are in the target areas. Vice Chancellor believes it is really important that colleges do not try to work around the repeatability thing, because the state legislators will be “running our institutions”. It will be hard to do, and checking how other colleges handle it would be a great thing.

7. There is a new addition of the program course handbook from the Chancellor’s office, and he will put it on the curriculum webpage. The more faculty that become familiar with it, the smoother processes will be.

6.3 College Update: Dr. Snow-Flamer thanked our Senate leadership and CRFO for working with him, Jeff Cummings and the president; it’s been a wonderful experience to work with faculty. He expressed concern over enrollment shortfalls (250 FTES) in fall enrollment (target was 2182). This will necessitate higher spring sections and that hasn’t happened since 2006 or 2009. There have been a lot of discussions about optimal figures and budget concerns. He is charging the Integrated Planning sessions to have those discussions with backup discussions in Senate. He was asked if we are low in spring do we have a chance to catch up in summer. Yes, but we stretched it this past summer to meet what we budgeted and we probably won’t do that. Are there any indicators or data that is pointing to why we have soft enrollment? Even nationally we are seeing dips of 2.5% of adult students. They aren’t coming back and less high school students are coming in (population numbers are shrinking; therefore so are adult populations). Are there ways to tell where we aren’t getting the adults, like day or night, and what might we do to help in terms of changing schedules? Dr. Snow-Flamer says that after the Sept 9 census we’ll be able to analyze data and get a breakdown of the demographics. With rosters coming out on Monday, will that include asking faculty to get them out at the end of the week? Comment by Copresident Brown: the news letters being sent out are a fabulous form of communication and a great way to continue to build transparency and trust and it’s very much appreciated. Thank you.

6.4 ASCR Update: Michelle Blecher; on the phone; ASCR is still waiting for the “new” ASCR office to open. Softball game sign-up sheets will be posted (when they have an office) for the October 12 softball game at the Eureka campus softball field. ASCR will send out emails with more information soon.

6.5 College Council Update: Please check the College Council website: the senate will be bringing up faculty specific BPs/APs. Please bring feedback to the Copresidents if you have questions/concerns. We will add them to future agendas.

7. Announcements and Open Forum: Pru Ratliff spoke about her upcoming grant workshops next week (emailed). She encourages as many faculty and staff to attend; she will present and will expect feedback, and will help anyone who needs assistance.

8. Adjournment: On a motion by John Johnston, seconded by Philip Mancus, the meeting was adjourned at 2:47 p.m.
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