MINUTES

Members Present: Mark Renner, Dave Bazard, Ted Stodder (for Steve Brown), Dan Calderwood, Mike Cox, Kady Dunleavy, Trish Blair (for Marcy Foster), Philip Mancus (by phone), Laura Mays (by phone), Richard Ries (by phone), Wendy Choate, Keith Snow-Flamer

Members Absent: Bob Brown, Peter Blakemore, Steve Brown, Marcy Foster, Chris Vicory

1. Call to Order: Co-President Renner called the meeting to order at 1:06 pm.

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Co-President Renner welcomed the Senators and audience and called for public comments. There was a question about why the Faculty Development Funding was not on the agenda; the timeline is that the committee will be looking at the proposals on Feb. 28, and then their recommendations will be forwarded for approval by the Senate on Mar. 7.

3. Approve the February 7, 2014 Meeting Minutes: On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Wendy Choate, the minutes were approved as written.

4. Action Items
   4.1 Approve Revised Interim AP 4021 Program Revitalization, Suspension, and/or Discontinuation: On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Ted Stodder, the procedure was discussed. Senator Bazard asked about the membership numbers, and whether the numbers could include one person covering two categories. Ted Stodder mentioned that his division wondered about the advisory committee members as the advisory members have a lot of influence; that language is included in Step One. Senator Bazard then asked about substituting “and” for “or” or “and/or” on page two, or some editing that prevents faculty from auto-deferring to the Dean – motion for amendment of changing language to “Deans/Directors who are responsible for, and faculty who teach in,…” in the AP by Dave Bazard, and seconded, the roll call vote to accept the amendment was taken: Bazard – y; Stodder – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Blair – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Ries – y. Then discussion went to typos (correct “chars” to “chairs”) and keeping the document aligned with standardized language by changing “Vice President” to “CIO/CSSO”. The roll call vote was taken and the revised interim policy was approved: Bazard – y; Stodder – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Blair – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Ries – y.

   4.2 Approve CIS/GE Options: Dan Calderwood presented a revised edition based on discussions from the February 7 Senate meeting. On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Ted Stodder, discussion ensued. What are the Math implications? It would not affect units for degrees and would not jeopardize someone graduating. It is to show
you have Math value even if not required for the degree – does not affect GE. If a student passes the math competency, they would still have to take a course from Area D. The GE option would now cover other courses, and those courses would be added to Area D for more options. The next step would be that this document (if approved) would be used in future curricular analysis by Curriculum Committee. The roll call vote was taken and the CIS/GE Option was approved: Bazard – y; Stodder – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Blair – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Ries – abstain.

5. Discussion Items

5.1 Academic Standards & Policies Committee Recommendations for BP/AP 7384 Emeritus Title & Status: Chair of ASPC (Connie Wolfsen) was not able to present, but Mike Peterson stood in for her. The only question was whether it was just for faculty or for everyone; this version covers all employees of CR. These are both revised from existing CR policy. With no other discussion or concerns, it will be brought back for approval on March 7 and, if approved then, will go on to College Council.

5.2 Distance Education Readiness Standards: Bringing it back now with revisions/suggestions toward DE processes. We are looking at it from several areas; Federal level, Dept. of Education, substantive change, etc. Discussion today will inform the DE Task Force in terms of the language that will be built into the standard. It may eventually be a task for the ASPC to make it a policy. A Senator remarked that it is very nice to have included ACCJC standards. Distance Ed has become a state-wide discussion and this document absolutely follow requirements. A set of requirements for instructor readiness seems to have become the norm. In answer to Trish Blair’s question about whether #3 “Demonstrate prior successful experience” would include an instructors experience at another institution; it does mean ANY prior experience. ASCR Senator Choate reported that students would truly appreciate uniformity in online classes; different instructors utilize different components and this document would seem to create the type of standards that students will appreciate. Regarding a question about training, CIO/CSSO Snow-Flamer reported that the new training center would include DE support as a key component. Trish suggested a possible amended #3 to include language such as “and complete CR online teaching orientation.” The Task Force will take suggestions and integrate them into the document that will be brought back March 7 for action.

5.3 Ad-Hoc Committee Members for Academic Senate Co-President Search 2014-15: Mark Renner summarized the intent. The attachment is from the Constitution regarding Election of Officers. We are looking for volunteers for the committee. Dave Bazard volunteered himself, other possibilities were suggested. The Co-Presidents will find two other definite members and then the committee will begin the search for next year’s Co-Presidents; their recommendations will be announced no later than the second meeting in April (in this case, by April 18).

5.4 Multicultural Understanding: Philip Mancus and George Potamianos: This is a very complex discussion and Co-President Renner summarized the past discussions and stated the hope that progress will be made to implement this MU. MU courses do help student success. HSU has a requirement for 2 courses, and this MU would help CR students get one of these taken care of before transferring to HSU. It would fall under the Area E requirements for transfer to CSU where three units are needed. Philip Mancus reported that 73% of CCCs already have some form of diversity/equity requirement. This MU would be particularly useful for workforce students, and would
also promote values in Student Success Act and help with persistence and retention of underrepresented groups. The question is how best to accomplish all these goals. It has been discussed innumerable times but has never gone through a complete process for implementation. Historical perspectives were mentioned, in that success rates were all over the map with different interpretations used. There is definitely an assessment component of this where we’re not demonstrating one definite outcome. It is a lower division requirement for Area E. It shouldn’t require extra courses, just need to be aware that your choice matters. So how best can we move this forward? Through discussions at Executive Committee, with Administration, and here at Senate, the steps may be:

- Adopt this MU (conceivably Option #1) as an action item for March 7
- Develop a rubric for course qualification (MDC? Ad-hoc?)
- Look at best practices (a lot of this research has been done)
- Create (?) a new category that would NOT increase units for student loads
- Offer coaching by instructors for helping students choose the right course for their education plan
- Create a list for GE; perhaps an asterisk next to courses that would be needed (Curriculum or MDC has a list?) Use the list to see where deficiencies exist
- Follow through with MDC and the Catalog Committee to ensure that everything is up-to-date and functional

There may be existing courses that fit within the guideline for an MU status, and as these courses come up for review, they may already qualify for this designation.

6. Reports

6.1 Budget Planning Committee Update: Michael Dennis showed a PowerPoint presentation. Tami Matsumoto had sent a very accurate summary of Lee Lindsey’s presentation from Feb. 14. Michael feels we shouldn’t use 2009-10 as a benchmark as it was not a sustainable FTEs due to the economy; we should go back to 2007-08 for a more comparable benchmark: 9% less FTEs in 12-13 than in 07-08. This year fell another 5.7% for a total of being down 14.7% since 07-08. Baby boom echo ended with high school graduations in 2005-06. Is the decline over? Students are not all 18, now, but cover an 18 to 25 range. It will continue to shrink over the next 5 years. At the same time the college has not adjusted its size: FT faculty numbers are up 10%; PT faculty up 13%; Admin is up 27%; classified is up 3%/FTES. Bad gambles were taken on growth, but we’d still be seeing declines even if we’d known what would happen back when we were making those projections. Deficit has already been reduced by 580K and is now at an $820K deficit. So now we must work on how to bring in more revenue per person and have fewer expenses per person, or have fewer people. We will have falling cohorts over next 6 years. Funding model? Persistence rates are pretty stable, but increasing persistence may be a partial solution! Do we need more genuinely new students? We are beginning attempts at bringing in more students with a head start on college with courses at CR during high school, and we should be trying to get online students from southern California schools that have too high enrollment numbers. ASCR Senator Choate says she came up here due to smaller class sizes and whatnot than in Stockton. Comments included; Publicity isn’t up to par (we’re off sanctions!!!); Arcata high school students are mostly coming to CR!; Have we seen the comparable # of sections drop, too?: there is random variation in data driven input, with Admin changes, external environmental changes, etc.; it is somewhat surprising that 1 in 4 of our students is from out of the area.
they did not live here 5 years ago…); we have to lay the foundation for a year and a half from now, to build on our base targets.

6.2 Distance Education Substantive Change: Executive Dean Jeff Cummings presented. The DE Substantive Change Task Force was put together by the Instruction and Student Development (ISD) division in late November and the Task Force (TF) have met weekly to look at the structural deficiencies that exist in regards to distance education and meeting the ACCJC requirements to successfully submit a Substantive Change Proposal. Mark Winter and others had already done a lot of the research. The TF started to align priorities that need to be completed or considerably underway by May 6. An electronic copy of the document is required 30 days prior to the meeting and if the TF can get a draft to Susan Clifford, she will review our draft and give suggestions; Dean Cummings emphasized “Proposal”. When the Substantive Change Committee reviews the document, they may make a recommendation to accept the proposal or to accept it with the caveat to complete what is in progress but not quite done. Dean Cummings went over the document, which includes indications for the next steps for each process in the proposal. Things are moving, and some of the “next steps” are already happening. There are pieces that have contractual components and they are being reviewed by the CRFO. This is really a collaborative and intricate process, with several key campus personnel doing very important work, and things are developing even as it is being written. CR is “building a new [virtual] campus” with this proposal. The same levels of student support, matriculation, services to student, complaint processes, curriculum, course outlines…all must be available/accessible in the virtual campus in the same way they exist in the face-to-face classroom now. Distance Education processes must be integrated with annual plans, evaluations, surveys, etc. The draft of AP 4105 Distance Education is a component, and is being reviewed at College Council. The next question is where are these processes currently being utilized and where might they be added/included to fill in gaps.

6.3 Accreditation Institute Update: Mark Renner and Dave Bazard showed a PowerPoint presentation. ***This presentation (along with Michael Dennis’s presentation) will be available on the new Senate website (http://inside.redwoods.edu/senate/) by the first week in March*** The emerging new standards were a big topic as well as the message to stay active in planning and assessments, not just finish the work and “sleep”. We must stay current with new standards and keep up with plans for sustainability. Their PowerPoint presentation showed several “take-aways” that will be useful at CR. We must demonstrate that we are not just meeting our goals, but assessing them and finding what we can do better in the future.

6.4 IPEDS: Angelina Hill reviewed the report and explained what is different than last year’s report in that the comparison groups changed; we got to customize our comparison group instead of them choosing for us, and we have the one new peer group to use in future. Angelina went through the report and it is also available on the Institutional Research web page, where you can pick and choose the data you would like to compare or review. Some points made included:

- Our fees are relatively lower than other schools.
- Our students receive more financial aid, grants and scholarships; at the same time they get less Federal loans.
- When we give students more time, we see better completion numbers (our students take more time in years to complete courses).
- It is not surprising that we got an influx of new students in 2009, but they did not
stay after the economy began improving.

- Our categories for Figure 12 Full-time equivalent staff, by occupational categories may be different than what other colleges use.
- We have more management personnel compared to other schools
- Some of the figures may be skewed because of federal dollars being “claimed” in different categories than other schools claim.
- We were not the smallest school in cohorts.

6.5 College Update: Keith Snow-Flamer reported that more time is being spent on noncredit courses due to being one place where we might improve enrollment numbers. There will be a staff development session on Feb 28 from 11 to noon with a video conference with the Chancellor’s office to describe the nuances of non-credit.

6.6 ASCR Update: Wendy Choate reported that there is a lot going on; Safety & Preparedness Days went very well, with maps of evacuation zones, etc. On Feb. 13 ASCR presented an event with Peet Guercio that went very well, had over 100 people show up and ASCR would like to bring more of the same type to CR; March 1-3 is the March in March and some students will go to Sacramento for this activism event; March 6 Erin Senack will be on campus from 10 to 5 doing motivational workshops and will end with x amount of people joining her for dinner; Spring break ORICK horse riding and the ASCR raffle through April 6. Pi day, March 14!

7. Announcements and Open Forum
   7.1 Email coming soon regarding Faculty and Associate Faculty of the Year nominations; a communique will be sent.
   7.2 No Faculty Meeting February 28 – next scheduled date is March 28

8. Adjournment
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