1. Call to Order: Copresident John Johnston called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm.

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Copresident Johnston welcomed everyone to the meeting and called for public comment. None were forthcoming.

3. Approve October 3, 2014 Academic Senate Minutes: On a motion by Peter Blakemore, seconded by Kady Dunleavy, Copresident Johnston presented the minutes from the last meeting, which were approved with minimal changes (Senator requested consistency in the minutes regarding names/labels). **Revised agenda now posted online**

4. Action Items
   4.1 Approve Curriculum Committee October 10 Recommendations: On a motion by Steve Brown, seconded by Peter Blakemore, Curriculum Chair George Potamianos presented the recommendations. With little or no the recommendations were unanimously approved by roll call vote: Colette Beaupre – y; Peter Blakemore – y; Steve Brown – y; Trish Blair – y; Kady Dunleavy – y; Deanna Herrera-Thomas – y; Ed Macan – y; Jon Pedicino – y; George Potamianos – y; Ruth Rhodes – y; Richard Ries – y; Sally Urban – y.

5. Discussion
   5.1 BP/AP Program & Course Development Review: ASPC Chair Connie Wolfsen presented the BP/AP and asked for comments. A Senator asked about course hours and how the Chancellor’s Office has become more stringent about reporting. A Senator asked about the market research, and how would new programs that can’t find funding get “research”? Not every program would require this research, and this was only part of the examples/suggestions for going forward with a new program. The second bullet on the first page of the Board Policy was called into question and suggested revision was given. The bullet was from the CCLC template, but Chair Wolfsen saw no problem with the suggested edit. On the first page of the procedure, there was a suggestion to change wording; Chair Wolfsen said that the same sort of paragraph was revised in AP 4021, and the committee would visit and do the same editing on AP 4020. It was to do with the initial recommendation for new programs and the procedure therein. The AP will be brought back for approval with edits to the next Senate meeting.
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5.2 Assessment Deadline Proposal: Dave Bazard presented the draft proposal to the Senators. Assessment committee has made comments about the deadline, and the odd dates and reset of the technical web sites. Course levels are still being done when dialogue about assessment are taking place. Due dates at the end of the semester make great sense. Associate Faculty contractual obligations are up at end of semester, and this new deadline would keep their participation within contract dates. A Senator forwarded that there are too many things to do at the end of term; but assessments could be done earlier. There are many issues at the beginning of the year, too. We are on a more aggressive assessment schedule as it is with a two year cycle. We should review the “meaningfulness” of assessment reports, too. We must be able to attain sustainable processes. Senators seem to agree that the proposal is worth further discussion by constituents and the full Senate. A senator suggested that revised deadlines might encourage instructors to do their assessments in a timelier manner. Copresident Johnston suggested that Dave send the Senators the proposal to take to their constituents, and then report back to the Senate with feedback. The proposal, if approved, would not need to be implemented immediately; if not approved, nothing would change.

5.3 GE Outcome Update: Dave Bazard reported that assessment does not come up in the current general education policy, so outcomes are not being evaluated based on current guidelines. What are the new outcomes for Area E? We should reevaluate what is listed under the “Global/Cultural Context”. Should one GE course provide a student all the needed GE outcomes? An ad-hoc committee is being proposed to deal with these problems. What about other Areas? Why just Area E? Through assessment we would not know which bullets a student is achieving. There are criteria at the front end of courses for approval, but not at the end for assessment. The bigger picture could be that an ad-hoc group would evaluate our intent for general education and how to assess those outcomes (examine the bullets, etc.). Senate Executive will be examining who might be part of an ad-hoc and bring their recommendations back to Senate.

5.4 The Senate and Assessment: Dave Bazard explained that BP/AP 3260 Participatory Governance should be evaluated as far as Assessment is concerned. After curriculum processes, the procedures/roles of assessment are not defined for faculty. We should examine best practices and possibly revise the BP/AP to clarify roles of different departments regarding assessment. The Assessment Committee protocols are not defined. Is the Senate going to have the appropriate oversight that they need? What is the cycle? We need to define the role of Senate in Assessment, including their role in the Assessment Committee makeup and processes (as Senate is included in Program Review, for instance). The current BP/AP is working, but Dave would like the Senate to look it over, and analyze best practices to keep us from being vulnerable later. Are our current processes sustainable into the future? Different departments are at different levels of expertise as far as assessment. It is recommended that the Senate revisit the BP/AP, beginning with the Senate Executive Committee.

5.5 Canvas Advisory Group (CAG) Report: CAG Tri-Chairs Mark Renner, Mark Winter, and Lisa Sayles were present to answer any questions regarding the report and findings from two surveys (faculty and students), and their recommendation to Senators to support the replacement of Sakai with Canvas for CR. The Senators were very appreciative of receipt of the report and for the high-quality work of the advisory group.
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5.6 Senate Position on the CAG Report: Copresident Johnston reiterated that it is important that the Senate votes to affirm or reject the recommendations of the CAG. The Senate has reviewed the report and in the usual way, it would be brought back for a vote at the next meeting. However, there is an issue with the timing: Senate won’t have another meeting until November 7, and contracts, training, etc. should be implemented before that date. So, Copresident Johnston proposed that Senators follow parliamentary procedure to move Senate affirmation of the CAG recommendations to Action today. Through Robert’s Rules and Brown Act provisions, a 2/3 majority Senate membership approval would is required to move this Discussion Item to Action, and it is further stipulated that there must then be discussion regarding the new action item. George Potamianos made a motion to move the 5.6 Discussion Item to Action and was seconded by Peter Blakemore; after asking for discussion of moving to Action, Ruth Rhodes called the question and it was unanimously approved by roll call vote: Colette Beaupre – y; Peter Blakemore – y; Steve Brown – y; Trish Blair – y; Kady Dunleavy – y; Deanna Herrera-Thomas – y; Ed Macan – y; Laura Mays – y; Jon Pedicino – y; George Potamianos – y; Ruth Rhodes – y; Richard Ries – y; Sandra Rowan – y; Sally Urban – y. Discussion Item 5.6 was moved to action:

Action Item 4.2 Approve Academic Senate Affirmation of the Canvas Advisory Group Recommendations for Adoption of Canvas. On a motion by Peter Blakemore, seconded by Deanna Herrera-Thomas, the affirmation was unanimously approved by roll call vote: Colette Beaupre – y; Peter Blakemore – y; Steve Brown – y; Trish Blair – y; Kady Dunleavy – y; Deanna Herrera-Thomas – y; Ed Macan – y; Laura Mays – y; Jon Pedicino – y; George Potamianos – y; Ruth Rhodes – y; Richard Ries – y; Sandra Rowan – y; Sally Urban – y.

5.7 Professional Relations Revised Bylaw: Copresident Johnston reviewed the last discussion, and gave some insight to questions Senators brought up then: Ombudsman – this position was only for mediation between students and the District, so this is not a viable substitute for the Professional Relations Committee; the other area was regarding the requirement for Interest-Based Approach (IBA) training in order to be a Process Facilitator – Copresident Johnston has asked for a list of the currently IBA trained faculty, and is confident that there will be enough faculty able to facilitate problem solving. IBA training is supposed to be available every two years, and that would be this year. The intent now is to find out if there are any more problems with this proposal, and to bring it back to be voted upon. A Senator asked why it was being brought forward, again, after having been dissolved, and it was explained that a past event would have been taken to this committee, but it was dissolved and not available. Through mutual agreement, this proposal will be brought forward for action at a future meeting.

6. Reports

6.1 College Update: Keith Snow-Flamer spoke about the Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities for Noncredit Courses attachment. The Deans and Directors will be responsible for noncredit courses that lead to a credit program, while Julia Peterson will remain responsible for noncredit courses that do not lead to a credit program. Keith also reported that Chancellor Brice Harris will be able to attend the Student Success Summit on January 30 as the keynote speaker, and that Mr. Harris will also be looking over the campus and our operations. Keith, President Smith and the Deans will all be traveling to HSU to discuss ADTs and HSU’s obligations as a CSU.
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6.2 ASCR Update: Jerred Scheive reported that due to last Spring’s election problems, their session has started a little late on September 19. The budget is approved and Senate training will be on Sunday. Funding has been approved for ASCR representation to the General Assembly in November; they approved a Task Force to implement AB1358 (Student Body Association: Student Representation Fee) which directs that $1 goes to [ASCR] Senate and $1 goes to State Senate; they are developing their event calendar, so let them know if you still need student committee representatives; Jerred and ASCR have been working on a new governing document for ASCR and is excited about getting it passed! Jerred looks forward to working with the Academic Senate this year. There are 14 available seats on ASCR Senate, and they still only have 10 of them filled.

7. Announcements and Open Forum
7.1 Faculty Meeting Scheduled for October 31, from 2:50 to 3:50 PM in the Boardroom!
7.2 No January 16 Closed Session Required for Tenure Review Committee Recommendations; faculty were sent the MOU that outlines the revisions to the tenure review procedures.
7.3 Upcoming CR Events (please announce any events!):
   - SCIENCE NIGHT! Friday, October 24 at 5 PM on Campus
   - Counselor’s Day November 7; will necessitate a late start for Senate (1:45 pm)
   - Wednesday, November 12 at 4 pm in HU 110 there will be a Town Hall with Faculty and the President.

8. Adjournment: On a motion by Peter Blakemore, seconded by Sandra Rowan, the meeting was adjourned at 2:34 pm.
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