REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Meeting of the Academic Senate
 Eureka: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road, SS 202 (Board Room)
 Fort Bragg: 440 Alger St (Fine Woodworking)
Friday, May 2, 2014, 1:00 pm

MINUTES

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

1. Call to Order: Co-President Brown called the meeting to order at 1:03 pm.

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Co-President Brown welcomed the Senators and audience and called for public comments. No comments were forwarded.

3. Approve the April 18, 2014 Meeting Minutes: On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Steve Brown, the minutes were approved as written.

4. Action Items
   4.1 Approve April 25 Curriculum Committee Recommendations: On a motion by Steve Brown, seconded by Peter Blakemore, George Potamianos answered a question about the math labs and non-repeatability strategies - each class may have its own math lab, so the Math Lab as it exists today may disappear. Kevin Yokoyama will bring the matter to his division meeting right after this meeting. The recommendations were approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown, S. – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Foster – y; Johnston – y; Mays – y; Vicory – y.

   4.2 Approve Revised Curriculum Committee (CC) Bylaws: On a motion by Kady Dunleavy, seconded by Peter Blakemore: George Potamianos was available for questions. Dave Bazard reported that his division is divided equally on the subject and that he remained curious about why the Articulation Officer (AO) would need to vote when they can always voice their opinion. John Johnston asked for more rationale as promised at the last meeting, and George provided information from the minutes of the CC meeting (You may find the discussion for CC in Agenda item 5.2 at http://inside.redwoods.edu/Curriculum/documents/04.11.14CurriculumMinutes.pdf) where it was discussed. Having the AO as a voting member would demonstrate to ACCJC and other entities that our institution realizes the importance of AO involvement and would perhaps make the AO more apt to speak up if they knew that their opinion held more weight. As to the order of the vote – it is always alphabetical. The recommendations were approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown, S. – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Foster – y; Johnston – y; Mays - y; Vicory – y.

5. Reports
   5.1 Student Equity Plan (SEP)-Student Equity Annual Plan Progress Report: Tracey Thomas reported that according to BP 5300 Student Equity The SEP is tasked with reporting the status of actions in the Student Equity Plan. She explained the attachment and brought a document that was the actual 2013-14 plan (this document may be found at http://inside.redwoods.edu/senate/documents/HandoutatMeeting-5.1aSEP2013-14AnnualPlan.pdf). Feedback included Dave Bazard thanking them and saying he was very impressed with the report and how open the progress report was. The report will also be given to College Council and the Board of Trustees.
5.2 2013-14 CTE Advisory Committee Report: Jeff Cummings reported that AP 4102 Occupational/Vocational Technical Programs outlines advisory committee guidelines and reporting procedures. Minutes of meetings are available online (http://inside.redwoods.edu/pac/). Kady asked why nursing was not included; they met too recently to be included in the attached report. Dave commented about other advisory committees that may not be on the CTE list, or have not provided minutes; committee reporting has been problematic for the Program Advisory Committees (PAC); ADCT, for instance, is one of those not updated online and is not even on the attached list, and the hope is that this report would bring about an institution-wide conversation about better communication and adherence to policy regarding reporting. Some do not have an established committee. Connecting all information online is important. Independent advisory committees are areas that should be strengthened and there is certainly room for progress and improvement. How are advisory committee members derived? The intent is to be inclusive, but the members are generally people who are available, willing, and who have contacted us (or been contacted), and we also try to be respectful of the faculty within each field. Jeff encouraged all faculty to continue to bring in new blood, and that they tried a district-wide advisory committee meeting in the fall – it is a challenge to get members, especially ones that need to travel or come after a day of classes to make it to meetings. It is really the faculty who “own” the advisory committee. Programs lacking a full-time faculty member definitely have a huge disadvantage, both for the program as a whole and for finding advisors.

5.3 Program Review Update: Joe Hash spoke to the process for program review. As his first year on the Program Review Committee (PRC), he welcomed the members of the group who had more experience and got him up to speed. In September they finalized templates, got them to Dr. Hill who populated templates; then templates were disseminated to Deans/Directors. Authoring was not the PRC purview, just the templates. Each year it seems that the data shows more programs to review as areas begin using the process. Dr. Hill proposed a rubric, looked at best practices, and on Nov. 22 the PRC approved her rubric. Terms used are “Exemplary”, “Acceptable”, and “Developing”. Completed March 28, and the PRC feedback was sent to Deans/Directors. Every program should have received their feedback or have been able to access their review online. Tech services presented an electronic template for submitting online reviews. Due to changes that have already happened, we stuck to the same process this year. We will vet the electronic template to constituents for reviews/suggestions/remarks and try to implement an online review process in future.

5.4 Marketing Update: Paul DeMark showed us the “Ready for a Change” post card that will be sent to the community. A class in market research was responsible for the postcard trying to get NEW students. We would like to do something similar for ADTs that would supply the same type of information, and he has meetings set up with the faculty in each of the current five ADTs to help with that project. If it goes well, we would do it for Transfers, too. The web task force would like to have a new website up by next fall; make it more streamlined, interesting, and with more ease of navigation. There are funds to support summer class promotions on radio, television, little bit of print. Web tiles are showing up on Lost Coast and other sites; will change to Fall promotions on July 1; high school flyers for Eureka, Arcata and McKinleyville and their counselors will promote; Angela Winkle will promote in DN; also advertising in The Lumberjack, KHSU, The Pepperbox (http://thepepperbox.com/). Marketing
student surveys found two primary things; students are looking for transfer
opportunities and career technical programs or GETTING A JOB. #1 marketing
advantage promotions is that we are affordable but we also have excellent teaching
faculty! You may find the postcard at www.redwoods.edu/getahead/.

5.5 IEC Proposed Institution-Set Standards and Targets: (*This report was moved up and
given right after agenda item 5.1, but appears here in the order of agenda.) Co-
President Brown turned the update over to Angelina Hill who made her report and
spoke to the ACCJC needing to see this report. Plans and Targets are totally different
from Plans, but at the same time they also do set “targets”. Some targets in the
Strategic Plan included ones that were unattainable, and they learned to set attainable
targets from that experience. Basic Skills, education are essential so they added those
success rates. They are utilizing the “Seven year trend” for the “attainment floor”.
They would like to roll it out within the institutional success score card-they would
add two columns and the explanations. After the proposal is approved, it will be
publicized. “Success” is measured by a C or better, or “pass”. Time frame? Each year
they would strive for the target and most likely update the target number. Dan added
that IEC does not have a finite goal for reaching the target, but will discuss it each
year. Dan also thanked Angelina for putting together this report in such a wonderful
way. Dave mentioned that it was good that we got these targets set so early, because
they learned at the Assessment Institute that other colleges have been setting their
targets low to look good, while others made the process too complex which opens
them up for retribution. These are almost like meeting your accreditation standards: if
you don’t meet them, you’re not always in trouble, but if you don’t have them or are
treating them lightly, that’s when you get in trouble. IEC reports to ACCJC their
standards and achievements every year. Some schools are starting to set institution
standards at the program level but we are doing it one step at a time. Will it be
reported at Convocation? Yes, and to the Expanded Cabinet and the Board before
convocation to get their buy-in. The table is great in order to get a quick glance of
progress.

5.6 College Update: Keith Snow-Flamer reported that the board packet includes a draft
document for MOU Mendocino – an editor misleadingly said that we had an
agreement, but it is still only in a draft form-next Tuesday they will meet with the
President of Mendocino College and there is still a lot of work to make sure it
happens.

5.7 College Council Update: Bob Brown: Enrollment priorities are being reviewed and
clarified. Old business: AP 4105 Distance Education has been tabled until CRFO
meets with ASPC to align and move it on to June board meeting. Brief discussion
about Emeritus privileges-there was a question about email privileges after retirement,
which is NOT current practice and discussion needs to happen with IT people about
whether they can handle the load; auto forwards, maybe? Lee Lindsey, Steven Roper
and Mark Renner will possibly do further research.

6. Announcements and Open Forum
6.1 Portugal Award Winner for 2014-15 - Shannon Sullivan
6.2 Flex Forms Due by 5 pm
6.3 Reminder: Eureka Senators VOTE for Eureka FOY/AFOY in the Senate Office!
6.4 Reminder: 2014-15 Senate Representation
6.5 Meeting Schedule 2014-15
**6.6** Reminder: Saturday, August 23 - Academic Senate Retreat

**6.7** Upcoming CR Events
No further additions were given.

**7.** Adjournment: On a motion by Peter Blakemore, seconded by Dan Calderwood, the meeting was adjourned at 2:15 pm, whereupon cookies and cheesecake was enjoyed by participants to commemorate Bob and Mark’s last Senate meeting as Co-presidents.

---

**Public Notice—Nondiscrimination:**
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**Next Meeting:**
Senate Retreat on Saturday, August 23 at 9:00 AM!