

## Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting

Tuesday, February 22, 2011

Members present: Nancy Schur, Kelly Locke, Jennifer Fellguth , Janet Pessagno, Larry Adams, Sunita Lanka, Mark Weber, Alejandra Gutierrez, Chris Moss.

Guests: Dolores Davison. Carole Bogue Feinour

1. The meeting was called to order by the President Nancy Schur and the Agenda was unanimously adopted. The president introduced Dolores Davison , The North representative of the State wide Academic Senate to the senate members.
2. Public Comments: There were no public comments.
3. President's Report: Nancy announced that the Board Of Trustees were convening a Board Development meeting (on the Brown Act and Legislative requirements) on March 15<sup>th</sup> at 5pm in the Training Room of the Call building. She invited the senate to join the meeting.

She also announced the Auto Collision discontinuance study group has determined that the initial findings indicated the need to proceed to the second phase of the discontinuance process.

Dolores Davison enlightened the members of the structure and functioning of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The state was divided into 4 area groups: A - the North, B – the Bay area, C – Los Angeles and D – San Diego. The State Academic Senate has 10 senators and 4 officers to serve over 60,000 full time faculty across the state. She elaborated on the state wide committees, their duties and activities. Committee meetings are held in turns at the north, south and other area headquarters. Issues affecting colleges individually were discussed at the Area meetings that were held twice a year. They were open to all. She also recommended that the senate members subscribe to the Community College League of California. The schedule of meetings and conferences was accessed on the website for members to view. She reiterated that they were an Advisory Board, and the Statewide Senate exercised power and access over decisions /actions affecting academic and professional matters at the community college level. The state wide and local senates were important because they were in control of the decisions made. Local union members' participation as senate members was a great help.

4. Discussion Items :
  - A. Equivalence to minimum qualifications for Academic Personnel: Kelly led the discussion and stated that the reason to revise the policy was to enhance the quality of instruction. The Administration supported more stringent modifications and there were questions about the motivation of the administration, and if it could compel its faculty to go

through the equivalency process in a separate discipline than the one for which they are hired originally. Kelly replied that the new process emphasizes the candidate's responsibility in demonstrating equivalency and filling in the forms, so the question of compulsion does not arise and wording was there specially for faculty who desired course assignments in areas other than their specific disciplines. The discussion consisted of examining and revising the policy to make it more effective. 45 units in the general education course work in addition to required discipline seemed reasonable compared with 120 general units in the Bachelor's.

The coursework requirement to seek equivalency for a Master's degree must include master's level research is an added phrase that the senate body supported.

Coursework provided evidence of work. Work experience alone is not being used for Master's prepared category. The burden of proof was with the candidate to indicate this. Candidates with Community College Credentials would be exempt from this because they have equivalency based on the Board of Governor's minimum qualifications document. There were concerns if full time, tenured faculty would be affected by this. Alejandra talked of her own case and clarification was made that equivalency would be required and faculty teaching NIC only would be re-evaluated like adjunct faculty. There was debate on whether the sentence regards "NIC" should be dropped and the senate members unanimously agreed to drop it. The senate members were assured that they would get to review the final draft before voting.

- B. Proposed Administration Structure: Nancy began the discussion by asking members to respond to Suzanne Flannigan's presentation on the proposed administrative structure. Some of the positives were more communication, opportunities for productive interaction, clear lines of responsibility and consequent accountability. There were concerns regards function areas because expertise was crucial in the content areas. There seemed to be support for the Dean structure and not Departmental Chairs. On behalf of the Social sciences department there was a very strong preference for this. Senate members echoed the same opinion and there was a general consensus that the ideal candidate would be a successful faculty member who also had knowledge of administration. To senate members' concerns Nancy assured that faculty would be involved in the process. Carole added that it was necessary to be specific about the required qualifications to reflect specific concerns. It was unanimously agreed that Suzanne would be welcome at a general senate meeting. No special meeting was required.
- C. Tenured faculty Review Process: Nancy suggested that we could model this process after a course (Education Scholar) she was taking.

It would be productive if faculty share their pedagogy, their teaching strategies and more transparency in sharing knowledge and classroom techniques. There was a general concern that student, faculty and administrative evaluations alone were inadequate to review performance. It was not merely filling in forms and reviewing observations. It

ought to be more meaningful and goal oriented. Kelly stated that the post tenure process was part of the negotiations.

There were two options:

1. It could remain the same
2. Totally restructuring the post evaluation process

There were concerns/questions regarding faculty members who were not evaluated this year. Nancy clarified that this decision was still to be negotiated, but had stopped with the support of Senate due to the process deviating from contract. Larry's suggestion to have a sub-committee to review the post tenure process met with a very strong affirmation from the senate members. A motion to have Larry, Mark, Nancy and Alejandra as members of the sub-committee was moved and was unanimously approved by the senate members.

5. Action Items: NONE
6. Senate Education: Larry informed the senate members about the senate constitution, the bylaws, articles - specified details on the terms of office, the steering committee, the Brown Act, Amendment of Constitution – an overview of the duties and responsibilities of senators and what constituted the standing committees like the Faculty Hiring committee, ACE committee, SLOs committee, Program Planning and Assessment Committee, RAC and the Faculty Development Committee. Larry promised to provide copies to members.
7. SB 1440 Update and Curriculum Committee – Tabled to next meeting
8. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.