

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting

Tuesday, 13th September, 2011

Members present: Nancy Schur, Larry Adams, Chris Moss, Sunita Lanka, Tony Anderson, Janet Pessagno, Jennifer Fellguth, Millicent Madrigal, Liz Estrella, Steven Triano, Elsa Brisson, Mark Weber.
Absentees: Hermelinda Rocha Tabera, Alejandra Gutierrez

Guests: Kelly Locke, Carol Kimbrough, Ken Rand, Jim Riley, Jim Butler, John Sword, Mary Dominguez

Call to Order: 3:05 pm.

Adopt Agenda: M/S/P at start of meeting. Amendments to the agenda included appointments of peers. RT hiring committee was put forth by Senate President, but postponed awaiting official request from HR.

Approval of the Minutes: Minutes of 5/10/11, 5/24/11 and 8/30/11 M/S/P approved by the senate.

Public Comments (non-Senators): Ken Rand thanked the senate for listening to him at the last senate meeting. He presented a scenario of communication that could have created better relationships as having the best resources for our students is naturally the goal of all. He wanted the senate members to focus on the following issues:

Does the administration have the authority to review the text book ?

Who does have this authority?

On what basis was his text book removed from the bookstore?

Could faculty be forced to order texts with exorbitant prices?

What about using off-campus resources for books – regulations?

Review of the 2005 Academic Senate documents guarantees that the faculty will choose books for teaching. It is the Senate's responsibility to see that the faculty chooses the text book. Ken accentuated the fact that the new text looked prettier, but was not more professional than his. He reiterated his experience in writing four books and editing more than 25 books. He justified his actions – making signs/corrections in the text – was to give clarity- to improve the book. He did not believe it was unprofessional to make revisions/make hand written notes. The banning of his book curtailed academic freedom. He quoted several instances from literature and history (William Blake and Martin Luther King), example books with hand corrections accepted at Harvard and Princeton Universities, but not at Hartnell. He believed it was sheer abuse of power and instead of solving the problem it was exasperated. He was willing to spend \$300 to typeset the textbook, but he alleged that the administration did not leave him any opportunity to do that in a time frame that would allow students to use the text in Fall, and the banning of text in Fall was unwarranted, since it has been used for 20 years with higher than average course completion rates. This was a denial of his academic rights. Nancy responded by saying this gave the members plenty of food for thought. The issue is listed for discussion.

John Sword addressed the Senate beginning with complimenting the Senate on its work. He too utilizes the text authored by Ken Rand in teaching Algebra. He narrated how he got a call from Lourdes stating that Ken's book was no longer to be used. He sensed that something was amiss. He had been using the book for 11 years. He enjoyed teaching from it. He said it was a brilliant book with highly developed problems that would interest students. The hand-written changes, in fact, catch the eye of the students and help them in their accuracy. There were several compliments from students. Students drop from these beginning algebra classes because Math text books are difficult to follow and are no longer \$20 but \$200. He felt that Ken was treated with

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting

Tuesday, 13th September, 2011

no sense of decency. He strongly implored the senate to support them. Jim Butler added that the book had games making math fun and that it's a wonderful book. Ken concluded by saying that his retention rate was 85.7% in his sections of the course, and was higher than the average.

President's Report: Nancy informed the senate that 16 Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) were completed. She reminded the Senate that new work groups were being formed to look at additional disciplines such as geology, nursing and several others. If persons are interested in working on these state wide projects, please read e-mail and sign up.

The State-wide plenary session was going to be held in the first week of November. Details were available on the Academic Senate website.

Ann Wright resigned from the senate this year. She appreciates the union senate rapport.

6. Action Items

A. Appoint faculty peer evaluators for probationary faculty

Nancy announced that Carol Kimbrough was doing two peer evaluations besides chairing the curriculum committee. Carol said she valued this because she gained and learned so much from this experience. Her feedback and service is appreciated by the Senate members, we also hope for expanding interest in mentoring in order to support ongoing faculty hiring. Joe Welch's has expressed a desire to not serve as peer evaluator this year, thus his appointment for John Anderson is pending. September, when he would meet with the Senate President.. The appointment of peer evaluators from numbers 2 to 6 was moved by Larry Adams, seconded by Jennifer Fellguth and approved unanimously by the senate. The senate also delegated the authority to the steering committee to approve Joe Welch as John Anderson's peer evaluator or Barb Durham as an alternate if he does not accept the role this year. This motion was moved by Tony, seconded by Jennifer and approved unanimously by the senate.

NEW APPOINTMENTS OF PEERS FOR TENURE REVIEW

1. John Anderson (Construction) - pending
2. Daniel Ortega (PE) – Carol Kimbrough
3. Christina Esparza (Economics) - Carol Kimbrough
4. Trisha Sanford (Mathematics) –Mark Weber
5. Ralph Royer (Agriculture) –Ali Americupan
6. Val Rodriquez – Steven Triano

B. Validate current membership to committees: A motion to move the approval of the following members to the curriculum committee was moved by Larry, seconded by Mark

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting

Tuesday, 13th September, 2011

Weber and approved by all the senate members except Tony who opposed it. Tony wished to make an amendment to the agenda to add Laverne Cook as a member to the committee. Larry clarified that there was no need for this as Cook was listed as an articulate officer. The motion was approved by 4 members, not approved by 3 and 2 abstentions.

1. Curriculum Committee Members

1. Larry Adams
2. Carol Kimbrough
3. Melissa Stave
4. Mary Cousineau
5. Cheryl O'Donnell
6. Jennifer Fellguth
7. Jeannie Garcia
8. Carl Christensen
9. Teresa Carbajal
10. (Laverne Cooke approved independently – see discussion above)

7. Discussion Items

A. Ken Rand's Request to Academic Senate: Nancy informed the senate of the contract the college had with Follett which insures that no course materials would be sold independently from Follett bookstore. Clarification was desired on the interpretation of the contract language. Some indicated that it did not refer to locations off campus, but to setting up a sale of an item on campus that competed with Follet. (No Attorney's present, so the question was left.) There were questions raised on the following issues – Does the President have the authority to ask Follett to take a book off the shelf? Curriculum dictates that course outlines list "text such as or similar to" and must have discipline approval. It was stated that the Math department did select and approve Ken's book, but the question of how frequently such choices should be reviewed was brought up. The senate members unanimously agreed to support Ken's right to select course materials. Jennifer said that this was an issue about academic freedom. The Senate should send a resolution regarding what the issues are and what should be the process to be followed. Mark Weber referred to Suzanne Flannigan's letter of warning where she stated that the book was not professional. Is it the prerogative of the department or the administration to decide whether a book is adequately professional? Who should decide this? What are the criteria? Does the Board say that the Vice President maintain a

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting

Tuesday, 13th September, 2011

policy to all departments? Chris stressed the importance of clarifying the process of textbook selection. Tony maintained that micromanaging in this manner hampers the academic freedom of faculty. Liz Estrella felt the Senate response had to be thought over carefully because when a text is considered suitable for 21 years – it cannot be removed without ample considerations. One needs to spell out criteria that deem the book unprofessional. Ken clarified that his book was specially written for developmental students and it was a non-traditional text. In the past, students were having issues with the replaced “suitable” textbook and his book addressed those issues. Nancy heard the desire to make a policy on the process of selection and approval of course materials. Larry stated that we ought to make a statement to support Ken’s academic freedom and this was seconded by Millicent. The senate members were all in approval. They also agreed that the whole issue was an arbitrary abuse of power by the administration. A resolution to form a subcommittee to draft a resolution to support Academic Freedom as it applies to Ken’s situation was moved by Tony, seconded by Mark Weber and unanimously supported by the senate members. The motion to have Mark, Jennifer Fellguth, Tony and Liz as members of this sub-committee was moved by Larry and it was approved unanimously. They will bring a resolution to the next Senate meeting for review.

B. The two week add/drop survey results: Mary Dominguez thanked the senate for the opportunity to present the responses to the survey. A packet was provided that included survey results, comments, and financial, implications. She informed the senate that extending to 2 week add period had brought in \$257,000 apportionment money as there were still NEW students enrolling in the second week. She also stated she still had requests by students with faculty supporting them to add week 3, these students she sees one on one, to try and minimize the need for such exceptions going forward. The going back and forth between one and two week add periods has been a challenge for Admissions and Records and faculty alike. The goal of the Senate and of Mary would be to examine the evidence of what is best for students and to determine a fixed policy. Many of the comments supporting one or the other format reference the confusion as a detrimental. Those students that did add week two will be tracked to determine if student success is equal to those that enroll week one or earlier. The deadline to make a decision for the spring semester was the following day (14th September). There were mixed reactions from the members. Steven Triano was favorable, Chris felt that the instructor should be given the option not to add a student; Elsa said one could adopt to either format if it was predetermined by setting up one’s syllabus to either anticipate late registration or not. With such a split vote in the survey and student success data pending the completion of the semester, and the need for timely decision making for Spring, Larry suggested the senate take a spirit of the senate vote. The two week add period for Spring was supported by the Senate with a desire to review the student success data from Fall and collect it again in Spring. The topic will come back for review with the data in Spring. (Please note: adding a student week 2 is 100% in the discretion of the Faculty, as all interest groups recognize that the amount of material missed, and the ability to catch up would vary from course to course.)

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting

Tuesday, 13th September, 2011

C. Senate Goals - Proposals : Nancy suggested that we pick 2 and 3 for fall and some could be taken up in spring.

1. Amend Senate Constitution : Steven suggested that we realign the documents with the current structure.

Text book Selection: A proposal to clarify the process of textbook selection was made. Nancy reiterated that the Senators' job was to raise the level of professionalism and to participate in policy making. It was believed that lack of proper communication was the core of the issue. Everyone agreed that communication helps a great deal in eliminating issues.

2. Update Committee Handbook : As part of Accreditation our processes will need to be evaluated, with this the Handbook could be reviewed and updated.

Evaluations: Nancy informed the senate that Anne Wright had emailed the Senate asking that evaluation process for probationary, tenured, and adjunct faculty be considered a priority as it affects so many issues on campus related to instruction, the contract and processes. It is an area where policy is needed. We could also look at the senate policies of other colleges.

3. Senate Outreach :

4. Senate Education to Satellite Campuses : Steven Triano had suggestions for the new adjunct faculty. For example they were evaluated, but not given any guidance on how to plan a syllabus. They are no longer being paid to attend orientation so they don't attend. Jennifer had developed an online orientation, Senators are urged to review this. We may adopt a goal as part of the Adjunct evaluation process to include participation in orientation to expectations as part of the process.

5. Strengthen link with standing committees

6. Senator participation at State wide meetings

7. Advocate to reestablish Academic Senate Budget: Also we may want to seize an opportunity to emphasize the Senate role in budget planning process campus wide. The ASCCC.org has several documents on this topic.

8. Announcements (Senators) : Chris announced that the state wide academic senate seminar on shared governance was going to be held in Los Angeles next year. Larry Adams announced the Political Club activities such as the Board of Trustees election that was scheduled for 6th October, 2011 was postponed to a later date.

9. Adjournment: 4:55pm