

Approved 11-14-2012

Meeting Minutes for Wednesday, October 31, 2012

West Campus, BC 214, 3:00 – 5:00 pm

Members Present: Angel Cardenas, Cindy Bower, Stan Bursten, Gordon Coburn, Steve DaVega, Melanie Eckford-Prossor, Jack Friedlander (Marilynn Spaventa for EVP), Chris Johnston, Debbie Mackie, Jennifer Maupin, Paul McDowell, Bronwen Moore, David Morris, Kenley Neufeld, Dean Nevins (President), Kathy O'Connor, Justin Perocco (student rep), Gail Reynolds, Sally Saenger, Jan Schultz, Patricia Stark, Laurie Vasquez, Dan Wrentmore
Members Absent: Jack Friedlander

Guest(s): Cornelia Alsheimer (IA/Senate Liaison), Esther Frankel, Art Olguin, Erick Pirayesh (*Channels*), Marilynn Spaventa (subbed for EVP Jack Friedlander)

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Public comment

No request was made or received.

1.2 Approval of Agenda

M/S/C To approve the current meeting agenda (O'Connor/Saenger)

1.3 Approval of Minutes 10-10-12

M/S/C To approve the meeting Minutes of October 10, 2012 (Mackie/Bower) 2 abstentions

1.4 Approval of Minutes 10-17-12

M/S/C To approve the meeting Minutes of October 17, 2012 (Bower/Mackie) 3 abstentions

1.5 Approval of Minutes 10-24-12

M/S/C To approve the meeting Minutes of October 24, 2012 (Schultz/Morris)

2.0 Reports

2.1 President Report (Dean Nevins)

President Nevins announced he would like to try something new for the liaison reports which seem to consume most of our meeting time. To strike a balance each liaison shall be given five minutes for their report. He asked the Senators to please wait until after the meeting if they had questions, or to email/phone the liaison.

President Nevins reported the last Board meeting the Trustees voted to approve a new classroom building using (the remaining) Measure V funds. Even without plans, the estimated costs are already over \$18 mil.

President Nevins also reported there would be no Exemplary Program nomination brought forward this year.

2.2 Academic Policies Liaison (Gordon Coburn)

Senator Coburn reported AP continues to work on the Grievance Policy; to separate policy from procedure.

2.3 Faculty Development Liaison (Laurie Vasquez)

Senator Vasquez reported there were no meetings to report on at this time.

2.4 Curriculum and Instructional Policies Liaison Report (Kathy O'Connor)

Senator O'Connor, with handout detailing all liaised meetings, reported on some of the highlights:

Matriculation discussed the proposed new FW grade policy; and the committee requested to review the actual policy language as soon as it is available. The formation of a new Student Success Initiative workgroup to work on the Initiative that goes into effect Fall 2014 and the call for faculty to serve was also discussed.

ITC discussed becoming a subgroup to the Lab Advisory Workgroup. Also discussed was the health and safety concern for the Journalism department in their current location and finding a suitable alternative location.

CAC it is business as usual. Monday next will be the first Prerequisite Review Committee meeting and departments, that wish to have a math or English course as a prerequisite, would need to be represented at the meeting.

CPC A) hired the former President of Moorpark College, as a consultant to work with CPC at a retreat, on revising our mission statement, which would then go through the consultation approval process. B) discussed in detail was zero based budgeting and before that gets approved, Dr. Gaskin was asked to provide something in writing on the concept. C) Integrated Planning workgroup - a consultation workgroup - to discuss how to integrate all the plans on campus in order to develop a better planning process. D) extensively discussed Continuing Education and to wait until after the election to make any decisions.

2.5 Planning and Resources Liaison Report (Kenley Neufeld)

President elect Neufeld reminded everyone that all Program Reviews are due November 21, 2012. P&R discussed and determined it was appropriate for the committee to review future projects related to the bond Measure items and compare it to the Measure V document prepared in 2006. Most of P&R's time was spent discussing the proposed new classroom building. Dr. Friedlander presented some of his thoughts on the classroom building as did Priscilla Butler, a P&R member, with her written analysis. Four options were identified for the new classroom building. Option 1 has a variety of room sizes and moves everyone from the temporary buildings into the new building. Option 2, the original idea, where all classrooms are the same size. Option 3 would be a combination of classrooms and offices housing a specified set of disciplines. Option 4 would have a mix of classroom sizes to match course placement (actual need to be evaluated later). P&R plans to recommend a building configured to meet the most needs and a possible combination of options and a minimum of 36 classrooms. To be determined; if all portables are to be removed.

2.6 IA Liaison Report (Cornelia Alsheimer-Barthel)

Liaison Alsheimer reported there will be a vote as soon as possible to ratify 1) the increased District contribution towards health benefits 2) IA constitution changes in the event of a tie vote from drawing of lots to a run off election and in the event that the status of a board member changes. Liaison Alsheimer added that she was elected Treasurer to the state CCCI Board.

2.7 EVP Report (Marilynn Spaventa for Jack Friedlander)

Marilynn Spaventa reported the deans have begun the learning process for the Continuing Education transition by meeting with the areas they are going to be responsible for so that when we go forward we do so in a coordinated fashion. We are at the beginning of that process and it is going very well. Dr. Friedlander has been working on the job description for the Executive Director of the Center for Life Long Learning (CLL) and will come forward for approval, before the hiring process begins.

3.0 Unfinished Business - Action

none

4.0 Action

4.1 Ranking of full-time faculty positions.

President Nevins explained that he would like to resolve a couple of items before the ranking discussions begin. Currently we have a process where those who come before us and do not get ranked favorably, and that is, they do not get to come before us to be ranked again. End of process. Last year, we gave those who did not get a ranked position a one year exemption to come before us again. The first question to the Senate is: What should we do with those that do not get ranked again this year? And second, if they were not ranked favorably the year before, do they get to come forward again for a second year?

Senator Bursten remarked, department's that did not get a position are going to be in more and more of a bind and should be allowed to come back for a ranking regardless of how far back or how often the request has been made and the pool continues to grow.

Senator O'Connor explained originally we had a policy to not let that happen because if the position did not get ranked favorably you really needed to come back as a new position because there was probably a reason for that. We have some unique circumstances because of funding, but this should not go on and on and should start fresh.

Senator Schultz added historically replacements never had to make a case before the Senate. It was up to the deans and EVP to recommend if those positions are still worthy. We are talking about replacement positions here; through no fault of the department somebody retired at a really bad financial time. A department should be able to come back again to request a replacement position, short of a liability issue or reason determined by the dean's

council or EVP that the should not be replaced, or maybe it needs that other step in the evaluation that is not filled through Program Evaluation.

Senator Eckford-Prossor suggested another consideration could be that once we return to a budgetary time when new positions are considered we could reconsider. However, until that time what we are saying is, if you have lost someone because of retirement or death, there would be no other way for your department to come back and ask for someone again. That would be incredibly unfair. New positions are not being entertained. If we do not let departments return with their unfilled requests, it would incorrectly make what was urgent appear to not exist.

Senator Reynolds added these are hard horrible times and the replacement positions are 1's. It would be inexcusable to not allow a department to come back to request a replacement position again.

President elect Neufeld would like to approach it as a year by year discussion and decision.

M/S/C To approve that all positions that do not get ranked can come forward next year as a replacement position (Maupin/Schultz) Unanimous

The ranking ballots were handed out and President Nevins explained the positions are listed in the order they were heard and instructed the Senators they would need to rank four of the positions as a 1 (the highest priority) and then four other positions as a 2 and four as a 3 (the lowest priority).

The Senator began their deliberations on the replacement positions to be ranked. Before the voting began Marilyn Spaventa for EVP Friedlander reported these are really difficult times. All positions are worthy of being filled. We can only fill seven of the requested replacement positions. The dean's acknowledged that they would rather have filled all positions and plan to work with faculty in the demoralized departments not able to have their request fulfilled. After quite a bit of discussion, and based on two criterion, Accreditation requirements and areas that served large numbers of students in areas that adjunct faculty would be difficult to cover, the dean's made the following selections and are presented in alpha order and not in any order of priority:

Associate Degree Nursing - Allied Health	Physics
Biological Sciences - General	Psychology
Biological Sciences - Microbiology	Radiographic Technology
Chemistry	

The Senate results of the first vote:

Biological Sciences - General	Psychology
Radiographic Technology	Computer Information Systems (CIS)
Associate Degree Nursing - Allied Health	English Composition
Chemistry	English Skills
Physics	School of Modern Languages
Biological Sciences - Microbiology	Computer Applications (COMP)

M/S/C To accept the first 6 and drop the bottom four (Wrentmore/DaVega)

Only one position remained to be filled and the Senate proceeded with a run off vote between CIS and Psychology. To facilitate discussion the Senate voted on whether the principles representing CIS and Psychology should be allowed to enter into the discussion to advocate for their department and the motion failed.

M/S/D To have Esther Frankel representing CIS and Stan Bursten representing Psychology speak on behalf of their department (Moore/Coburn)

Because the ballots had been handed out and many had already voted prior to the discussion and vote to allow the chairs of CIS and Psychology to speak on behalf of their departments a vote was taken to do the vote over.

M/S/C To re-ballot (Coburn/Mackie)

The Senators proceed to vote again and the results were CIS 11 and Psychology 10.

M/S/C To ratify the final results for all seven replacement positions to be filled as follows: 1) Biological Sciences - General, 2) Radiographic Technology, 3) Associate Degree Nursing - Allied Health, 4) Chemistry, 5) Physics, 6) Biological Sciences - Microbiology, 7) CIS (O'Connor/DaVega) 1 opposed 2 abstentions

5.0 Unfinished Business - Discussion

5.1 BP 4160 / AP 4160 Establishing, Modifying or Discontinuing Programs

President Nevins explained several meetings were held over the summer to develop BP 4160, the Board Policy on establishing, modifying or discontinuing programs and the corresponding administrative procedures.

Approximately a week ago President Nevins attended an ACCJC workshop on the very same topic and integrated planning and was reassured that we were doing the very same thing when it came to best practices policies and that we are in fact on the right track. A highlight of BP4160 is that it expands the term program beyond the terms and definition of Title 5 and protects other parts of the college, e.g. athletics from being eliminated by their Trustees because they are not considered by Title 5 standards and definitions to be a program. By expanding the definition it allows us to protect those programs or at least have a sensible discussion. Other areas not considered programs would be Transfer Achievement, Career Center, Transfer Center, Gateway, Tutorial Program, any department that does not lead to a certificate or degree. We think of these as being programs when technically they are not according to Title 5. How to define program was discussed. Senator Eckford-Prossor was asked to send President Nevins the proposed revised definition.

6.0 Discussion

6.1 Timing of grade submissions

To be brought forward to next agenda

7.0 Adjourn

KEY: M/S/C – Moved/Seconded/Carried (motion is approved)

M/S/D – Moved/Seconded/Defeated (motion fails)