

Academic Senate
MINUTES
November 1, 2006
3:00 p.m. - BC214

Members Present: Ignacio Alarcon, Blake Barron, Barbara Bell, Susan Broderick, Dixie Budke, Cathie Carroll, Esther Frankel, Tom Garey, David Gilbert, Kelly Lake, Ray Launier, Linda Lowell, Kathy Molloy (Chair), Kim Monda, Marcy Moore, Elida Moreno, Kathy O'Connor, Jan Schultz, Sheri Shields, Oscar Zavala

Member(s) Excused/Absent: Eric Borlaug, Jack Friedlander

Guest(s):

1.0 Call to Order (3:00-3:05)

- 1.1 Approval of Agenda – w/added information and discussion items so approved

2.0 Information (3:05-3:10)

- 2.1 EOPS/CARE counselor

This is a hearing position and paid for by categorical funds. President Romo would like to make this a permanent position funded by categorical monies and counted as part of the Full-time Faculty Obligation. He has offered to come to the Senate and explain his position and answer any questions the Senate may have about the decision.

Senate President Molloy asked the EVP about the role of the Academic Senate in this, and he said that the President of the College had the authority to make that decision. Ms. Molloy reminded the Senate that Dr. MacDougall had made the decision to have the categorically funded DSPS and EOPS positions not be counted towards the Full-Time Faculty Obligation.

This would not count towards this year's FTFO count; however, whatever the FTFO number is next year, there will be one less position available because of this decision. Concern: Could this be an unbiased ranking? What type of statement would the Academic Senate ranking make? Opinion: In reality, this would not help us achieve the goal of 75/25.

- 2.2 ESL faculty position request: NEW or REPLACEMENT

Senate President Molloy presented the rationale for making one of the new ESL positions a replacement position. Ms. Molloy studied the policy 1400 Employment of Faculty section 1411 (updated Spring 2000) where paragraph B "... needs for new and/or expanding programs" indicates to her that the recommendation should go forward. Senators pointed out that there is also a "shall consider" at the beginning of sentence.

Ms. Molloy reminded everyone the 1411 Procedures have nothing to with approval of positions. Replacement positions can be (and have been) included in the rankings. Ms. Molloy's concern is that we have a policy with language that would seem to indicate that one of the ESL positions should be called a replacement position.

Ms. O'Connor stated the bigger issue is that whenever a new program is created, that information/plan should be brought to the Senate along with a new faculty member request. If/when approved, that program with a new faculty member would automatically vacate another program for a true replacement. The ESL situation does not seem to qualify as a true replacement. There is no change being made to the FTFO; it's an assignment change. If the department opposes a change in their department, they should come forward to the Senate to discuss it.

Question: In 2000 when this first occurred, did ESL request a new position? Some history: The last new hire is Marit Ter Mate-Martinsen, who is in her second year. Part of the rationale for this new position may have been that a faculty member moved 50% to a new program. Everyone else has been a replacement. ESL had been approved for a full-time position before 2004 and the budget was frozen. Departments are not always consulted on changes.

Reminder: Automatic approvals do not always occur. The Senate has traditionally been firm that, if it is not a direct vacancy, it is not considered a replacement. There are always changes going on. Many departments are down positions.

The situation in ESL didn't occur all at once. It happened over time. It comes down to semantics at this point, and when the Senate ranks, they rank according to the merits, not whether it is called a replacement or new position.

M/S/ To move one of the two new ESL faculty position requests to a replacement position and that a hearing be required (Moreno/Bell)
M/S/D Move the ESL change request to action (Monda/Moore) 5 yea 11 nay 3 abstentions – motion defeated

3.0 Hearing/Discussion (3:10-3:15)

3.1 Library Collection Development Policy

The Committee on Teaching and Learning has reviewed and approved.

3.2 Planning and Resources: Next Step

President Molloy had asked each Senator to consider next steps for the faculty response to the Long Range Capital Construction Priorities. P& R did not want to do any ranking and wanted this to be a representative decision from the Senate. Each Senator was asked to comment.

English Division – B. Bell generally speaking would like to prioritize in some way

PE/Athletics – K. O’Connor would like a careful discussion with reps from CPC and P&R participating and faculty should make a statement on some of these items

Mathematics – I. Alarcon would like more participation with P&R

Sciences – B. Barron would most likely favor some sort of tiered (not individual) ranking system

Sciences – J. Schultz accept the P&R report as is and forward to CPC

Social Sciences – R. Launier asked that the Social Sciences Division named and included along with English and Math Departments regarding the need for General Classroom expansion, rehabilitation and renovation in the IDC building.

Social Sciences – C. Carroll felt she was too new to the Senate – pass

Health Tech/Human Svcs – S. Shields felt that P&R did a good job; before going forward the Senate should review and rank

ESL/Foreign Languages – E. Moreno agrees with Sheri Shield’s recommendation

Fine Arts – T. Garey pointed out that the state has a provision where colleges can apply for funding the modernization of a building 30 years or older to extend its useful life and bring it up to code. Typically the state even with bond funds only provides approximately 60% of the cost, and the balance would need to be funded locally. Thus, even with the state funding a project like SOMA, an additional \$10-20 million in local funds would be required. This is a unique opportunity that needs further discussion and some prioritizing to make a recommendation.

Fine Arts – L. Lowell agreed with Tom Garey.

Health Tech/Human Svcs – K. Lake agreed with Linda Lowell and Tom Garey

Technologies – D. Budke would like further discussion to see how everything could be arranged and would also like to know what our compliance issues are.

Business – E. Frankel would like to discuss prioritizing the report – after CPC because the report may change.

Adjunct Faculty Rep – M. Moore would like to prioritize

English – K. Monda and P and R would like the Senate to prioritize.

Mathematics – D. Gilbert unsure if it can be ranked – would like to do a section 1, section 2 see how that works.

Educational Support – S. Broderick recommends developing priority categories

Note: most of the projects in the report require some kind of local funding

3.3 Faculty Recognition Committee liaison, Kelly Lake, reported the nominee for the Hayward Award for Excellence in Education is Dr. John Kay.

M/S/C To suspend the rules and move the Hayward Award nominee to action (Moreno/Frankel)

M/S/C To approve the Faculty Recognition Committee’s recommendation of Dr. John Kay as the Hayward Award nominee (O’Connor/Alarcon)

4.0 Action (3:15-4:00)

4.1 Department Program Review

AP has provided their concerns/input. The EVP has addressed all of AP's concerns in the document with the exception of public accountability and the unreliability of the statistics on majors and transfers. The EVP agreed the review shall be biennial (every two years) not bi annual (twice per year).

The Senators expressed concerns:

- How to make/report revisions to the program report once presented.
- Section 4175.2.2 what type of SLO data?
- Still seems burdensome to dept. chairs
- Individual grades
- 4174.3 focus of the statistical data is on decline; language added to address plan of action in writing is still there re: grade distribution
- Declaring a major doesn't mean that much
- Edit document/language structure/shorter sentences needed; #c content is redundant
- The report will be longer than 3 pages if every requirement is addressed
- The policy is longer than the report should be
- There needs to be a template

The Senators suggested:

- Create ad hoc committee to edit/condense Policy w/B. Bell (chair); L. Lowell; D. Gilbert; K. Monda; and E. Hodes to rewrite policy
- Remove item about collecting aggregate data on SLOs at end of policy; we're not at that point yet.
- Separate policy/procedure
- Revisit K. Lake program review and develop a policy based on that review
- Return the completed policy to the first Spring 07 Senate meeting

M/S/C To wait until the first Senate meeting of Spring 2007 to return Program Review Policy rewrite for action (Broderick/O'Connor)

4.2 Spring 2008 calendar

Ms. Molloy reported that the deans would take a proactive role to make the calendar decision work, possibly offering some workshops/short unit courses during the winter break.

The Senators held a lengthy discussion about the academic implications of having two Monday holidays during a semester; having a two 3-day holidays or one 4-day holiday in February and how that affects students with children; when to hold spring break.

M/S/C To end debate/discussion (Garey/O'Connor)

M/S/C To accept option III where January 28 Spring Semester begins the Monday after MLK holiday (Shields/Barron) 16 yea 2 nay

M/S/C To have Spring break 2007 held the first week in April.
(O'Connor/Monda)

M/S/D To have two 3 day weekends in February where Feb. 8 is observed as
Lincoln's Holiday (O'Connor/Alarcon) Tie vote / President voted against

M/S/C To have one four day weekend beginning February 16-19, 2007
(Garey/Monda) 12 yea; 5 opposed; 1 abstention

5.0 Reports (4:00-4:05)

6.0 Adjourn