

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

Date 19 April 2012

Time: 12:30 p.m.

Location: LRC 604, MESCC 206, BESCC 122, KRV 2

Type of Meeting: Academic Senate Regular Meeting

Meeting Facilitator: Matt Crow, Academic Senate President

- I. **Call to Order** Matt called to order the regular meeting of the Academic Senate at 12:37 on Thursday, 19 April 2012 in LRC 604.
- II. **Open Forum: None**
- III. **Roll Call:** Susie Ama, Scott Cameron, Lucila Gonzalez-Cirre, Matt Crow, Lisa Darty, Pam Godfrey, Matt Jones, Sarah King, Corey Marvin, Mike Metcalf, Mary O'Neal, Bonita Robison, Debra Rundell, Joe Slovecsek, Christine Swiridoff, Laura Vasquez
- IV. **Adding Agenda Items:** none

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of 29 March 2012 approved with the following correction: The next board meeting is April 12th not Aug. 12th 2012).

- V. **Closed Session:** Election of student speakers moved to closed session. Nominees: Tammy Kinnan, David Santiago, Anna Moschito. Anna Moschito will not be graduating this semester. Tammy turned down the nomination. Matt asked if we want to elect another speaker or approve just one. Motion made and second to move ahead with one student speaker. David Santiago was approved.
- VI. **Discussion Issues:**
 - a. Election of Academic Senate Executive Board: Matthew Crow, President; Jan Moline, Vice president; Cheryl Gates, Treasurer; Laura Vasquez, Secretary; Lucila Gonzales-Cirre, member at large.
Motion/second to approve the nominees. No discussion. Motion approved.
 - b. Election of student speakers: Tammy Kinnan, David Santiago, Anna Moschito.
This was moved to closed session.
 - c. Approval of Ped/Tech recommendation Regular and effective contact: see attached.

The committee addressed the fact that adjuncts do not have office hours; clarification of language on regular contact hours. This was changed to "appropriate contact hours." The

committee also agreed on a grading turnaround of no more than two weeks, per Academic Senate discussion at the last meeting.

Mary O'Neal asked how we can be fair and allow for the exception (from a union standpoint). Can an instructor post a notice saying due to illness, papers will not be graded within the two-week turnaround and still be within the letter of the law. The committee saw that as appropriate.

After no further discussion, the guidelines were accepted.

- d. College council appointments: Need a vote to approve John Stenger-Smith.
Approved
- e. Approval of Professional Development Committee recommendations: These are posted on the group site.

The committee paired down the development portion. There are two parts: faculty contractual and classified. There is a sample list of acceptable flex/professional development activities; however, this is not an extensive list. Some of the activities are free, some are not. Faculty will be required to submit, by the end of each Spring, the planned activities for the following year. Plan may be updated during the year, so faculty is not locked into a specific assignment. After the activity, faculty will also need to report on how they will implement the activity.

Those who present at a workshop get twice the workshop hours, but several conditions apply.

Further discussion: The committee will be rolling out the website in about a week (for committee review), then it will be available to all faculty.

Process approved

- f. Amendment to Bylaws: Strike:

~~Section 6. A Strategic Plan Committee shall oversee the development and annual revision of the Strategic Plan and work with the Vice President of Academic Affairs to ensure its implementation. The Strategic Plan Committee is a committee of the Academic Senate and shall consist of four (4) faculty members selected as described in the Academic Senate Standing Rules.~~

Needs 2/3s majority. Strategic planning is done through College Counsel with faculty input /
Approved

- g. Election of faculty marshal: Charles Humphreys and Steve Busby have been nominated.

Discussion: does there have to be only one? Yes.

Nominations: - Steve Busby approved

h. Approval of Child Development Program Review.

The Child Development program review was emailed to faculty and is posted to the group site.

Matt stated that IEC approved 2 of the 5 program reviews to move forward. IEC is a recommending, not an approval committee. Senate needs to determine what happens to the recommendations.

Discussion: Someone asked if recommendation should stop the approval of a program review.

Matt: IEC makes the recommendation – If that recommendation is to radically modify the program review, should it come back to IEC to see if it has met the recommendations IEC or should they be reviewed by executive council or Senate?

Mary: this is such a better process than we've ever had. Let's send it back to IEC to review again and then it comes to Senate after those requests have been met.

Susie – also recommend to senate – IEC either approves or disapproves program review.

Corey – a key part of this would have to be the timeline. Program reviews need to be due by Dec 15. So it can work as long as timeline is in place.

Matt will draft language for the next meeting that outlines what powers IEC has and what the process will/should be.

Child development program review approved

VII. Information Issues:

a/ Ped/Tech Recommended Techniques of Authentication: posted on group.

Promote adoption by faculty to assure online student authentication and integrity. Primarily committee would like to see faculty using a variety of techniques that assessments happen early in the semester and are varied.

Discussion:

Instructors become familiar with students' writing style through various formats, including anti-plagiarism techniques, making students aware of these issues, and proctoring tests.

It is important to raise awareness among students about what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate academic behavior in an online class.

Proctors have more control than a lock down browsers.

Question: Are instructors required to use proctors?

Corey stated that institutions are required to have these guidelines in order to get accreditation. We meet the letter of the law, but we need more. Only have one password to get into all programs which has advantages and disadvantages. With this document – all instructors must choose one of these programs.

Students out of area are required to get their own proctor. Proctors must be approved.

How do we get information out to students? We need to find consistent ways get information out to students. DE director is working on a more consistent way to inform students of necessary requirements.

Someone suggested the college post something that says: In all likelihood, the majority of online classes will require proctored testing.

Matt suggested we change the wording in number 3 from “anti-plagiarism techniques” to “ use turnitin.com or another anti-plagiarism tool.”

Question: Can departments require everyone in their department develop these as procedures. Corey said they could if it’s a department policy/procedure – and if a faculty doesn’t use it, the faculty member can be held accountable in evaluation.

The committee will refine the document and bring it back to the next meeting.

b. Change to Program Discontinuance Policy

Significant change under rationale – initiator is now faculty or appropriate administrator.

Under procedures: #5 – suggesting that we need to have signatures of evidence of consultation, not just the wording. 5 needs to reference 2B

"Change to Program Discontinuance Policy" Mary O’Neal would like new language at the end of the document requiring signatures after this section:

5. EVIDENCE OF CONSULTATION - Provide a narrative summary demonstrating consultation with appropriate and affected entities on campus and within the community.

Corey doesn’t think language is incompatible – faculty calls for discontinuance, and it goes to committee and comes to Senate. Suggestion: IEC would produce the report that allows the discontinuance – anyone can initiate it, but IEC should write the report. Initiator should write the rationale then report written by IEC. Matt will change the wording to reflect this change with required signatures (per Mary O’Neal’s recommendation).

A motion was made and seconded to clarify the procedure and add a signature page to the narrative summary to validate the narrative. Motion carried.

VIII. Reports (only those reported above)

IX. Future Meeting Dates

Executive Council Meetings: ~~25 August, 15 September, 4 October, 20 October, 8 November, 1 December, 19 January, 2 February, 23 February, 15 March, 5 April, 26 April, 17 May.~~

Senate of the Whole: ~~1 September, 29 September, 13 October, 27 October, 17 November, 8 December, 26 January, 16 February, 1 March, 29 March, 19 April, 10 May.~~

X. Announcements

XI. Adjournment: 1:50