

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

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

Date 10 May 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, 10 May 2012 in LRC 604.

II. Open Forum: None

I. Roll Call: Suzie Ama, Vivian Baker, Dick Bensen, Shannon Bliss, Adnan Buxamusa, Scott Cameron, Matt Crow, Lisa Darty, Cliff Davis, Cheryl Gates, Lucila Gonzalez-Cirre, Jon Heaton, Annette Hodgins, Dennis Jensen, Matt Jones, Sarah King, Michael Metcalf, James O'Connor, Karen O'Connor, Mary O'Neal, Heather Ostash, Mary Peoples, Bonita Robison, Debra Rundell, John Stenger-Smith, Norm Stephens, Christine, Swiridoff, Laura Vasquez, Matt Wanta

III. Adding Agenda Items:

1. Program reviews have been sent back with request for changes. A motion and second was made to remove program reviews from agenda.

Discussion: The IEC program review committee sent a list of recommendations back with the program review. After reviewing the re-submitted documents, the executive board believed that further revisions were still needed.

Karen O'Connor asked if there were implications or ramifications for not having it done at this time. Corey stated there were none at this time.

Matt said that since there is no program review committee at this point, the documents are reviewed by IEC and then the Senate executive committee recommends approval or return for more revisions

Motion approved to remove from agenda.

2. AA transfer degree – came through for two readings / added to agenda.

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of 19 April 2012 – approved

IV. Closed Session: None

V. Discussion Issues:

a) Resolutions regarding Departmental Reorganization

Move and second to divide the motion – approved

Part 1 of resolution: Be it resolved that Digital Media Arts merge with Business/CIS, that Health Careers move out of Public services and merge with Human Services and Emergency Medical Technology.

Discussion: net result – zero change in number of departments. This is a logical move because it moves Human Services into a CTE program – all faculty and departments involved are in favor of the change.

Approved

2. Be it further resolved that faculty director's reassigned time be tied to the same formula as faculty chairs with an additional .1 reassigned time added to attend faculty chair meetings and complete any additional tasks not a part of their responsibility as director.

Discussion: This is inappropriate unless Senate is going to have a voice in reassigned time. Cheryl stated that in the contract outlined, job duties are defined for most director positions, so to put this with department chairs is not appropriate, especially since extra duty days will be treated similar to reassign time.

AJ, Nursing, and EMT are the current director positions

Motion failed

3. Be it finally resolved that there be no minimum reassigned time for faculty chair.

Discussion: currently Porterville and Cerro Coso receive a minimum of .3 because there is no support staff to help the chairs and because these two colleges have so many more adjuncts.

Mary O'Neal stated that this was a compromise position.

Motion Failed

Two resolutions on Humanities (the second resolution will be voted on first)

Resolution 1: Be it resolved by the Academic Senate of Cerro Coso Community College solve the problem of a lack of a Humanities Chair by merging Foreign Languages, ASL, and Film with English and Anthropology and Philosophy with Social Sciences

Be it further resolved that the merger be adopted for only one term of the Humanities Chair with point a new election for Humanities Chair be held involving the original constituency disciplines.

Resolution 2: Be it resolved by the Academic Senate of Cerro Coso Community and KCCD/CCA negotiate a memorandum of understanding that allow a member from outside Humanities to serve as chair. Be it further resolved that the term of this outside member last only one term of the Humanities Chair at which point a new election be held involving only the original constituency disciplines.

Discussion: This was a good two year solution. Jon Heaton stated there were other suggestions presented which are not being considered. Matt clarified that this recommendation did not come from administration; it came from Tuesday's Senate meeting. Faculty has had time to deal with this issue. It has been known since last semester.

If there is no outright chair of Humanities then there is no one to be compensated at the minimum amount of reassigned time.

Someone asked how a determination would be made: Who outside the department could be named chair? Does it need to be a closely related field? Will this solve the problem in two years or would this still be an issue in two years?

Resolution approved Approved

Approval of Program discontinuance Policy

Rationale unchanged

Evidence of Consultation: addition (signature page)

Discussion: Matt stated that we have every reason to believe that this process will be thoroughly tested in the fall. The questions was raised: Who determines the "involved parties" (CIC chair) – Corey said that at some point we need to know the list of people for signatures up front. Board policy says Senate has a recommendation only – it is the president who makes the final decision.

Matt said he will take this back for more clear wording

- b) Approval of Ped/Tech recommendation Techniques of Authentication.
Approved with the caveat that the wording in #3 be corrected.
- c) College council appointments: Joe Slovacek has volunteered
Approved
- d) Programs Reviews:
 - a. Approval of Library Services Program Review.
IEC recommends accepting this program as presented.
No discussion: Approved
 - b. Approval of Welding Program Review – As per discussion above, this was sent back for further corrections.
 - c. Approval of Paralegal Program Review - As per discussion above, this was sent back for further corrections.

VI. Information Issues: Covered above

VII. Reports

None due to lack of time.

VIII. Announcements: None

IX. Adjournment: 1:50