

**Academic Senate
September 2, 2009
Unapproved Minutes**

Academic Senate President Scott Rippey called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

Members Present: Daniel Bahner, T.L. Brink, Robert Brown, Tom Bryant, Jodi Hanley, Steve Hellerman, Catherine Hendrickson, Jim Holbrook, Denise Hoyt, JoAnn Jones, Liz Langenfeld, Damaris Matthews, Jessica McCambly, Meridyth McLaren, Bob O'Toole, Catherine Pace-Pequeno, Mario Perez, Snezana Petrovic, Scott Rippey, Gary Williams, Sherri Wilson

Members Absent: Ryan Bartlett, Jane Beitscher, Debbie Bogh, Ken Bryson, Diane Pfahler, Frances White

Guests: Cheryl Marshall, Kim McCormick, Karen Peterson, Rebecca Warren-Marlatt

I. Administrative Report

None

II. Approval of Minutes

A. May 6, 2009

Motion: To accept with correction to attendance. (Jones, Petrovic, MSC)

Discussion None

B. August 19, 2009

Motion: To accept (Bahner, Wilson, MSC)

Discussion: Statements should have names, with no names it appears that the Senate is saying this. Would be able to identify the person, is this a problem? Often we speak for a group. Which voice is it? The personal or the voice of a group? Need to add this issue of amount of detail and format to a future agenda.

III. Treasurer's Report

Added \$200 in direct payment as well as faculty dues from payroll deduction. The balance stands at \$3202.05.

IV. Other Reports

A. Classified Senate Report

None

B. Student Senate Report

Yolanda Cooley – New SS rep. Sports Day coming. Ice cream social for club advisors coming soon. Club charters due Sept. 11

C. Senate President's Report

1. A copy of the report will also be sent to all faculty. Off to a good start. Preparing for the October progress report. There will be open forums to discuss and question. Gloria and Matthew Lee will attend AS meetings to report. We will have 9 days to make comments – comments due October 18th.
2. Scott spoke with Cheryl Marshal about progress on SLOs – everyone seems to be working diligently.

V. **Old Business**

A. Discussion of new committee authority/prevue/charges

1. SLO committee

Handout about Cheryl's thoughts and ideas. These are not set in stone - just a potential starting point.

Not intended to be a policing committee – more of a place for dialogue.

The committee would discuss a college wide assessment plan.

2. Accreditation committee

Steering committee would gather information, check in about progress. Set up training for faculty and staff.

These need to be joint committees where differing perspectives can be expressed and discussed. If we all come together it is easier to see the whole elephant – rather than just pieces.

We can't do some of the charges if you don't have an institutionally wide committee. To create institutional proficiency we need to have all parts contribute.

Cheryl urges us to consider a joint committee. Two committees could potentially create problems.

(Cheryl chose to leave the meeting to allow open discussion.)

Questions/Discussion

What does she want from us today? Consensus? Discussion?

Depends where we are in the discussion. Don't want to make rash decisions, but something needs to be decided quickly.

Often hear of the need for campus wide input, but past experience has not been supportive of that process.

Can't control everything, but need to make the effort.

Upcoming situations are going to require that we collaborate.

In these two areas the rug can't be pulled out on us because these are our responsibilities. They are academic matters. Collaborating will not weaken us or remove our ability to assess our own programs. If we stand up for our decisions then admin can't not listen to us.

What would be the make up of this committee? Who would determine how many of each group would participate? Scott addressed this issue with Cheryl as well.

Would this be an academic Senate committee? If it is a joint committee it would be under the President.

We will need to collaborate to make decisions but we need to make sure we do our role. If we don't take our role then someone else will.

Chairs Council voted to allow the VP of Instruction to determine the agenda for one meeting a month to allow her to discuss some issues. This should be reflected in the minutes so that the knowledge is more widespread. Faculty have the most responsibility for SLOs.

Faculty in the meetings and at Senate should disseminate the information that was discussed.

We may need to develop some guidelines for keeping minutes.

The issue is whether we are going to have 2 or 1 committee? There is going to be a joint committee regardless if there is a Senate Committee.

How many faculty requested to be on these committees? One – same person for each.

Size and structure of the committee? Need to establish these guidelines.

What do we want input on?

- Number of faculty
- Composition of committee – ability of people to participate - representation
- Charges
- How members selected
- Authority and leadership
- (Faculty rep will be selected by AS – according to law – doesn't have to be just senate members)
- How will we communicate
- Connection between communication and decisions
- How large will the committee be
- Need to have fresh representation – not just use the same people over and over.
- A code of professional conduct – rules of engagement
- Cooperative problem solving – does not mean homogenizing
- Relationship/Integration of this committee with other decisions making bodies at this institution and district - avoid isolation

If we can get agreement of all of these areas would we agree to have one campus wide committee for SLOs and one committee for Accreditation? And not have a separate senate committee? Yes

Could we have a sub committee of the joint that is an Academic committee? Have we had a conversation with the classified senate? Need to let them identify the Staff role and then take those to the President's Cabinet.

How will the information that is discussed at these meetings be distributed? What will happen with the information? How will we institutionalize the learning?

Motion: Move to endorse one universal SLO committee and one universal Accreditation committee the set of criteria will be forwarded to the classified and admin for input. Results will be brought back to our next meeting (Holbrook, O'Toole, MSC)

Commendation by VP of Student Services for taking this step.

VI. New Business

A. Revision of by-laws – First reading

Request to include rationales with changes in the future.

Motion: To approve for first reading (Holbrook, Matthews, MSC)

Discussion - none

Motion: Suspend committee reports (Matthews, O'Toole, MSC)

VII. Committee Reports

- A. Curriculum
- B. Student Interests
- C. Personnel Interests
- D. Educational Technology
- E. Honors Steering
- F. Chairs Council
- G. Scholarship
- H. Educational Policy
- I. Planning and Program Review
- J. District Assembly

VIII. CCA Report

Luncheon 2 weeks from today – Sept 16th at 11:30 in the Crafton Room

IX. Announcements

None

X. Statements from the Public

Thanks to the police and fire crews for their work in putting out the fire.

Welcome Back BBQ – 9/11 -11:30-1:30

Fire on campus – tried to call 5050- no answer.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Meridyth S. McLaren
Secretary