

**Academic Senate  
April 7, 2010  
Unapproved Minutes**

**Members Present:** Debbie Bogh, TL Brink, Robert Brown, Tom Bryant, Jodi Hanley, Steve Hellerman, James Holbrook, Denise Hoyt, JoAnn Jones, Liz Langenfeld, Damaris Matthews, Meridyth McLaren, Robert O'Toole, Catherine Pace-Pequeno, Scott Rippy, Gary Williams, Sherri Wilson

**Members Absent:** Daniel Bahner, Kenneth Bryson, Catherine Hendrickson, Jessica McCambly, Mario Perez, Snezana Petrovic, Frances White

**Guests:** Gloria Harrison, Cheryl Marshall, Kim McCormick, Charlie Ng, Marina Serna

Academic Senate President Scott Rippy called the meeting to order at 3:08.

**I. Reports**

A. Administrative Report

Gloria Harrison reported that we working on various tasks – EMP, district strategic plan, allocation plan and HR plan. Info will be distributed electronically. Notices for open forums will also be sent out.

52 SERPS – 11 on this campus. Many positions will not be replaced.

Budget still up in the air due to state budget also not solidified.

We need to be able to tell the accreditation team in the fall that we have completed their recommendations.

Will Gloria be going back to meet with the commission? Will be given the opportunity in January 2011.

Reorganization of divisions? Is it finalized? If no, do we know when it will be finalized? No, don't want to put anything out until it is more determined.

Will the reorganization affect divisions? May affect who gets replaced.

B. Treasurer's Report

The balance stands at \$4408.93.

C. CTA Report

Will be having an election. No candidate for PT rep at CHC. Any suggestions please refer them to Steve for info about running. Currently most positions are uncontested, but still need to vote. Picnic – May 2<sup>nd</sup>, Sylvan Park

D. Classified Senate Report – none

E. Student Senate Report

Today was last day for student elections. Ballots counted, results will be announced tomorrow. Meeting with the student senate from Valley to compare notes about activities. Negative Checkoff for ASB fee.

Revenues are down to AS. Want to go back to having fees taken automatically – if students don't want to pay they have to check the box.  
Planting trees this weekend up in the mountains.  
Practicing dancing for the Gala.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

March 24, 2010

**Motion:** To approve the minutes (O'Toole, Brown, MSC)

**III. Academic Senate President's Report**

- A. District strategic plan is going forward. Now the committee is working on the objectives and timelines. Will be distributed for feedback.
- B. Planning and Program review – have made changes, done an incredible amount of work. Reports have been submitted to the president. Trying to make sure handbook and forms are consistent. There has been no feedback to or from the faculty and departments who participated in this process 2 semesters ago. Making changes without feedback. Any department who did Program review have received feedback. Annual Plans have gone to the Deans. Priorities have been drafted based on info in the plans. Scott will look into process. All departments should get feedback in the year it is submitted. Is now the time to give feedback to the committee? They are beginning to do their own review and they will gather information from the departments who were reviewed. Departments are going to be held to the plan. If there has been no feedback then the department must assume that the plan was perfect. What do we do with the feedback from Program Review? Use it to create your annual plan the following year. 2<sup>nd</sup> year – you would look the effectiveness of the changes and report on that. Then the next year you would be back to Program Review. In the past there have not been enough people or time to read all of the plans and reviews and providing feedback. This year the change was made in how the plans were moved forward to ease the burden on the 6 members of the committee. Need to continue to look at process.

**IV. Old Business**

- A. District Management Hiring Policy – tabled at District Assembly due to Vice Chancellor's absence.
- B. A point of order - last meeting there was a motion that was not on the agenda. This is not allowed. New business – D – because this was not on the agenda, this motion was out of order. Need to withdraw the motion from last meeting and have put it on this agenda. Liz Langenfeld withdrew the motion. Need to make sure we are consistent with adhering to parliamentary rules.
- C. Peer evaluation assignment process – evaluation section of the contract was sent out. States that peer reviewers should be knowledgeable about content areas. Does this open up previous evals to being contested?

Peer evaluators should be evaluating on an instructors abilities in general, but this clause says knowledgeable. Need not to restrain ourselves to the point of being impractical.

Some faculty having issues with the way they are being assigned to do evals. Not being asked but being assigned. Perhaps we need to create a handbook for future AS presidents about previous procedures or agreed upon interpretation on contract requirements.

Perhaps the AS president should contact the Faculty Chair for feedback about who would be qualified or recommended. Issue with the eval process for non-instructional faculty. There are different forms. The tools committee will address these form issues.

Who is the tools committee? Scott just got an e-mail saying he needs to appoint someone to that committee.

TL willing to serve, Kim McCormick and Jim Holbrook.

Need to have protocol for how evaluators are chosen. Can there be a protocol for a faculty member requesting a change of the AS appointed peer evaluator? There are some issues with being able to refuse an evaluator so you get someone you like or want. Perhaps we should have an adhoc committee to make these decisions so that it isn't the responsibilities of one person. In the past there was a discussion between the President and VP. Clarifying the peer choosing process is a good undertaking. Also need to include more issues, such as the entire process. Scott will write up a clarifying protocol for choosing peer evaluators, bring it to the body for feedback.

## V. New Business

### A. Allocation Model

Accreditation recommendation to be more planful and transparent.

How is the district deciding how much money they need to take? Using previous budget numbers – will convene a committee to look at their budget more critically.

**Motion:** to extend discussion upto 20 more minutes (Holbrook, O'Toole MSC)

KVCR using general funds to pay personnel, fundraising is used for programming.

Who is the governing board of KVCR? The board.

This is the first time we have seen a model like this in the district. Things can change – numbers are based on the current State budget. The model is what is the focus at this point.

Given current numbers, we will be short. District has discussed making cuts to their budget so that our allocation isn't reduced so much.

Comments – shows significant progress, would like to see model with actual numbers – not a model or illustration.

Does the district publish their expenditures/final budget? Yes, it is on the district site.

If anyone has any comments please submit them in writing to Scott Rippy.  
They will be forwarded to the committee.

- B. Spring Plenary – Resolutions and attendance
- VI. Announcements
  - Opera – The Magic Flute – very creative presentation.
  - Wednesday, April 21<sup>st</sup> – Service to Your Community. 30 organizations will be on campus to recruit for internships and volunteerism. 10 pm -1:00 pm
  - Looking for 2 faculty for the SBCCD Assembly. Any suggestions for candidates, let Scott know.
- VII. Statements from the public (including faculty and staff)
  - None
- VIII. Adjournment
  - Adjourned at 4:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Meridyth S. McLaren