

**Academic Senate  
September 17, 2008  
Approved Minutes**

Academic Senate President Rick Hogrefe called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

**Members Present:** Ryan Bartlett, Jane Beitscher, T.L. Brink, Ken Bryson, Milly Douthit, Stephanie Gomez, Amber Hammons, Jodi Hanley, Steve Hellerman, Catherine Hendrickson, Rick Hogrefe, Jim Holbrook, Denise Hoyt, Marina Kozanova, JoAnn Jones, Damaris Matthews, Meridyth McLaren, Sandra Moore, Bob O'Toole, Catherine Pace-Pequeño, Snezana Petrovic, Mark Snowwhite, Sherri Wilson

**Members Absent:** Daniel Bahner, Deena Baker, Debra Bogh, Robert Brown, Jeff Burke, Mario Perez, Diane Pfahler, Ralph Rabago, Frances White, Gary Williams

**Guests:** Judith Ashton, Larry Aycock, Candace Leonard, Kim McCormick

**I. Administrative Reports**

None

**II. Approval of Minutes from September 3, 2008**

Approved by consensus

**III. Treasurer's Report**

Same as previous meeting – Balance stands at \$1698.28.

**IV. Other Reports**

A. Classified Senate Report

Candace Leonard reported that participation is increasing – have only had 2 meetings but attendance has been good. At this point, CS is working on committees and starting on fundraising for the scholarship. CS President met with the accreditation representative. It went well. Candace thanked Rick for his help and guidance in her transition to presidency. Thanks to the Classified Senate, from Rick, for their increased participation in campus and district meetings.

B. Student Senate Report

*September Advisor* is out and will be published monthly due a generous donor. Club rush went very well – over 100 students.

Reminder to not post any posters on a painted surface. Ericka will put the reminder in the club instruction flyer.

**V. Senate President's Report**

Rick met with Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of HR, College Presidents and Senate Presidents regarding issues with HR. Valley passed a resolution last year re: issues in HR. Issues mainly centered on communication, hiring, efficiency, etc. HR has been creating procedures but not writing them down or asking for input from the campuses. Response from Chancellor was favorable. Rick invited the vice chancellor to attend a Senate meeting in the future.

Do HR policies go to the board? Yes, but procedures don't. These go to the Board as information items.

Policies regarding Academic and Professional matters go through AS, then Board. There will be a number coming forward this year.

On Monday the chair of the accreditation site visit was here. She met with various people involved in process. During the visit, there will be a number of forums for people to speak with the accreditation team.

Is there a list of the members of the team? Yes, but the number of people and names are changing.

There was a comment that the accreditation team will most likely focus on why the college has had to do the same administrative reports, twice.

## **VI. Old Business**

None

## **VII. New Business**

### **A. Discussion: Faculty Staffing Levels**

The district did offer an incentive to retiring full time faculty but the state is still currently without a budget. Until the budget is passed we don't get state funds.

There are approximately 20 faculty on this campus who would qualify for the incentive. There are 13 faculty members between the ages of 60-65 who are most likely to take the incentive.

One discussion: Why do this? 1<sup>st</sup> saving – people retire, we don't replace. But we can also save by replacing with a lower salaried faculty member.

This issue prompted a request for campuses to do a faculty analysis. This is being done by administration.

We have positions from people who retired years ago who have not been replaced. We are consistently hiring people who don't make money for the college.

Need some ideas from faculty about where we want the hiring issues to go.

There is a district full time faculty obligation requirement – 75/25. Ideal FT to PT faculty ratio – we have never been there.

Some faculty have been replaced, but not necessarily in the same department or even the college from which they retired.

Report from the district is that we are 20 over our obligation.

50% law – 50% of our funds must be spent on instructionally related expenses.

This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> year that faculty chairs have received a stipend, yet we are still getting closer to the 50%.

We have hired very few faculty in the last few years.

FTEs have risen. In the last two years we have gained about 8% in FTEs while reducing the number of sections we offered. Some individual areas are down.

We should follow our mission, vision and values. We spent an enormous amount of time to create that document and we aren't following it.

Librarians and counselors are not counted on the instructional side.

Math position is going out for rehire. These things should be discussed – some transparency of the process.

In our planning documents we advocate for new positions. We need to have some discussion as a faculty as to the state of open and new positions, retirements, etc.

There is too much variability in who actually gets hired, not necessarily connected to the planning process. There are changes in priority, but everyone needs to be aware of the change and have some part in the discussion.

This is where we will have issues with accreditation – how these changes and decisions are made are not identified and communicated.

Individual departments can identify priorities but do we as a Senate want to also identify priorities. These would be our suggestions about what we feel are best for the educational environment. The colleges and districts can educate us on the financial aspects.

B. Discussion: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Practices

This will be the one thing that will fall on the faculty if we have any deficient findings. We have not accepted the leadership on this as much as we should have.

There seems to still be disagreement of the value of this practice.

How do we want to address this issue if it is identified as an area of need by the accreditation team?

There was meeting at district about this last Friday. VP said she would pay for subs to cover classes for faculty who are teaching. It was a very helpful meeting for those who are still not clear about how to write SLOs. There is still resistance on the campus to these. What do we do about this?

We have to get passed this disagreement. We are not going to be able to convince some people that this is not a fascist strategy. How far (ie discipline, department, campus) do SLOs go? Do we need to come together as a large group to determine the direction we as a faculty believe we need to take? Many faculty don't understand the terms, how do we explain to students the additional work they are going to be required to do? We will get a report regarding our accreditation visit in January, should we use our in service day to come together as an entire faculty group to come to consensus regarding outcomes? Not to identify an outcome but to define the process and the reason we do it.

We should ask Gary about which processes we should measure. This would give faculty a start, a draft. Then they may seem less intimidating.

SLOs should be entirely defined by faculty. Deadlines can be identified by admin but the picture of SLO should come from faculty.

Even people who are doing it may think it is a waste, but it is required.

If we can agree on what it means for the bigger picture of the campus, then maybe faculty will take some ownership. If we don't do this now, we will be in the same situation in 5 years.

Should this be a part of our mission statement then? We will have to address this in some way.

Need to have a conversation as a faculty not just a senate – on a service day.

Faculty need to write down their objections so that we can organize them. There are certain things that you can not measure – curiosity, grand scale synthesizing. We

are not measuring everything we teach – maybe more so in CTE because there are skill sets. We need to have this conversation. And we need guidance.

What do we do next? What do we do with our SLOs? Start implementing.

### **VIII. Committee Reports**

- A. Educational Policy – met last Wednesday, have 5 charges and are starting to work on a few
- B. Scholarship – met earlier this week. Working on what belongs on a syllabus. Want to have wider recognition and marketing of scholarships – have requested a spot on the student newspaper and a place on the webpage. There are 3 major scholarships open.
- C. Personnel Interests – met last week, timeline for charges
- D. Chairs Council – met last week. Prioritized charges.
- E. Professional Development – Workshop tomorrow on presentations in the Crafton Room.

### **IX. CCA Report**

Had their first luncheon today, next one is on October 15<sup>th</sup>. CTA is supporting certain candidates for Board of Trustees. There is a Vacant Adjunct Representative position. CTA will be sponsoring a wildflower walk on campus and February is the bowling and pizza event.

### **X. Announcements**

The Professors are playing at the Little Fisherman.  
Is Student Senate mailing too much? No.

### **XI. Statements from the Public**

Look at the board election – 4 open positions. For 3 of the positions the incumbent is running.

### **XII. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:23 pm.