

**Academic Senate
March 24, 2010
Unapproved Minutes**

Treasurer, Jodi Hanley, called the meeting to order, due to Scott Rippy's absence, at 3:07pm.

Members Present: Debbie Bogh, T.L. Brink, Tom Bryant, Jodi Hanley, Steve Hellerman, Catherine Hendrickson, Jim Holbrook, JoAnn Jones, Liz Langenfeld, Jessica McCambly, Meridyth McLaren, Bob O'Toole, Mario Perez, Snezana Petrovic, Gary Williams, Sherri Wilson
Members Absent: Daniel Bahner, Robert Brown, Ken Bryson, Denise Hoyt, Damaris Matthews, Catherine Pace-Pequeno, Scott Rippy, Frances White
Guests Present: Cheryl Marshall, Kim McCormick

I. Reports

- A. Administrative Report
None
- B. Treasurer's Report
The balance stands at \$4408.93
- C. CTA Report
CTA Picnic – Sunday, May 2nd 12-4 pm – Sylvan Park, Redlands
- D. Classified Senate Report
None
- E. Student Senate Report
None
- F. Personnel Interests Committee
Reminder to return ballots for the Professor and Classified of the Year voting.
Classified Appreciation Luncheon will be on Thursday, April 22 in OE2 – Engine Bay.
Faculty will be asked to bring salads, sides and desserts. Please contribute food.
Will look at moving Luncheon to a Friday next year, but we will need to make sure we have enough faculty presence if we do.
Will also need volunteers to deliver invitations.
Should we invite district classified? Yes

II. Approval of Minutes

- A. March 3, 2010
Motion : To approve the minutes from March 3, 2010 with corrections (Bogh, Jones, MSC)

III. Academic Senate President's Report

None

IV. Old Business

None

V. New Business

- A. Election – Historian
Steve Hellerman nominated Jessica McCambly, she accepted
Motion: To elect Jessica McCambly as Academic Historian (replacing Denise Hoyt) (Hellerman, Hendrickson, MSC)

B. District Strategic Plan - Directions and Goals
Concerns based on Goal #

1. Concern with 1.1 with the use of catch terms – loaded words we don't often see in operation. Perhaps reliable is better – this mean predictable. This is consistent throughout.
Lots of legalese – lots of words that don't mean much. Valley's portion had benchmarks and percentages. The comparison between the two schools makes ours look lacking. Our plan was written with more columns that are not in this format – those other columns have goals, objectives, timelines and persons of responsibilities. 6.1 – some decisions will have to made without a lot of formal evidence. There are times when we have to make decisions based on experience and best guesses.
2. Title 5 identifies and equal opportunity employer and diversity – we have a diverse institution we need to be aware of these. The plan is where we want to go, not where we are. This is the guideline for the direction we want to go.
3. Dynamic balance is an excellent choice of words – very forward thinking. Since we don't have the entire document are we just supposed to be looking at the validity of the goals? We are really just looking at the white columns – the gray column is just how CHC and Valley's plans support
4. 7.2.1 & 2 – very powerful and have the potential to be very unsettling when we do them.
5. 20 years ago Crafton wrote a Student Equity plan – it was a very forward thinking plan. We need to make some effort on this or it will end up like the other plan, on a shelf. Where is the original plan? Since this is a district plan, do they have anything specific for how to meet these goals? They will start that part after they get feedback on the goals.

How much feedback has been given about this? Responses need to be in writing – written comments have greater power. Need to accept our responsibility to be professional and provide feedback. It is hard sometimes to know what all of this means. Putting this in written form would be effective. Communication was an issue with accreditation – there are many who may not be sure of how to respond, but that information is important to pass on to the administration. Goals don't have specific steps – those are developed in a second phase. Look at these goals – is this the direction we want our district to go? If not, then we need to let the district know. If these seem like good goals then they need to know. The gray column is only to show that the district was using information from the campus to form their goals.

Goals should also be achievable – using nebulous statements and words that don't have any specific meaning or potential for achievement.

These are vision statements – but these are not goals – goals are measurable, have steps. Leadership should have visions – then those guide goals and objectives.

What does Strategic mean? Long term.

Directions are the visions – goals are things than can be achieved in 3-5 years.

In order to be a goal there has to be a milestone.

Value means high level affect, to have high level affect you have to have high level cognitive behavior.

6. How are they going to measure something being achieved? All programs should have qualitative and quantitative measures – neither is perfect, both are informative. We want to teach students in every discipline to be critical thinkers and problem solvers.
7. One goal that we did not see – that we operate as a unit – we are the SBCC District. Reduce separatism between Valley, Crafton and the District. We are 3 different sites. We even have different graduation and certificate requirements. The college should still be autonomous – we need independence and interdependence.

Did they create these goals based on the separate college plan or are we supposed to conform to their plan? These goals came from looking at the goals for both colleges.

Is the district a service provider, a leader or both? The district has never had a plan before – so they did use input from Valley and Crafton. These aren't just about the district office this is about the 2 college as a district.

C. District Management Hiring Policy

Motion: To table until the next meeting (Perez, Brink, MSC, 1 opposed)

D. Future Senate Business

What do we still need to address as a Senate? We are only representing faculty.

We need to be a voice for all faculty which means we need to talk to them. There are a lot of voices that should be carried forward.

Campus Issues? Where does Health and Safety fit into the 10 + 1. We are taking the safety trainings but we do not have the tools to implement the things we were trained for.

Need to tackle committees/meetings. Need to continue to address faculty participation in campus meetings.

Motion: To allow faculty who are being evaluated to request a different Academic Senate appointed evaluator in an anonymous way (Langenfeld, Perez, tabled)

Discussion: currently the AS President appoints the person. Perhaps get some notification of who has been appointed to evaluate – is this okay, if not, then you have until this date to respond.

This is also a CTA issue. We are also having issues with faculty being evaluated by other faculty who don't know anything about the field. There are also issues with the procedures.

Do we want to put a limit on the number of times this change could be requested?

Motion : To table the vote on the motion to a future meeting (Perez, Wilson, MSC, 1 opposed)

VI. Announcements

OE2 VITEA process workshop 1:00

Two artist exhibition on Thursday, March 25th

Would like to have an After Graduation Party at AJ Barilla's - will let us know how much per person.

VII. Statements from the Public (including faculty and staff)

None

VIII. Adjournment

Adjourned at 4:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Meridyth S. McLaren, Secretary