



Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda

February 5, 2019

12:30 – 1:20 pm, Room 1770

MINUTES

Present: A. Badgett, S. Balassi, S. Ball, M. Biddenback, W. Fortier, G. Kell, S. Lohse, F. Smyle, L. Yanover

1. Welcome

- Meeting called to order at 12:30 PM

2. Adoption of Agenda

- M/S/P

3. Approval of Minutes: 12/04/18

- M/S/P

4. Public Comment

- None

5. Announcements

- Comment made that senate needs to weigh in on submitting early grades for specific circumstance where “Preliminary Grade Verification” form is used.
- Plan to have Student Success Standards Committee follow up regarding this issue in the future.

6. Action item

6.1. BP 2510 Participation in Local Decision-Making

- Feedback received requesting to emphasize that there be proper input when decisions are made.
- Language added directly from Ed Code to meet this request.
- Motion and second to endorse with additional language.
- Discussion regarding adding reference to Ed Code at bottom of page.
- Comment made to add “10 +1” in parenthesis at bottom of first page.
- Comment that there needs to be a space on the last page after student section before “Except for unforeseeable...” for clarity.
- Comment made that for consistency all sections directly out of Ed Code should be in quotes.
- AP(s) that falls under this will contain content from D1140.
- D1140 is becoming this BP 2510 with additions AP(s).
- Discussion regarding having the changes to this BP 2510/D1140 be transparent. Possibly even having the spreadsheets on tracking be available on the senate webpage.

AB 1925 10 + 1 RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1 Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and places courses in disciplines
- 2 Degree and certificate requirements
- 3 Grading policies
- 4 Educational program development
- 5 Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
- 6 District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
- 7 Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
- 8 Policies for faculty professional development activities
- 9 Processes for program review
- 10 Process for institutional planning and budget development
- 11 Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon

**AB 1925
10 + 1
RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 1 Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and places courses in disciplines
- 2 Degree and certificate requirements
- 3 Grading policies
- 4 Educational program development
- 5 Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
- 6 District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
- 7 Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
- 8 Policies for faculty professional development activities
- 9 Processes for program review
- 10 Process for institutional planning and budget development
- 11 Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon

- Discussion regarding how endorsing this BP as is will affect the related APs to come after it.
- Clarification that nothing will be lost in endorsing this BP, that this is an improvement upon what is already in place.
- Discussion regarding collaboration with other constituent groups and the timeline for the related AP(s).
- D1140 and the current BP 2510 coexist at this point. D1140 will still be in effect once this BP 2510 is endorsed.
- With the mentioned amendments, M/S/P.

7. Information item

7.1. Academic Senate Unit Plan 2019-2020

- Input needed for unit plan.
- Faculty evaluations requests online evaluation process to be considered in unit planning.
- Curriculum Committee mentioned CurricuNET issues that may be resolved by OAA funds.

8. Discussion item

8.1. Post-Pilot Committee Structure

- Survey results presented.
- There is an interest in committee flexibility.
- Curriculum committee, Planning & Budget (P&B), and Faculty Coach Committee (FCC) will remain. P&B are requesting to stay together.
- Comment made that the results may seem to be split but 69% of those who took the survey do want a change from how the committees were before.
- Discussion about how Board Policy review went for Faculty Business Committee (FBC) and Student Success Standards Committee.
- Discussion about Professional Development Committee potentially coming back.
- Discussion about potentially forming a Board Policy Committee with a dedicated group of informed policy people.
- Comment that there are some faculty who did not take the survey and some are saying that it would be helpful to find a way to train faculty who will be on a committee or workgroup so that they have a better understanding of what to do in their role there.
- Discussion about the workload distribution during the pilot compared to prior.
- Faculty Coach Chair mentioned that a better name for the committee could be The Evaluation Committee instead of FCC.
- Comment that faculty evaluation items should be able to be endorsed straight from the FCC instead of going to FBC.
- Discussion about sizes of each committee compared to tasks they are charged with each semester.

**AB 1925
10 + 1
RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 1 Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and places courses in disciplines
- 2 Degree and certificate requirements
- 3 Grading policies
- 4 Educational program development
- 5 Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
- 6 District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
- 7 Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
- 8 Policies for faculty professional development activities
- 9 Processes for program review
- 10 Process for institutional planning and budget development
- 11 Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon

- Comment that division representation is not tenable as there are small and large divisions. It may be best to only maintain division representation on Curriculum and P&B which would decrease size of committees.
- Any remaining unassigned faculty would have the flexibility to decide what priority is for the following year.
- Discussion that a Board Policy committee would improve structure. This committee could train the members and keep training others as they transition.
- Concern expressed that a Board Policy committee wouldn't get enough input from the stakeholders.
- Comment that if policies and procedures are all updated there wouldn't be a need to keep retraining people, they can just reference the policy/procedure.
- Idea presented that there could be a Board Policy specialist group of 6 people who are trained on policy. They could go to each committee to assist with the process.
- Comment that this is what the committee chair's responsibility is now.
- Comment that vote buy in and not just survey buy in is needed.
- Idea presented that there should be something presented to the senate to ask yes or no by vote.
- Needs to be solidified before elections so new leadership know what they will be leading.

9. Adjourn

- Motion to adjourn at 1:33 PM
- M/S/P