CALL TO ORDER

A. Public Comment – Each speaker will be given a maximum of 4 minutes to address the senate about a non-agendized item or items, with a maximum of 15 minutes allowed for public comment. The senate may vote to extend public comment at any meeting. Please contact the senate secretary before the meeting when wishing to speak at public comment. The senate welcomes all speakers to participate in the discussion on agendized items.

B. Approval of Agenda

C. Approval of Minutes from November 15, 2010

II. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

A. Announcements

B. Plenary Session report

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Upcoming committee work highlights

IV. ACTION ITEMS

NONE

V. INFORMATION ITEMS*

A. Committee Appointments (handout)

B. Faculty Professional Development Committee Revisions (handout)

C. Research Liaison proposal (handout)

D. Legislative Program (handout)

E. Professional Development Approval Process Model (handout)

*The Academic Senate may move information items to action upon a 2/3 vote.
Academic Senate
Grossmont College
Minutes of the Academic Senate – November 15, 2010

GUESTS:
• Barbara Blanchard - Vice President, Academic Affairs
• Beth Smith, Math Department Faculty, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Treasurer
• John Colson-Vice President, Student Services

RECORER: Rochelle Weiser

I. CALL TO ORDER (11:05)

A. Public Comment

None

B. Approval of Agenda
A motion was made to approve the day’s agenda. M/S/U Wirig/Atchison
C. Approval of Minutes from November 1, 2010
A motion was made to approve the minutes from November 1, 2010.
M/S/U Robinson/Sim

II. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

A. Announcements

Chris began by sending congratulations to the newly elected Governing Board members, Debbie Justeson and Edwin Hiel; and re-elected member Greg Barr.

Chris announced the San Diego Community Colleges in conjunction with The League for Innovation would be hosting the League’s annual conference in San Diego. The dates of the conference are: February 27, 2011-March 2, 2011 and it will be held at the Hilton San Diego Bayfront Hotel. Chris noted that not only will Grossmont College have the opportunity to host the conference, but if faculty members volunteer for 4 hours of work, they may attend the entire conference for free. Chris asked that anyone interested in volunteering/attending the conference to please contact Bernadette Black and request their name be put on the list.

Sue Jensen reported that various conferences and institutes for basic skills were upcoming and if any faculty are interested in attending to please contact her. She noted some funds were available through the Basic Skills Initiative, but interested parties needed to contact her ASAP.

B. Part-time Officer at Large vacancy

Chris reported that the Senate Officers Committee (SOC) had discussed the current vacancy of the Part-time Officer-at-Large position and ways in which to facilitate communication with the Part-time Faculty Committee with the position vacant; at present no one has been interested in filling the temporary position. Chris noted that according to the bylaws the position could be filled by any part-time faculty member who is a current Senator. Chris reviewed the meetings the Part-time Officer would attend; the Senate, Senate Officer’s meetings and chair the Part-Time Faculty Committee. From the SOC discussion emerged the idea that Chris could serve as a liaison to the committee, facilitate the meetings and facilitate communication for the remainder of the fall semester and through the spring if a temporary replacement could not be found. Election of a new permanent Part-Time Senate Officer for the 2011-13 term would occur in the spring semester. David Milroy noted that it would be difficult for the Part-Time Faculty Committee to make a decision, as they have been unable to meet. It was also noted that there was such a short time until the elections that the suggested idea may work. It was decided that the Academic Senate Part-Time Faculty would meet for their scheduled meeting on Monday November 22 and Chris would facilitate the meeting. It was noted Rochelle will send an email with the location of the meeting.

C. Accreditation Faculty Co-Chair Selection-Laura Sim

Laura began by noting that today was the day to vote on the Accreditation Faculty Co-Chair. She reported that Chris Hill was the only nominee and that the previous week Rochelle had sent out an email with Chris’s completed application; she hoped everyone had an opportunity to review it. Laura explained, as per the election process, Chris would have 5 minutes to give a synopsis of her application and answer any questions. Laura noted that she would adhere to the 5-minute time limit in order to move onto the voting process. Chris then reviewed her application and highlighted her previous involvement with the accreditation process.

Laura then asked the Senate officers to assist in distributing the ballots; Laura noted there was space available for write in candidates. Todd Myers then made a motion to vote by acclamation.
Chris thanked Laura for her help in facilitating the various elections and for her assistance in the formation of the evaluation task force.

**D. English as a Second Language (ESL) Task Force follow-up**

Chris reviewed items, including issues as well as short- and long-term recommendations from a task force discussion regarding concerns related to the ESL student population at Grossmont College. The issues included difficulties with discipline in the classroom as well as impacts on financial aid, student services and the assessment process. Some ideas that emerged from the task force discussion were: a document/guidelines for faculty on how to help non-native speakers in class; ESL workshops; discussion in Chairs and Coordinators as to what issues the various departments are dealing with; possible orientation requirement for students receiving financial aid as to what the consequences are of failing or not attending courses and possibly have this translated. There was a question about possibly translating the student code of conduct. John Colson reported this option has been considered, but it is a costly process so options are still being reviewed and ideas are still emerging.

Chris then asked the Senators for their input on these ideas; it was noted that it takes approximately 3-7 years for a non-native speaker to properly acquire the language. It was also mentioned that the ESL workshops will cover tools to help faculty work with non-native speaking students. It was also pointed out that faculty should not grade non-native speakers any differently or give them special exceptions. It was determined that many faculty would like the ESL faculty to come to the department meeting to share strategies and ideas on how to help with ESL students. It was noted that learning communities would be helpful to students—while taking a Political Science class all the content of the ESL course would deal with content from the Political Science course. In closing Chris encouraged faculty to work with the ESL faculty to have them attend department meetings, to encourage all faculty to attend the ESL workshops during flex week, and that the task force could continue to work on the development of a plan on an institutional level. Chris noted she would forward the highlights to Senators.

**E. Professional Development contract review/approval process**

Chris began by reviewing the discussions that occurred at previous Chairs and Coordinators meetings and noted that this report was just to have Senators become aware of the upcoming discussions. Chris reported that the current Professional Development process requires the department Chairs and Coordinators to sign off on faculty activities; the Chairs and Coordinators had expressed that they would rather not be involved in the process. Chris reported that our Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC) has identified options and processes that are in place at other colleges that could be adapted for Grossmont including clear guidelines regarding what does and doesn’t meet the Professional Development criteria. One of those options includes the review of the conference/seminar and independent studies requests by the Professional Development Committee (rather than the chairs). Oralee Holder noted that the conversation also emerged at one of the joint Cuyamaca/Grossmont chairs and coordinators meetings and at that time it was noted that the processes for approval of Professional Development hours are different on the two campuses. Ginny Dudley noted that the issue was brought to local Chairs and Coordinators Council because there are no guidelines for approving activities and the Chairs are not in a position of authority over the faculty in their departments. Because of this, they felt the Chairs should offer guidance for the process, but not be in the position for approval. Sue Gonda noted that this item was currently just a discussion
item and there was not yet a proposal; that all agree a list of guidelines would be helpful; there are inconsistencies amongst the various departments as to what qualifies as Professional Development.

Chris briefly reviewed the process within the Academic Senate for making changes to anything related to academic and professional matters: it comes forth as an information item, then goes back for discussion among the departments and faculty, then the item returns to the Senate as an action item, is discussed and possibly modified, and then voted on. Chris noted that the opportunity for debate will happen when it becomes an action item. William Snead noted that the Chairs would prefer not to be involved in the approval process for Professional Development activities. Martin Larter, co-chair of the FPDC, noted that the their goal would to make sure the activity follows the proper criteria and that the Chairs understand the criteria and whether or not activities meet the criteria, then the Dean signs off on the activity. In closing Chris noted that the committee would bring forward a proposal outlining the current and proposed models.

F. Plenary Session report

Chris began by noting due to time constraints she would be unable to cover this item in full, but that highlights from the meeting were available on the Academic Senate website and she would cover it in more detail at the next meeting.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Upcoming committee work highlights

This item was moved to the next meeting, November 15, 2010.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. SLO Coordinator Model

Chris began by reviewing the current SLO Coordinator Model, a single coordinator with 0.4 LED reassigned time. Chris noted that with the SLO process moving to the assessment phase the need for an “assistant” to the SLO coordinator arose; a pilot program was developed for the position with 0.4 LED reassigned time. This allowed for meetings with departments and more help for them during the SLO assessment process. Chris then asked Devon to explain the benefits of having a dual coordinator model, which included sharing the workload involved with SLOs, having different ideas and strategies for the process, and allowing for one on one contact for the departments. Devon felt that having two people for the coordinator position would benefit the SLO Program and Grossmont College as a whole.

Motion was made to put the item on the table for discussion.
M/S/ Sim/Gonda

Chris then opened the discussion. Clarification on the release time and job descriptions/responsibilities was requested (Chris clarified that a set of responsibilities accompanied the reassigned time application for the assistant position). Chris then reiterated that the discussion today would be whether or not the Senate would like to continue with the program set forth by the pilot program; if not the second amount of reassigned time would go away not be assigned to the SLO Coordinator. It was also noted that the discussion was not regarding Senate approval of the amount of reassigned time; per the faculty contract, a Reassigned Time Committee exists to handle that aspect, rather the Senate discusses the need for and the duties of the position and the proposed model. Laura noted that it doesn’t create a
new position, rather a sharing of the duties of SLO Coordinator within the current assessment framework. Gregg Robinson expressed some concern about extending additional college resources toward SLOs. Chris reminded the group that development and assessment of SLOs are an accreditation requirement and this model helps to provide our colleagues with needed assistance in that assessment. Oralee asked if the pilot program was a renewable option; Chris said it was. It was noted that the availability of two coordinators to the departments allowed for great conversation in the department, was helpful, and valuable.

A motion was made to end debate and call for the question.
M/S Wirig/Passatino-motion failed

A motion was made to table the discussion of the dual coordinator model.
M/S Milroy/Gelb-motion passed.

Chris noted that the other option, which had been mentioned by Oralee, would be to continue with the current pilot program with an SLO assistant.

A motion was made to continue with the current model, as a pilot program, and renew the program as needed.
M/S Holder/Robinson- motion passed
1 opposed/ 3 abstentions

V. INFORMATION ITEMS

None

Meeting Adjourned at 12:25 pm
Next meeting is scheduled for November 29, 2010.
CH: rw

The Academic Senate minutes are recorded and published in summary form. Readers of these minutes must understand that recorded comments in these minutes do not represent the official position of the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate expresses its official positions only through votes noted under “Action.”