I. 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 29, 2010

II. PRESIDENT’S REPORT  25 minutes

A. Announcements

B. Textbook Rental Program – Mike Gilchrist

C. Staffing Process Update – Sunny Cooke, Shirley Pereira

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

NONE

IV. ACTION ITEMS  50 minutes

A. Committee Appointments (Attachment #1)

B. Faculty Professional Development Committee Revisions (Attachment #2)

C. Research Liaison proposal (Attachment #3)

D. Legislative Program (Attachment #4)

E. Professional Development Approval Process Model (Attachment #5)

V. INFORMATION ITEMS*

NONE

*The Academic Senate may move information items to action upon a 2/3 vote.
### Academic Senate
#### Grossmont College

**Minutes of the Academic Senate – November 29, 2010**

| GUESTS | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| • Sunita Cooke, President - Grossmont College | • Beth Smith, Math Department Faculty, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Treasurer | | |

#### RECORDER: Rochelle Weiser

**I. CALL TO ORDER (11:05)**

**A. Public Comment**

**Todd Myers:**

Todd began by apologizing if his comments during the previous meeting seemed aggressive; Todd noted that he does appreciate the work Chris does and feels she is effective in her position. Todd noted that the item that he does have a principled stand on, which he felt was not captured in the previous meeting minutes, is academic freedom. Todd expressed that...
through bureaucracy and paperwork more work is created for faculty. He noted that there are universities that allow for flex days and leave the use of that day up to the faculty; this allows for creativity for professional development and keeps the individual’s professional development under their control. Todd voiced concern over requiring a pre-approval process; he felt it does not allow freedom to choose items that might better relate to a faculty member’s discipline or the independence to develop themselves professionally. He voiced concern that if an individual does not become irate about their professional profile or their personal responsibility they cannot obtain any freedom for themselves; each individual is a grown person and a professional. Todd expressed concern that by denying the autonomy of serious professionals to do their own creative work, it makes them all the same. He noted that this method leads to more bureaucracy; creating more committees, more paperwork, more conformity, thereby diminishing professional autonomy and destroying the teaching profession. He also noted he did not like the idea of taking a simple number to determine whether teachers are effective or not. In closing, Todd noted his concern about faculty sleepwalking away from their professional dignity and academic freedom into more paperwork with little thought or reflection on the hours of time and creativity lost to mindless reproduction of systems of control that do not result in the best for Grossmont College.

B. Approval of Agenda
A motion was made to approve the day’s agenda.
M/S/U Morrison/Nolan

C. Approval of Minutes from November 15, 2010
A motion was made to approve the minutes from November 15, 2010 with the addition of Todd Myer’s notation regarding the minutes, specifically his point in the conversation regarding the Professional Development contract was to ask everyone to stop and slow down for a moment, to really consider the items that would bring more freedom and more autonomy to the process rather than more paperwork.
M/S/U Robinson/Sim

II. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

A. Announcements

Chris began by noting that after the last meeting during a conversation with Oralee they realized clarification was needed regarding re-assigned time. Chris explained there were different types of release/re-assigned time; one being the release time that is covered in the union contract (an example being the release time for chairs and coordinators). The second is presidential discretionary release time, which is not covered by the contract. Presidential discretionary reassigned time initially goes through the district Reassigned Time Committee. In addition, recipients of that time are annually asked to report annually on their use of the time and discuss their work for the upcoming year. The president of the college may renew that time as the need continues. Chris clarified that any release time outside what is covered by the contract must go through this process. Michael Golden asked how much reassigned time there was at the college; Sunny Cooke noted that she would provide the exact amount.

B. Plenary Session report-Sue Gonda

Chris asked Sue Gonda to review the highlights from the Fall Plenary Session. Sue began by reporting that many of the resolutions at the Plenary dealt with two legislative items; SB 1440 (transfer degrees) and SB 1143 (connecting student success with funding). Sue then highlighted the resolutions. Sue noted that SB1143 would connect funding at the community colleges with student success. Sue reported that there is a statewide task force being formed to work on what defines student success and noted Beth Smith as ASCCC Treasurer is involved in this process. Some ideas on measuring student success mentioned were: monitoring students
as they move from basic skills to college-level coursework and as they complete career development coursework. Sue noted some of the other highlighted resolutions were: supporting a strong faculty voice in all the task forces leading to a student success definition; adding Art History to the disciplines list; faculty professional development and making it a high priority with funding at the state level (which has previously been legislated and not yet seen); encouraging Senates to review/revise the academic freedom statement (new recommendations had been made by the American Association of University Professors-AAUP and sent to the ASCCC Executive Board for review); advocating for part-time faculty. In closing, Sue noted if anyone had additional questions to please contact her. She also noted Beth Smith as a resource regarding the ASCCC.

Chris then asked Beth Smith for any additional comments. Beth reported on the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC) meeting and their study on Student Success. She noted that through faculty involvement they were better able to focus on new ideas for measuring student success (i.e. what makes sense to track, how many items should be tracked, how do faculty members define student success). She noted that the trend in student success over the last 25-30 years has been almost flat and that many factors go into student success, including things outside the college or faculty control. She noted in order for the data to be helpful, a way to track what the college does have control over needs to be utilized in order to have a better picture of the college’s/faculty’s impact on student success. Gregg Robinson noted that a simple flat trend in success does not take into account the change in student population over a period of time and could possibly show improvement. Gregg also commented that the best predictor of success at school is often not what happens at school but what happens at home. In closing Chris noted this topic of conversation will be ongoing and one that will continue to deal with how faculty can facilitate the methods used to measure student success.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Upcoming committee work highlights

Chris began by explaining rather than having each of the committees come to the Senate and report on their upcoming work, the committee chairs would give a highlights report to the Senate Officers Committee(SOC); which Chris could then pass onto the Senate. Chris then reviewed the some of the highlights:

- Professional Development Committee-made changes to the flex week schedule allowing for 10-minute passing periods, is working on an electronic form for submitting professional development activities and a model for approving the activities;
- Student Success Steering Committee-has set goals for the Basic Skills Initiative, one being to continue faculty training and professional development in Basic Skills, develop, improve and expand current programs college wide (i.e. math academy, contextualized learning communities, project success, project learning and ESL programs), and continue ongoing conversations regarding measuring student success;
- Curriculum Committee-is discussing implementation of SB1140 requirements, pre-requisites, coordinating a Liberal Arts for Education Degree, and having ongoing discussion of processes for changing SLO’s and Course Outlines for records;
- Technology for Teaching and Learning Committee-is developing a tech plan for Grossmont College, integrating technology into the planning process, planning training for the district-wide Microsoft 2010 upgrade districtwide for Fall 2011, and developing a Best Practices document for teaching online courses (concern was raised regarding whether or not requirements for teaching online courses would involve the union and contract. It was clarified that this item would be a best practices document chairs could use as a guide for teaching assignments and would be cleared through both the Senate and the union before being implemented), integrating Eluminate into Blackboard, student
orientation for online courses, and a document for academic integrity regarding online courses;
- SLO Assessment -meeting with individual departments to access needs and offer support, offering an assessment workshop to highlight best practices during flex week, offering tutorials, reviewing the SLO Coordinator responsibilities and models.

Chris reported that the Academic Rank committee had not met yet and the Academic Senate Part-Time Faculty Committee just met for the first time and both would be reporting at a later time.

Mary noted that the Faculty Staffing Committee had not met and was not sure if this was due to the restrictive hiring practices (due to the budget) at the moment. Chris clarified that the committees she reported on were strictly committees that reported to the Academic Senate, but that the specific issue Mary raised would be on the Senate agenda for the next meeting.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

None

V. INFORMATION ITEMS

Chris reviewed that the information items were being presented so that the Senators could share the information with their constituents. Chris noted that there is only a week between this meeting and the next, and encouraged Senators to make a point of sharing the information. She noted she would also be sending an e-mail to all faculty regarding the information items. Chris then clarified that as information items they would not have a discussion or debate on the items but opened the floor for questions and clarification of the items. Chris then noted that the items were available as a handout.

A. Committee Appointments

Chris reviewed the list and noted some committee positions are at large (from any discipline) and some are discipline specific. She noted that she does contact all those that expressed interest in joining the committees (both appointees and not) via email.

B. Faculty Professional Development Committee Revisions

Chris reviewed the proposed composition of the committee and explained that at various times the committee has needed the input from the different divisions. The proposed composition would allow for representatives from each of the divisions. Some discussion occurred regarding the original composition of the committee and previous department involvement in the committee, often tied to the need within the department or division for approval of department specific professional development activities. It was suggested that an “at large” position be available as well, for those situations and for individuals interested in professional development. The question was raised as to the need for the SLO Coordinator to be a part of the committee; Chris deferred an answer until the next meeting when Devon could be present and possibly explain the need.

C. Research Liaison proposal

Chris explained that with the ongoing discussions on student success, program review, and planning (among other things) there is a general need for both quantitative and qualitative data and a way to make the data useful. Chris explained that a task force composed of faculty, staff and administrators from across campus was formed to formulate ideas on how to create a framework for interpretation and use of the data being collected. Chris then reviewed the needs of the college and asked the other members of the task force to comment. Oralee noted that at the department frustration often occurs when research data is collected and reported, but then
there is no follow-up; often no one in the department knows who at the district to contact or even how to begin the process. She noted that as discussion occurred the need for an individual on the Grossmont College (GC) campus, who knows the various departments, is working for the interests of GC, and can be a contact between GC and the district whose purpose would be to assist in the recording, interpreting and finding of research data. Sue Gonda noted that by having one person as a liaison they would be aware of the studies that have already been done and provide the information. Bonnie Schmiege noted that it would be helpful to have someone that would come back to the departments with the data to help motivate the department to utilize what has been found. It was suggested perhaps this liaison could be included in the professional development committee revision.

The question was raised regarding what the release time for the position would be; Chris explained that had not been determined as yet, first it needed to be discussed whether or not the Senate would like to endorse the concept, the Task Force would need to further review the requirements of the position and develop a proposal to go to the Reassigned Time Committee. Chris encouraged the Senators to get feedback on the liaison position and reiterated she would send out the information to all faculty.

D. Legislative Program
Chris reviewed that each year Grossmont College has a legislative program, key positions that the district wants to support and pursue with state legislators. Chris then highlighted items that had been changed; the addition of prerequisites and changing lower costs of textbooks to pursuing affordable textbooks.

E. Professional Development Approval Process Model
Chris presented the Proposed Models for Approval of Independent Professional Development Activities document. Chris explained that Title 5 does have criteria for qualifying activities for flex credit and that is why GC needs a way in which to approve/certify activities. Chris asked Martin Larter and Cliff Quinn to review the options. Cliff noted that the committee’s goal is to streamline and simplify the process. Martin noted that this process is for the items that are not included during flex week. It was noted for full time and part-time faculty, it covers any independent projects. Chris then reviewed the current process for independent projects; all the forms are available on the Faculty Professional Development website. Some of the questions that arose were: whether pre-approval was required by law; would there be a list of acceptable activities; could a online form be available with a database of activities.

Cliff noted that by creating a listing of acceptable and unacceptable activities it will facilitate the process. It was noted that many departments would like to keep the approval within the department; could departments have the option of having the chair approve the activities or having the committee do it? Michael Golden expressed concern that this item might be negotiable. Chris reiterated that professional development is part of the senate’s 10+1. She noted that conversations regarding flex activities would need to occur with the union as it is an item of overlap. Chris noted they would find out if activity approval is mandated by Title 5, but clarified that approval for activities is a practice already in place and what the Professional Development Committee would like to know is how the faculty like to have those activities approved; via the chairs or a committee. In closing Chris noted a pros and cons list in the handout that the committee had developed for the faculty to review.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:25 pm
Next meeting is scheduled for December 6, 2010.
CH: rw
Attachment #1

2010-11 Committee Appointments – Part 2

Campus Art Review:
- Gwenyth Mapes

Continuing Education and Fee-based Advisory Committee:
- Scott Barr

Curriculum:
- Angela Feres
- Brian Keliher
- Joann Carcioppolo
- Patrice Braswell-Burris

Institutional Review Committee:
- Diana Vance
- Angela Feres
- Joann Carcioppolo
- Patty Morrison
- ALC rep – to be determined

Sabbatical Leave Committee:
- Shina Alagia
- Mary Rider

Technology for Teaching and Learning:
- William Snead

Screening/Interviewing Committees:

Clerical Assistant, Child Development Center:
- Angie Gish
- Claudia Flores

Senior Student Services Assistant:
- Mary Rider

"Computer Lab Technician – Evening"
- Jeff Waller
- Julie Middlemas
Proposed Committee Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Academic Senate-appointed committee addresses all issues concerning faculty professional development. It (1) plans, approves, implements, and evaluates flex week, (2) oversees professional development activities during the academic year, (3) administers and disperses available funds committed to faculty professional development, and (4) submits appropriate reports, such as needs assessment and activity evaluations, to district and state entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Schedule</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Thursdays 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representative <em>(from within the committee membership)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representatives (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-voting Resource Members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Success Steering Committee liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SLO coordinator or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CATL coordinator or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TTLC liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29, 2003; October 1, 2004; May 27, 2005; May 26, 2006; May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committee chair (or one of the co-chairs) should regularly attend Academic Senate meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action Item – December 6, 2010

Attachment #3

Proposed Research Liaison Position

The college has need for effective collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and information within a number of our processes (i.e. program review, strategic and annual planning, student success, SLO assessment, and accreditation). The proposal research liaison position would be filled by a faculty member who could work closely with faculty, staff, and administrators to determine data needs, assist in developing a comprehensive research program for the college (including easy to access standard reports), and help mentor them in the effective use of both quantitative and qualitative information.

Needs of College:

- Oversight of progress toward achieving college strategic planning goals;
- Monitoring of institutional effectiveness measures (i.e. key performance indicators);
- Coordination of ongoing data used by program review, outcomes assessment, accreditation, and various college initiatives into a coherent research agenda;
- Support and training to faculty and staff for data analysis and interpretation;
- Support of unit action plan progress and evaluation; and
- Analysis of data and facilitation of data-informed discussions.

Two-part framework:

- Institutional Excellence Committee (already provided for within revised planning process); and
- Research Liaison (a faculty member from the college).

Basic responsibilities of Research Liaison:

- Assist in the prioritization of projects related to institutional research and the development of a comprehensive college research program;
- Provide hands-on data analysis, interpretation of analysis, and preparation of standard reports for both internal and external use and distribution;
- Translate data into usable information for the college community;
- Work to enhance effective data and information flow between the college and the district Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness, and partner with other offices, faculty, and staff to enhance college-wide data collection and analysis; and
- Act as a liaison to academic, student service, and administrative units on issues regarding program review, assessment, accreditation, and other research.

Basic qualifications for Research Liaison:

- Experience in quantitative and qualitative research methods;
- A strong statistical and analytical skill set;
- Excellent oral and written communication skills;
- Effective leadership and organizational skills;
- The ability to work independently, attend to multiple projects simultaneously, and meet deadlines; and
- Demonstrated experience as a leader of or participant on college committees related to planning, student success, accreditation, and/or institutional excellence.
Per Legislative Strategy Committee discussion 11/15, the following draft positions are presented. Considerations during discussion included the importance of addressing both access and success, programs and services and using wording that establishes broad principles that will enable the District to act proactively to help shape legislation. The positions are consistent with the GCCCD Strategic Plan 2010-2016, including its 2010-2011 implementation plan. The final adopted legislative program, because it has the approval of all constituencies, is a powerful collective tool for the positions taken.

This draft is ready for distribution and further discussion. If you would like me to attend any meeting where it is discussed, please let me know. Once the broad principles are approved, background information will be drafted to provide data, circumstances and rationale. Thank you all for your insights and assistance. Dana

**Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District 2011-2012 Legislative Program (State Issues)**

**Access to Programs and Services**

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District supports:

1. Maintenance of access to programs and services
2. Maintenance of effective transfer and articulation processes from community college to four-year universities

**Student Success**

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District supports:

3. Program policies that facilitate seamless student transition, including assessment, placement, basic skills, non-credit programs and effective implementation of prerequisites
4. Funding for basic skills development
5. Affordable textbooks and materials

**Fiscal Stability and Accountability**

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District supports:

6. Fiscal and accountability standards that are quantifiable, educationally sound, reduce duplication, include a long-term perspective, and reflect the diverse needs and academic and vocational goals of community college students.
7. Measures to permanently backfill property tax shortfalls
8. Replacement of purchasing power for educational services that has been lost to to lack of COLA, funded growth and continued deferrals of funds owed.
### Models for Approval/Certification of Independent Professional Development Activities
(to include conferences, seminars and other activities outside of FPD committee-sponsored activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current (chairs)</th>
<th>Proposed (committee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval</strong> (obtained prior to beginning work on activity)</td>
<td>Chairs/coordinators ➔ Deans (consult with FPD if questions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria (does it count for prof dev or not?)</th>
<th>Vague list of approval criteria on website</th>
<th>Basic guidelines for approval and specific examples of acceptable and unacceptable activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic guidelines for approval and specific examples of acceptable and unacceptable activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Process & paperwork | - List on Professional Development Contract  
- form for conference attendance  
- project proposal form (memo?) describing activity/project  
- independent activity application | - List on Professional Development Contract  
- independent activity application |

| Verification & paperwork | - proof of conference attendance to dean  
- report on completed activity or conference  
- posted on FPD website | - report on completed activity or conference  
- posted on FPD website |

| Dates | - PD contracts due on Friday of flex week  
- independent activity applications (due at least 20 days?) prior to event | - PD contracts due on Friday of flex week  
- independent activity applications *(due at least 20 days?) prior to event* |

NOTE: In order to help facilitate either model, the FPD will work with other staff development groups at the college to develop a semester calendar of upcoming events which will be available, at least in part, by the first day of Flex Week.