

Academic Senate Council Minutes

Tuesday, September 15, 2:30-4:00 p.m. in the CCCR

STANDING MEMBERS						Guests
POSITION	NAME	PRESENT	POSITION	NAME	PRESENT	Welcome! Please sign in. Neil Stewart Brandon Purdy
ASC Pres	Jeff Baker	X	Film, Interior Design, Art	Riley Dwyer	X	
ASC V.P.	Rex Edwards	X	Health Sciences	Dalila Sankaran		
ASC Secretary	Lisa Putnam	X	History/Institutions	Susan Kinkella	X	
ASC Treasurer	Rex Edwards	X	Library	Mary LaBarge	X	
ACCESS	Melanie Masters	X	Life Sciences	Andrew Kinkella		
Athletics	Howard Davis	X	Mathematics	Phil Abramoff	X	
Behavioral Sciences	Linda McDill	x	Modern Languages	Raquel Olivera		
Business	Stephanie Branca	X	Multi Media, Journalism, Photo	Svetlana Kasalovic	X	
Chemistry/ Earth Sciences	Omar Torres	X	Music/ Dance	James Song	X	
Counseling	Chuck Brinkman	X	Physical/ Health Education	Nancy Stewart	X	
Computer Info Systems	Mary Mills	X	Physics/ Astronomy	Clint Harper	X	
Computer Sci/ CNSE	Vish Viswanath	X	Student Health Center	Dena Stevens	X	
English/ ESL	Beth Gillis-Smith Alt. Kathryn Adams	KA	Theater Arts/ Communications	John Loprieno	X	
EATM	Cindy Wilson	X	<i>Student Liaison</i>			

Quick Recap:

Action Item Topic	Discussion/Comments	Action
ASC Release time Reduction	Resolution letter to be revised	Tabled to next meeting
BP72XX Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies	Request the word “formal” to be added: <i>These local qualifications are to be determined by the Dean after FORMAL consultation with faculty in the discipline and in collaboration with the Human Resources Department.</i>	Approved as amended
AP 72 XX Minimum qualifications and Equivalencies	Discussion clarified that MC does not agree with the other two colleges in the process to approve equivalencies.	Tabled to next meeting

I. Public Comments (Those wishing to make public comments should be in attendance by 2:30 p.m.)

Jeff apologizes for missing the first meeting due to family obligation.

Jeff is pretty much a stickler on protocol; 3 pros and 3 cons on action items. We have a lot to get through this year.

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of September 1, 2009)

Moved to Approve: Next meeting we will vote (due to not having sent the minutes with agenda)

Seconded:

III. Treasurer's Report (Rex Edwards)

- \$ 2566.82 checking
- \$ 1221.30 savings

IV. Committee Reports

a. Curriculum (MLaBarge)

Request from Curriculum Committee: See new business

Tech review meets twice a month, Curriculum meet twice a month. Please volunteer.

Curricu-Net is just getting started. All course outlines were entered by hand by consultants. If the outlines were old, they were still entered. It is hopeful that January is when we will fully be using Curricu-Net.

b. EdCAP (JLoprieno)

Meeting on Sept 22

c. Facilities CAP (PAbramoff)

First official meeting tomorrow; however, Academic Center update: Dept Chairs, Deans, Admin met yesterday to form a subcommittee to create a series of priorities to determine which area gets classroom space in this new building based on pedagogy. After this decision is made, they will then begin to decide who will have office space in this building. The target date for decisions will be sometime in October. (Also, see New Concerns: Jeff Baker is concerned about the absence of process in determining these kinds of decisions. He has insisted that the senate be involved in the developing a strategy.)

d. Faculty Development (MMills)

Meets tomorrow for the first time.

e. Fiscal (JBaker)

Meets next week. Jeff has extended a provisional invitation for Iris Ingram to attend out 9/29 meeting. We need to begin discussions on process by which we look at the viability of pairing back many of our programs. We have about a year to discuss future, deep, budget/program cuts. One-million dollars appear to be in jeopardy in our mid-year budget cuts. Reserves are topic of conversation with our college president; can we use any of these reserves to get through this difficult time. This is a board decision, and the Academic Senate has little power. We can, however, have a voice (and we have three in this district). There are strong arguments on both sides. Our budget is an anomaly; it is the worst budget in history. We need a process for program reduction or discontinuance. We might not like the results of the process, but we need a process. We need to review our program review process. Jeff's message is consistently that when we talk about identifying our "core" it goes beyond our GE and Major prep. We have a college identity to maintain. We have to all agree on a process to begin making these difficult choices.

f. TechCAP (REdwards)

The first meeting has not occurred.

g. Senate Subcommittees & Liaisons

i. Associated Students

N/A. The AS President (Ryan Krebs) is aware of our meetings.

ii. District Reports-DCHR, DCSL, DTRW, Consultation Council

See below.

V. Unfinished Business

a. Action Item: ASC Release time Reduction (attached)

A draft letter from the ad hoc committee has been received by Jeff B. Some of the wording might need to be adjusted, but the letter is great. Letter was read to group. There was question as to whether or not this rejection letter was what we had agreed to do. Were we not to first determine what the other two colleges were going to do, as well as statewide? It was also recollected that we were going to try to negotiate for a return on the release time when times get stronger.

Jeff B contacted the other two Acad Senates. They were told that the reduction it was still in discussion stage, but that they should plan for the reduction. Jeff B. also spoke with our MC President. The reduction came about from the chancellor looking at the statewide Acad Senate losing their funding statewide. Chancellor determined that our district should also. He felt that the AS President was important and VC President was not utilizing their release time fully. As far as statewide, Jeff's general impression is that VCCCD has had it pretty good with release time. Jeff's opinion is (1) He is very cautious to not take our group's advice, however (2) Jeff does have more background information. Jeff believes that a confrontational letter might not be in our best interest. We understand that everybody must pitch in their fair share. However, it is important for pass presidents and past vice presidents need to come up with language to describe WHY the release time is necessary, and how it goes up and above service time requirements. I hope we consider moving forward on a resolution, but keep it open for some compromise. We really need to get this into our Bargaining Agreement, which is the only way to protect the release time. We have options. We hope that the resolution will be in language that recognizes the crisis of the moment but tries to negotiate the return on the release time when the crisis is over. The current draft takes a confrontational position, if Jeff plays it out to the end, where it has to end up will be a vote of no confidence with our Chancellor. We will be throwing down the gauntlet. We are in a very weak bargaining position to take such a strong stand. The wiser course will be to change the language of the discussion to one that begins for a return of release time when better times return.

The other two college Academic Senates will sign our resolution once we determine appropriate language. We ought to add language as the value of the Academic Senate in to our resolution. We need to make a reasonable argument, and show numbers, leaving an opportunity to return to these levels of release time in future negotiations. With this, our chancellor should be open to at least considering our request.

The question is, with the removal of the release time, will the job still get done? Is there a necessity for the release time for officers. We ask that you let the ad hoc group go back to the drawing board and re-write the resolution by the next meeting. Group agrees.

Item Tabled.

Phil moves to table, Chuck seconds, passed unanimously

b. Action Item: BP72XX Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies (attached)

This is a culmination of the work done by the three Academic Senate Presidents last year. Is there a motion on this Board Policy? Since there was no discussion on this last meeting, yet this was discussed last year.

Issue of "Eminence in the Field": Sometimes eminence is granted on reasons that are not always reasonable. Eminence was originally set up to allow for people to come teach at Community Colleges who did not have master's degrees in their field because at the time there were NO master degrees (or very few) available. This is a hold-over that is still in Ed Code – it would be inappropriate for VCCCD HR to remove something that is in Ed Code. Ed Code supersedes Board Code

BP, A3, sentence 2: Local Qualifications: *These local qualifications are to be determined by the Dean after consultation with faculty in the discipline and in collaboration with the Human Resources Department.*

There is a concern regarding consultation; it allows for the Dean to decide eminence, determining local qualifications as opposed to discipline faculty. Can we have something done with this sentence? Jeff explained that the legalities of staffing require the processes to be set up the way we have them set. Faculty propose the position and qualifications to the dean, then the deans work with HR to move through the process. The dean consults with HR, and then typically discusses it with the department chair again, but this is not official. The Board Policy is not necessary HOW it is done, but it is more LAW of how these things must take place. Language suggestion: add the word "formal" to sentence. *These local qualifications are to be determined by the Dean after FORMAL consultation with faculty in the discipline and in collaboration with the Human Resources Department.*

**Action: Chuck moves to approve as amended
Mary LaBarge, seconds, Passes Unanimously**

- c. Action Item: AP 72 XX Minimum qualifications and Equivalencies (attached)
Jeff B. recommends: Ventura's AS has voted NOT to adopt the language of this procedure, for a variety of reasons. The strategy developed by all three senate presidents.

It has been determined that convening a team each time is not practical with the timelines that we hire within. Bottom line, we have three campuses but one board. WE must abide by equivalencies granted by other schools. Suggested that all local determinations will be honored, we will still be able to locally determine equivalency and the honored by all three campuses. We are out of compliance if we do NOT honor these equivalencies granted by our sister schools. Here are our choices (1) either adopt something similar to this, convening a panel; or (2) we will honor the equivalencies granted by the other two colleges. What are the pros and cons: Why wouldn't we want to have an input within a panel? The largest con is the timeliness – this whole process holds up the hiring process. It appears that we do not agree with the VC approach.

Action: Phil moves to Table this Item
Omar seconds, passed unanimously

VI. New Business

- a. 1st Reading: Curriculum Committee Representation (email attached)
See Marie's Email below.

Curriculum is requesting a review today, and a vote at next meeting.
Right now curriculum is moving smoothly, but controversy does happen.

Cons: Consider if your division has one rep and another division has two reps, this can greatly affect the decisions being made. Think about courses going for general education status, especially in these times.

Pros: It will help get through the CORs – one rep is getting bombarded with the amount of work that is crossing this committee. Also this makes the process more inclusive. Also, the variety of disciplines in one department makes it difficult for one person to represent such a wide variety of interests.

- b. 1st Reading: Decision Making document (on MyVCCCD Portal)
Group agrees to allow Jeff to take the lead on submitting the edits/input. Everyone who is interested will send recommendations either via email or to next meeting. Jeff will pull it together.

VII. New Concerns

- a. FYI--Educational Master Plan Y'All Come
Tomorrow at 3pm.
- b. Faculty office assignment strategy/Dean hiring/assignment philosophy
Jeff's Philosophical thoughts:
(i) Deans ought to know something about the disciplines that they oversee
(ii) Faculty within each department should have a departmental/divisional identity

Phil reminded everyone of his attempt 5 years ago to survey faculty regarding office assignments.

- c. Committee assignments: it has been decided that ASC must approve all committee assignments. The assignments will be forwarded via email for everyone's review for accuracy. It will be on next meeting agenda, and then voted on October 6th.
- d. BP7205: Employee Code of Ethics will be reviewed at next meeting.
- e. AdHoc committee for voting procedures. A document will be on next agenda under old business (it was missed on this agenda by mistake).
- f. Courtesy subs == why there was no consultation on the decision made. Could Ed Knutson come in for Oct 6 meeting to discuss how the decision was made and how to handle these situations.
- g. It is faculty job to bring concerns to the Senate; the administration moves forward whether or not faculty are made aware prior to the decision being made. This is not always deliberate, but it is the faculty

Phil moves to adjourn at 4:05 p.m.
Mary Seconds
All in favor

VIII. Announcements
None.

Next ASC meeting: *September 29, 2009*

MOORPARK COLLEGE
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
MEMORANDUM

To: Jeff Baker, Ph.D., Academic Senate President
From: Pam Eddinger, President
Date: August 1, 2009
Subject: Academic Senate Reassigned Time
Cc: Ed Knudson, Executive Vice President
Iris Ingram, Vice President of Business Services

Over the past two years, the revenue for the state budget has declined precipitously. This shortfall has affected our College in all aspects of its operation, with little relief in the foreseeable future. In the proposed Tentative Budget slated for approval by the Trustees in August, general fund apportionment for our college will be reduced from \$52 million of prior year to \$49.3 million in FY10. Categorical program budgets cuts will be invasive and keenly felt, since the program funds support primarily personnel. Three categorical programs sustained a 21% reductions, and Matriculation was reduced at 42%.

The general fund reductions were met through a number of strategies, including the consolidation of the schedule to core offerings, reduction of services, and reduction of discretionary spending. Categorical cuts were made to services and personnel, while saving mandated services and direct aid to students. Some of the categorical costs were shifted into general funds. While none of this was a surprise to us, the drastic nature of the cuts, the loss of value-added experiences for our students, the loss of colleagues, and the lack of relief in the near future paint a sobering reality.

Today, I am communicating to you a directive as well as an appeal for your leadership and assistance.

Beginning Spring 2010, the College will change total reassigned time for Academic Senate activities from 2.0 to 1.40 FTEF. The reduction reflects the need for budget savings. The preservation of the 1.4 FTEF acknowledges the importance of Academic Senate work, particularly as it relates to the president's participatory governance duties and the work of the curriculum chair.

My appeal to you and the Senate Executive Committee is that you hold firm in your commitment to serve in spite of this change. I hope the officers would consider Senate leadership work a part of their regular college service, and continue to avail us of their talents. Your leadership will certainly help unite and sustain us as we move through these difficult times.

Thank you for your consideration.

BP 72XX Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies

Reference:

Education Code Sections 87001, 87003, 87359, 87743.2; Title 5, Section 53400 et seq.

It is the policy of Ventura County Community College District (District) to provide an opportunity for individuals applying for academic positions within the District to demonstrate their qualifications as presented in the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* or through an equivalency process should the individuals not possess a valid California Community College Teaching Credential appropriate to the discipline.

A. Qualifications for Employment

1. Minimum Qualifications

Minimum qualifications are established by the legislature and the Board of Governors in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges. A current list of Board of Governors approved *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* is available on the District's website. (jobs.vcccd.edu)

2. Diversity Qualifications

In accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 5 § 53022, job requirements shall include "sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students." These criteria are standard language on all District faculty job announcements.

3. Local Qualifications

The District may establish local qualifications which focus on knowledge, skills and abilities of instructors, counselors, librarians and other student services faculty. These local qualifications are to be determined by the Dean after consultation with faculty in the discipline and in collaboration with the Human Resources Department. The hiring process will focus on ensuring the District selects instructors who can inspire learning and who are experts in the subject matter of the curriculum, and counselors, librarians, and other instructional and student services faculty who can foster community college effectiveness and are subject matter experts in their area of specialty.

B. Equivalency

1. Definition

EQUIVALENCY, as defined in California Education Code § 87359, California Code of Regulations Title 5 § 53430, and by the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges, was established to credit those whose preparation is at least equal to the state-adopted minimum qualifications as defined in *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*. Equivalency for disciplines in which a Master's degree is required means equal to a Master's degree. In disciplines for which a Master's degree is not generally available or expected as determined by the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, equivalency means equal to either a required lower level degree, or a combination of degree and experience.

Employees approved for an equivalency in a discipline in the District are determined to have met equivalency standards district-wide.

The authority to grant equivalency resides with the Board of Trustees or designee relying primarily on the expertise of the faculty in the discipline utilizing the board policy and procedures developed and agreed upon jointly by the Academic Senate(s) and approved by the Board. It does not give a district the authority to waive or lower standards and accept less-qualified individuals.

Minimum qualifications shall be determined for disciplines, not for courses or subject areas within disciplines. In compliance with the California Community Colleges State Chancellor's Office regulations "...a district is not authorized to establish a single-course equivalency as a substitute for meeting minimum qualifications in a discipline" the district Board of Trustees or designee will not approve single-course equivalencies.

2. Criteria for Equivalency – Disciplines Requiring a Master's Degree

a. Equivalency may be granted based upon:

- completed appropriate coursework in a related degree, or
- professional work experience providing knowledge equivalent to that gained from a formal course of study (not to include teaching in the discipline), or
- eminence in the field.

Equivalency may never mean fewer qualifications than the published minimum qualifications.

b. Bases for an Equivalency:

(1) Anticipated Completion of a Degree

Equivalency may be considered based on the completion or anticipated completion of course work necessary for the required degree, however the applicant must possess the Master's degree required by the discipline as listed on the job announcement and consistent with the current *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* prior to date of employment. Validation of conferred degree is required prior to beginning employment.

(2) Completion of Appropriate Coursework in a Related Degree

Equivalency may be considered based on completion of appropriate coursework for a related degree. In the event an applicant lacks the specific degree or experience listed in the current *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, the applicant must meet one of the following minimum standards:

- (a) Possess a Master's degree in a discipline not specifically listed in the job announcement and upon review by the district-wide equivalency subcommittee, it is determined the coursework is closely related and/or parallel to the required discipline.

OR

- (b) Possess a Bachelor's degree in the required discipline, plus an additional 30 graduate-level semester units of coursework specific to the discipline and relevant to the position. The coursework must be from an "accredited institution" as defined by Title 5 § 53406.

(3) Eminence

Eminence may be considered for an individual who is eminent in a specific endeavor and is recognized as such beyond the boundaries of his or her community; has demonstrably advanced his or her field; has been acknowledged by his or her peers beyond the norm for others in the specific endeavor; and attained prominence and celebrity status in the specific industry and/or community at-large. Eminence alone is not sufficient to grant equivalency. In addition, the individual must provide:

- Evidence he or she possesses the equivalent of the minimum general education component of the appropriate degree, and
- Evidence of the specialized knowledge of a particular discipline, and
- Evidence of his or her knowledge and ability to teach effectively at the community college level.

(a) Eminence criteria must include all of the following:

1. The applicant is recognized as eminent beyond the boundaries of his or her community. The applicant must be renowned outside of the individual's geographic community, whose professional reputation, expertise, and influence is beyond the norm within the field.

AND

2. The applicant has demonstrably advanced his or her field. The applicant must provide documentation to demonstrate advancement of the field by advanced degrees OR distinguished employment within the field OR evidence of research and authorship activities substantially contributing to the field.

AND

3. The applicant is acknowledged by his or her peers beyond the norm for others in the specific endeavor and provides evidence of several of the following:
 - a. Letters from other experts, former employers, or professional colleagues in the field (beyond those with whom he or she currently works) relating to the individual's recognized expertise, position, or prominence within the field
 - b. Documents evidencing an extraordinary ability worthy of distinction, such as written advisory opinions from peer groups or organizations representing the field
 - c. Evidence of a major, nationally or internationally recognized award for uncommon achievement in or advancement of a particular field
 - d. Evidence of a significant contribution made to their field
 - e. Publications and/or articles published in established trade or professional journals
 - f. Evidence of having been invited to present to discipline-related professional organizations
 - g. Evidence of extraordinary success in their field

AND

4. The applicant has attained prominence and celebrity status in the specific industry or community at-large. This may include appropriate local, state, national, and international associations, organizations, trade unions, guilds, or communities comprised of experts, who are themselves renowned in the specific field and who can attest, in writing, the prominence and celebrity status of the individual.

(b) Documentation verifying eminence

It is the applicant's responsibility to provide supporting documentation and information for consideration. Documentation shall include a completed Supplemental Questionnaire for Equivalency from the individual describing his or her accomplishments that support a claim of eminence and shall include:

Academic background documentation:

- Transcripts showing completion of advanced degrees OR
- Transcripts showing academic work equivalent to general education required for the degree listed under the minimum qualifications for the discipline

Eminence-supporting documentation:

- Distinguished employment or performance records in the specific field of endeavor
- Evidence of leadership in state or national professional organizations
- Authored publications in their entirety
- Evidence of work products demonstrating a command of the discipline
- Awards or honors attained for contributions to his or her field of endeavor
- Statements/letters from individuals or groups (beyond those he or she currently works with) whose evaluations would support eminence

3. Criteria for Equivalency – Disciplines not Requiring a Master's Degree

The Board may elect to grant equivalency based on the following criteria for faculty in vocational disciplines not requiring a master's degree:

- a. Completion of college or university-level coursework may be substituted for the required Bachelor's or Associate degree requirement as follows:
120 semester units AND two years of occupational experience in the discipline; or 60 semester units AND six years of occupational experience in the discipline; or
30 semester units or industrial certification AND eight years of occupational experience in the discipline.
Note: All semester or equivalent units must all be earned from a regionally accredited postsecondary educational institution.
- b. Related occupational experience may be substituted by teaching experience in the discipline or related discipline on a year-for-year basis.
- c. Recency: An individual employed to teach a vocational discipline shall demonstrate a competency in the current technology of that discipline.

Review of minimum qualifications for applicants including equivalencies will be done in accordance with established procedure. The procedure will ensure a fair and objective process for determining if an applicant has the equivalent qualifications and is not intended to grant waivers for lack of the required qualifications.

AP 72XX Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies

Reference:

Education Code Sections 87001, 87003, 87359, 87743.2; Title 5, Section 53400 et seq.

- A. Procedure for the Determination of Qualifying Degrees (when not defined by the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*)
1. Disciplines listed in the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* which allow for any qualifying degree in a specified area, yet do not specifically indicate the exact titles of degrees which qualify (e.g., “any biological science”), will be evaluated by committees of faculty in the discipline consisting of two faculty members from each college for the purpose of developing lists of specific degrees meeting the minimum qualification requirements. The committees shall convene each time the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* is revised and published.
 2. All screening committees refer to the established lists, as appropriate, when determining if candidates meet the minimum qualification requirements. Screening committees may not consider a degree as qualifying unless it is specifically listed in the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* or it is determined to qualify under the list developed by the discipline-specific qualification committee.
- B. Procedure for the Determination of Equivalency
1. All faculty position announcements state the required qualifications as specified by the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, local qualifications if any, and diversity qualifications including the possibility of meeting the degree requirements by equivalency.
 2. Annually the Human Resources Department identifies the need for specific District-wide equivalency subcommittees for the academic year. In consultation with the academic senates, the Human Resources Department establishes equivalency committees for those disciplines in which faculty recruitments are identified. Composition of the subcommittees includes one tenured faculty member in the discipline from each of the colleges in the District including the discipline representative from the hiring college’s screening committee. An Academic Senate President from one of the colleges not recruiting within the discipline shall also be present to serve in an ex-officio capacity. In the event all colleges are recruiting in the discipline, any Academic Senate President may serve on the committee. Exceptions to the above composition shall be approved by the Director of Employment Services as necessary following consultation with the Academic Senate Presidents.
 3. Following the closing date of the recruitment, the Human Resources Department forwards requests for equivalencies for faculty positions to the appropriate district-wide equivalency subcommittee prior to releasing the pool of applicants to the screening committee. The Human Resources Department will not forward files for applicants who indicate on their application they meet minimum qualifications and are not requesting an equivalency, or for applicants who request in their application an equivalency be considered but fail to attach the Supplemental Questionnaire for Equivalency. The Director of Employment Services may authorize an exception to the above for special circumstances, i.e. hard to fill vacancies or low numbers of qualified applicants in pool.

4. The subcommittee reviews requests for equivalency and provides recommendations to the Human Resources Department. Recommendations to grant equivalency are forwarded for consideration provided there is a unanimous vote by all committee members. Less than a unanimous vote results in the denial of the equivalency request. The district-wide equivalency subcommittee documents in writing whether the equivalency is recommended or not recommended on the Declaration of Equivalency Form.
5. The Human Resources Department forwards all recommended equivalencies to the full screening committee(s) for review along with all other completed application materials.
6. Applications for candidates not recommended for equivalency are made available to the entire screening committee(s). Committee members may review the equivalency determination and challenge any denials. Challenges are taken back to the district-wide equivalency subcommittee for consideration. Upon review, the subcommittee may choose to sustain or modify its initial recommendation.
7. Those applicants who require equivalency approval and who are recommended for hire are reviewed by the local Academic Senate Presidents, Executive Vice President, College President, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Chancellor, and Board of Trustees or designee, in that order. The individuals confirm or deny the recommendation for equivalency, relying primarily on the advice and judgment of the equivalency subcommittee, in accordance with Ed Code 87359(b). In the event a recommendation for equivalency is denied at any level of review in the process, the denying individual sends the recommendation back to the previous reviewer for discussion. The authority to approve the hiring of employees with equivalency shall remain at the Board of Trustees or designee level.
8. Representatives of the collective academic senates and the Human Resources Department will review the equivalency process on a periodic basis to ensure adherence to established policy and procedures.

From: Marie Panec
Sent: Friday, September 04, 2009 10:26 AM
To: Mary LaBarge
Cc: Marie Panec; Donna Santschi
Subject: Curriculum committee representation

Mary,

As the Academic Senate rep on Curriculum committee, can you please see that the committee's recommendation to change the representation makes it to the Academic Senate's agenda.

I would like to see it on the Sept. 15 agenda, if possible, so that we can seat any new reps as soon as possible.

Currently, each division is entitled to one voting representative. The proposed change is to increase this to 2 representatives at the discretion of each division. That is, each division can have at most two representatives. Though some may choose to have one.

The rationale is that some of the divisions are very large and the workload is too much for one representative.

If approved, voting representation on curriculum committee would then consist of:

2 co-chairs - EVP and one faculty member selected by curriculum committee and approved by Academic Senate

3 deans - appointed by EVP

1 librarian

1 articulation officer

1 or 2 representatives per division, at the discretion of each division - voted on by faculty in each division

Non-voting representation:

1 counselor

Thanks!
Marie