

Academic Senate Council Minutes

Tuesday, February 2, 2:30-4:00 p.m. in the FH 120

STANDING MEMBERS						Guests
POSITION	NAME	PRESENT	POSITION	NAME	PRESENT	Welcome! Please sign in.
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		
ASC Treasurer	Nenagh Brown	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	World Languages	Raquel Olivera	X	
Business	Stephanie Branca	X	Multi Media, Journalism, Photo	Steve Callis/ Joanna Miller	SC	
Chemistry/ Earth Sciences	Omar Torres		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		
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
Productivity Survey Review	Minor edits made to survey. Survey to be administered over the next two weeks. 3-year-comparison of Enrollment/Retention/Success data to be developed and shared with ASC	
Ad Hoc for Program Discontinuance established	Volunteers: Mary Mills, Riley Dwyer and Raquel Olivera	
Ad Hoc for Part Time Hiring and Resignations established	Volunteers: Howard Davis, Kathryn Adams, Nenagh Brown and Jeff Baker	
Ad Hoc for Sabbatical Subcommittee established	Volunteers: Melanie Masters, Nenagh Brown, Rex Edwards	
Ad Hoc for Local for Equivalency Review of Current Employees	Volunteers: Rex Edwards and a co-chair designated by the EVP office	

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

Handout for Haiti

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of January 19, 2010

Moved to Approve: Riley D

Seconded: Mary L

Passed unanimously.

III. Reports

Treasurer (Nenagh Brown)

- Checking : \$ 4,725.82
- Savings: \$ 1,197.01

Note: Everyone has signed in at the bank on the new cards.

Committee Reports

a. Curriculum (MLaBarge): No report.

b. EdCAP (JLoprieno) *Report given the first meeting of the month

AdHoc sub-committees: should we add one to address the fourth focus. It was decided that it is covered within other three.

MC2: Approval for equivalency question was raised, and the process from last year was discussed. Meeting equivalency to teach a specific piece of software, for example, has been deferred to equivalency process in existence.

c. Facilities CAP (PAbramoff)

Update on Academic Center: Current status, arrangement of classrooms has been seen. Assignment of office space, current plan is that Math moves in, partial English dept, and some counselors, and room for one dean. This is tentative, and being sent back to department chairs for approval. Looking for one wave of moves. Walk-through took place.

New kiln complete. Ceramics studio approved and going out to bid. Lot-A (dirt lot) has temporary surface applied, but a problem with some damage already occurring with unsafe driving on the surface. John Sinutko would like faculty to bring this up with the students, reminding them to drive safely. 22 buildings on campus require roof-repair. Many are going on 40+ years without roofing repair, and were built for 20 years. Due to budget crisis, state has rescinded some monies with promises to disperse at a later date.

d. Faculty Development (MMills)

Nothing new.

e. Fiscal (JBaker) *Report given the second meeting of the month

f. TechCAP (KAdams)

g. Senate Subcommittees & Liaisons

- Associated Students: None (no students available at this time)

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

DCHR: See below.

DCSL:

Consultation Council: None.

DCAS: See below

IV. Unfinished Business

a. DCAS “Productivity” Update – proposed survey (TBA)

Add: Div, Dept, and Discipline IDs (optional). See notes for changes to the survey.

Lisa P. will be gathering 3-year-comparisons of enrollment/retention/success data for administration. The reports are public information and will be made available to all faculty on McShare, and sent to department chairs for program planning purposes. The reports will also be shared with Academic Senate for review, in addition to the survey results.

b. District-wide Equivalency Update from DHCR

Local concerns: list of 30 disciplines that they want faculty names for. The new policy says that all recommended faculty to sit on the committees need to go through Academic Senate. Jeff would like to run the lists through the deans to get the names, and then have the lists vetted here in Academic Senate. Recommended that the lists go through the department chairs rather than through the dean. This is how it will be done. The names will be vetted through Academic Senate.

Immediate Attention: Music, History, Art and English need to have reps right away to forward to Human Resources. We are trying to form the committees quickly, so that we do not hurt applicants applying for equivalency. Should we have alternates listed? HR hasn't requested alternates just yet. We will keep it simple for now (maybe once the lists are established).

Ongoing issue continues with the review of existing employees who do not have equivalency paperwork on file and who do not meet minimum qualifications. HR definitely does not want “rubber stamps” on these. We need to have a genuine review process of anyone who might not meet minimum quals and who do not have appropriate paperwork on file. This audit has triggered this need. Jeff would like to propose an ad hoc subcommittee, with Jeff and another officer, and probably Ed or a Dean, and one or two discipline experts (discipline experts will have the true vote, the others there to ensure that people are being reviewed in the same way) in the field to review existing all employees, rather than individual groups for each employee in question. This will assist in maintaining standards/criteria being used, reviewing those who have continued their education. The interpretation and parody will be more credible with one ad hoc subcommittee rather than several. Any opposition to this recommendation? None expressed. It is so important, should it be a larger group? Jeff believes that the two discipline experts will be the ones who hold the power; the others are there to ensure the process.

c. Program Discontinuance Policy (AP 4021) (?)

Policy had been approved and forwarded. That policy hit DCSL late Spring 09, it was determined that there wasn't a clear enough definition of “program.” We have two documents: (1) a simple document that has been approved, and (2) a longer document trying to define program. Jeff proposes that we have an ad hoc committee review both documents. Volunteers: Mary Mills, Riley Dwyer and Raquel Olivera. Group will report back to Academic Senate on Feb 16th.

V. New Business

- a. Proposed District Grade Change Policy
Nothing new.
- b. New Parking Permit/Procedures (Phil Abramoff)
Concern was brought forward: the change to placards and the restriction of only 2 vehicles approved for parking. The complaint was that there was a lack of shared (participatory) governance in coming to this decision. The senate has 10+1 areas where we have primacy in making recommendations. Is this an Academic Senate issue? Maybe it should have gone to Campus Safety or Environment Committees? It has been decided that it is not an Academic Senate issue.
- c. Sabbatical Sub-committee/Faculty Professional Development
Jeff proposes another Ad hoc committee for this work. Volunteers: Melanie Masters, Nenagh Brown, Rex Edwards. Report back to Academic Senate TBD.
- d. CTE Equivalency (placeholder)
(see above).

VI. New Concerns

- a. Class size:
(1) Union is considering a possible grievance action because the policy on large class stipends has changed and they believe that managers are violating the contract by capping classes at 55. (2) Class size is a pedagogical issue, and we are attempting to get at it with the survey, but it is in the bargaining agreement – it has established caps already, such as in English. Now that this is a bargaining chip, Jeff will set up a meeting with the Union folks to discuss places where senate work/responsibilities overlap with the contract. Before that happens, Jeff is cautious in getting involved, doesn't want to usurp the work of the union. It is quite possible that the Union will say that they want us to say something about the pedagogical concerns with class caps, and will likely want to use our survey results. We can go to our steward with our specific concerns.
- b. Bricks.
(1) A bridge being built over the fountain to come into the main entrance of Fountain Hall, we could have a "walk of fame" with bricks making up the edges of the bridge, or (2) an honor wall can be built.
- c. FYI – Senate release time proposal in contract negotiations. Sue Johnson commended the work that the senates are doing. Right now the recommendation is to have a 1.8 release – which is where we are today.
- d. Code of Ethics (BP 7205) committee has come back with a new policy and we need to review it again. It appears to be relatively unchanged. Propose to create a generic board policy, and then an AP that describes process.
- e. Part time hiring policy/procedures and faculty resignation procedures ad hoc committee. Volunteers: Howard Davis, Kathryn Adams, Nenagh Brown and Jeff Baker.
- f. Change to audit form, a dean's signature will be added to it. It will be new business next meeting. Previously this has been a faculty decision to allow students to audit. In some classes, languages for example, auditors enhance the classroom experience due to their knowledge of the language that they usually bring with them. One of our deans is championing this change; Jeff will invite them in to discuss the rational.

VII. Announcements

- a. Y'All come 2/17 (Wed at 3pm) to discuss budget, in addition to a status report of campus.

Next ASC meeting: *February 16 — FH120*

To members of the Moorpark Faculty—

This past fall semester, your Academic Senate Council approved a proposed change to our elections process for your consideration. Below is a complete summary of the existing language in our senate's constitution regarding nominations and elections to the senate officer positions, as well as the proposed change in language that will create an elections committee to oversee the elections process. Please read the proposed change, and vote YES or NO as to whether you accept the proposed change.

Existing Language—

Section D: Nominations and Elections. Nominations for the offices of President, Vice-President, Secretary, and

Treasurer shall be made by a nominating committee of the Academic Senate Council selected from its members. Nominations may also be made by any member of the Academic Senate. Voters may write in votes on the election ballot.

The list of candidates shall be published and presented to the Academic Senate Council and shall be no later than the following May 15.

Voting shall be by secret ballot. A simple majority of those Academic Senate members voting shall be sufficient for election. If no candidate receives a majority on the first ballot, a run-off election shall be held between the two candidates receiving the most votes on the first ballot.

Representatives from the college **departments** shall be elected as specified in the By-Laws.

Proposed Change— Section D: Elections

Elections for the offices of President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer shall be run by an Elections Committee. This committee shall be comprised of five members reporting to the Academic Senate Council. Its duties shall include receiving nominations, collating and distributing the position statements of all candidates running the election, declaring the results, and adjudicating any disputes that may arise. All decisions of the Committee shall be final subject to approval by the Academic Senate.

Volunteers for the Elections Committee shall be called for and its membership confirmed during the first meeting of the Academic Senate in March during Academic Senate election years. Any voting member of the ASC may volunteer, unless running for election, and if necessary the ASC shall determine by vote the committee's final membership. Upon first meeting, the Committee shall appoint a chair and vice-chair. The ASC Faculty Statement of Ethics shall provide the guiding principles for the decisions and actions of the Elections Committee.

All nominations for the executive officers shall be submitted to the Elections Committee no later than the first meeting in April, when it will announce the list of candidates to the ASC.

The Committee shall ensure that elections are held before the first meeting in May. Voting shall be by secret ballot. A simple majority of those Academic Senate members voting shall be sufficient for election. If no candidate receives a majority on the first ballot, a run-off election shall be held between the two candidates receiving the most votes on the first ballot. Any disputes before or during the election shall be resolved by the Elections Committee.

The Elections Committee shall announce the results of the election at the first meeting in May, upon acceptance of which by the ASC, the Committee shall disband.

Representatives from the college departments shall be elected as specified in the By-Laws.

I vote (circle one)

YES

NO

For this proposed change. (A change to our senate constitution will require a supermajority, that is, 2/3 of all those voting, to be adopted.)

(Ed Knudsen's reply to proposed courtesy sub form)

Good Morning Dr. Baker,

I am receipt of your e-mail, with attachment, regarding the Senate position and questions concerning the issue of Courtesy Substitutions for the coverage of classroom absences. While I appreciate the Senate view that this is a pedagogical issue and therefore within the Senate purview; I respectfully disagree.

This issue is an operational one of compliance with employment and compensation law, risk management, and attendance accounting requirements. The issues we must address, and with which we must comply are:

- If work is performed it must be compensated.
- If the employee assigned to do the work is unable to perform it due to absence, that absence must be reported and documented.
- If the absence is not documented, the absence is unauthorized, which poses significant liability risk to the individual and the institution.
- The number of hours scheduled in the classroom must comply with the COR, system Attendance Accounting Manual and Code requirements.

While the proposed form and implied reporting process you forwarded from the Senate would meet the above, the process adds a complete duplication to the existing process, and doubles the clerical tracking and reporting time for a single absence. The cost of this additional layer, and the added room for error, do not make the proposed solution a viable consideration for the reporting of absences and assignment of substitutes for classroom absences.

As a means of clarifying the application of the substitution guidelines, the following points are offered:

- If it is possible for the first absence, we ask that the class session be cancelled.
- If cancellation is not possible, then we ask that an alternative assignment be given to address the time lost in class.
- Failing these two alternatives, hire a substitute.

The determination of the application of these guidelines is left to the Dean, Department Chair and faculty member on a case-by-case basis. The Dean approves the payment for a substitute. As faculty develop instructional plans for their classes for each semester, it is requested that consideration be given to planning contingencies for unexpected class cancellations (illness, natural disasters, power outages, etc).

Thank you for your consideration and the input of the Senate in addressing this concern. If I can be of further assistance please do not hesitate to call.

Ed

Ed Knudson
Executive Vice-President
Moorpark College
805-378-1403

SCHEDULING PROTOCOLS

INTRODUCTION

This document is intended to provide a set of guidelines and objectives for scheduling courses and class sections, and for cancelling those sections should that become necessary. While this is not policy, it is intended to provide a set of criteria that should be used, and by which we can provide a consistent method of establishing how our schedule of classes is determined and presented to our community and students.

Our over-arching priority in schedule development is to create access to courses that meet the needs of our community and educational goals of our students. To that end, the following protocol is designed to aid in meeting community, student and institutional objectives.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. All of our decisions are curriculum-based and meet, as a first priority, the needs of the community and students.
2. Moorpark College is a two-year college that provides instructional programs in lower division transfer for university preparation and career and technical programs for immediate workforce preparation, however most of the CTE programs at Moorpark also ladder directly to transfer programs at 4-year institutions. Further, the college also provides a limited inventory of courses for preparation in basic skills to prepare students for college level study.
3. This set of guidelines will primarily provide structure for the mix of courses and programs designed to meet the needs of students and community engaged in the lower division transfer preparation and career and technical education portions of the college mission.
4. As a foundation for developing the schedule in lower division transfer courses, we will use as a base the notion that our students are prepared to do college level work. We recognize that this is not always the case, but the sequence of courses for lower division transfer is based upon a two year sequence once a student becomes college prepared.
5. Career and technical education offerings that provide degree and certificate programs and workforce preparation are also assumed to be integrated into course sequencing so students have the opportunity to develop transfer patterns for these programs as well. This allows for transfer to the upper division in specific majors.
6. We recognize the demographics of our student population in developing schedules and sequences in order to meet the needs of the traditional full-time college student, the working student, and students requiring developmental education.

CLASS SCHEDULING GUIDELINES

1. We recognize that we have distinct scheduling segments: students who wish to take classes between 8am and 4pm; and, the working student who primarily takes classes after 4pm and on weekends. Both of these primary patterns are complemented by distance education offerings, and late start and short term class offerings.
2. Our schedules must maximize facility usage. Generally course scheduling patterns view 8am-4pm, Monday – Thursday as a primary block; after 4pm Monday – Thursday as a primary evening schedule; and Friday and Saturday mornings as an additional opportunity in supplementing the other two scheduling patterns. Aside from specific use laboratory classrooms, lecture only, multiple use classrooms cannot be reserved for the exclusive use of a single department. In concert with consistent use of scheduling block patterns, this will maximize choices for students and increase facility use efficiency. This doesn't mean that the departments cannot have a first opportunity at scheduling certain classrooms, simply that these rooms must be open to use by the entire campus to ensure efficient use of our resources. Friday and Saturday mornings present excellent opportunities for once per week offerings that mirror our evening offerings, and once per week laboratory offerings.
3. The college is impacted and has little to no classroom space available during the 8am to 1pm the time frame. Where possible, if lecture rooms can be freed up during that time it benefits all students. One method of doing this is for programs to move one section of a program or area of emphasis requirement, lecture-only section, from the 8am – 1 pm time frame to either 7am, or after 1pm. This maneuver frees one classroom per program for an additional section of general education classes during the time the college is impacted. The reasoning is that all students must take general education classes, and while they also need program classes, these are often single section courses and will be taken when they are scheduled. This frees classrooms and reduces conflicts between Gen Ed offerings and program requirements.
4. Course sequences must provide for degree and certificate completion in a timely fashion. For degree seeking students, who are prepared for college level work, and are scheduled to take 15-18 units per semester this means the completion of an Associates degree in 4 semesters. For the part-time student taking 6-10 units per semester, this means a schedule pattern that allows for completion in 6-8 semesters.
5. Distance Education extends college capacity and should incorporate effective course sequencing to complement the regular college schedule. Capacity is also extended with late start and short term course offerings. These courses meet a specific need for students who are constrained from attending on-campus or semester length classes due to learning styles, work, family obligations or transportation issues. These courses are an important part of our scheduling mix, but represent only a minor portion of those offerings, and should be seen as a complement to the full schedule.
6. Summer session schedules will offer core general education and required program courses to assist in timely completion of degrees and certificates. At Moorpark College the summer session for 2010 and the foreseeable future will be an 8-week, Monday-Thursday session beginning on the second Monday in June. This session allows for 8-week, 6-week, and 4-week scheduling patterns.
7. Class sizes must remain efficient while still meeting student needs. In most cases this will be a minimum of 80 % of the capacity for lecture only classes, and 80% of capacity for laboratory based courses. There are exceptions to this rule: Student safety, regulatory requirements, new course offerings, required courses for completion of a degree or certificate, etc. If a class is required for completion, but enrollments are historically low, the course should be offered less frequently (i.e., once per year or every other year). In each of the above cases scheduling should be reviewed frequently to

maintain efficiency in meeting student needs. Classes required in a major field of study should be core to the curriculum and required at the lower division at a four-year institution.

Extra large class sections will be scheduled to meet student needs and will typically be assigned when the availability of classrooms or faculty availability dictate such. For example, we may be able to increase access to science classes by scheduling two laboratory sections from one large lecture section. In this case, the class capacity would be dictated by the size of the laboratory sections assigned to the lecture. Another example of utilizing a large class section would occur when the availability of faculty with a specific expertise is limited, and access for students is enhanced by the large section.

8. Scheduling will provide first those classes which meet the greatest overall need. General education breadth courses and prerequisite courses which immediately impact educational progress will be high priority, along with core, major preparation program requirements. This means that all students can progress through their identified programs. For example and not meant as an inclusive list, General Biology, History, Humanities, Music Appreciation, Art Appreciation, Economics, English and Math as general education and prerequisite courses take priority in those departments over courses for areas of emphasis in those areas. This means that courses for areas of emphasis may be offered less frequently, but still often enough to meet transfer or completion requirements. Elective or stand-alone courses have last priority.
9. Whenever possible, scheduled sections should have a waitlist allowing students a fair advantage of moving into sections once they become available.

CLASS SECTION CANCELLATION GUIDELINES

In determining whether a class section is to be cancelled, the following guidelines will assist in guiding the decision.

1. Classes would normally be cancelled one week prior to the first class meeting to allow students the opportunity to adjust their schedules to other options. The department should assist students, where possible, in securing other options.
2. Cancellation decisions should be made on a section by section basis, not the aggregate student enrollment for a department or faculty member.
3. Where there are multiple sections of a course, classes would normally be cancelled if they have fewer than 80% of capacity for lecture only classes, or less than 80% of capacity for laboratory based classes. This assessment should be made at least one week prior to the start of a semester.
4. Where there is a single section offering of a course in a given semester the class would normally be cancelled if there are fewer than 15 students enrolled.
5. Where a class is required for completion, and is a single section offering, the class may continue with fewer than 15 students, however, the number of times that the course is scheduled in an academic year should be reduced to increase the enrollment for that class when it is offered. If the course still does not maintain enrollment, the curriculum should be reviewed and appropriate adjustments made.
6. Before cancelling a section, if a waitlist exists in another section, every effort should be made to notify students on the waitlists of the availability of the under-enrolled section.