

Academic Senate Council Minutes

Tuesday, February 16, 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	X	
ASC Secretary	Lisa Putnam	X	History/Institutions	Susan Kinkella	X	
ASC Treasurer	Nenagh Brown	X	Library	Mary LaBarge	X	
ACCESS	Melanie Masters	X	Life Sciences	Andrew Kinkella	X	
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		
Chemistry/ Earth Sciences	Omar Torres	X	Music/ Dance	James Song	X	
Counseling	Chuck Brinkman		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	Kathryn Adams Alt. Beth Gillis-Smith	KA	Theater Arts/ Communications	John Loprieno		
EATM	Cindy Wilson		<i>Student Liaison</i>			

Quick Recap:

Action Item Topic	Discussion/Comments	Action
Elections Committee Referendum		Amendment to Constitution Passes
Program Discontinuance Policy -- AP 4021	Ad hoc committee reports it would not be in our best interest to adopt this policy as it stands, and does not match the draft we approved last year. Jeff Baker will get copy of last year's draft and bring to ASC meeting March 2, and then will take it to DCSL	None taken
Sabbatical Subcommittee/Faculty Professional Development ad hoc report	Much work has taken place already in the form of a "toolkit" for faculty to use when applying for sabbatical, yet it is missing a feedback loop. A handbook will be drafted to include missing information. Ad hoc committee will continue its work.	None taken
Potential Changes to Petition to Audit Form	Dean's Council is requested that DCSL add a Dean's signature onto the audit form	ASC opposed having a dean approve petitions for audit.
BP 7205 – Code of Ethics (draft)	Vote will take place at March 2 meeting.	

2:30 pm—Call to Order

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

Jeff B. announced that he will not be serving his second year as president due to health issues, as well as the district issues, and he is expecting his first child.

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

Moved to Approve: Riley

Seconded: Phil

Passed unanimously.

III. Reports

Treasurer (Nenagh Brown)

- Checking : \$ 4,708.59
- Savings: \$ 1197.01

Committee Reports

- a. EdCAP (JLoprieno) *Report given the first meeting of the month.
- b. Facilities CAP (PAbramoff).
- c. Faculty Development (MMills)
- d. Senate Subcommittees & Liaisons
 - Associated Students: None (no students available at this time)
 - District Reports-DCHR, DCSL, DTRW, Consultation Council
 - DCHR:.**
 - DCSL:**
 - Consultation Council: None.**
 - DCAS:**
- e. Fiscal (JBaker) *Report given the second meeting of the month
Jeff reminded us that there is a Y'All Come on Wednesday (2/17) at 3pm. There are a lot of rumors regarding classified layoffs and reductions in schedules. The formula for calculating the number of layoffs is so complex that nobody knows how many people are being laid off.
- f. Curriculum (MLaBarge):
Kinesiology courses are being voted on this afternoon. A five-year plan for course revision is being discussed.
- g. TechCAP (KAdams)
The budget numbers will be revised by the next meeting. The TRAC committee, which prioritizes our technology requests from Program Plans, might be contacting departments regarding these requests. Please respond so that they can move forward with their work. If you need help with determining pricing/quotes, contact Rick Shaw at the District. Rumor regarding monies being taking away from budgets – yes, there might be unspent money pulled back, but it will be stored for Moorpark College (not district) to use. Please do not go on a spending-spree; Iris will be watching for these and could deny the purchase.

IV. Unfinished Business

- a. Elections Committee Referendum (Outcome: 32 Yes, 5 No, 2 votes un-circled = Amendment Carries)

- b. DCAS “Productivity” Survey Update (Lisa Putnam)
Reviewed the draft of results.

- c. Program Discontinuance Policy -- AP 4021 (Mary, Riley and Raquel)

Riley reported that the group agreed that it would not be in our best interest to adopt this policy as is stands. The policy is not even close to the one that we had drafted and adopted last year. We had clearly adopted a process that follows Title 5, and that the new one is not so much a process – it is just a “do-it” for those that were already earmarked for discontinuance. If there are three people on campus who agree that a program be discontinued, the program can be moved forward for discontinuance.

Restore the one we adopted last year, and not consider either of the new versions. There are some good ideas from the one from the district, but it is not entirely in our best interest.

There are so many versions of many policies, it is difficult. We would like to go back to our original version, edit it as necessary, and take it back to DCSL for them to act upon. Should we just take the original one back to DCSL and state that they haven’t even been working on the right version? OR should we work on the original one and edit if necessary and then take it to DCSL?

1st step: We already did the work. Here is the version that we already adopted.

2nd step: If we were talking about the adopted version, then here are some changes that we would recommend.

Do we want the ad hoc group to send changes forward as a package, having made changes to the adopted version? Or should they simply move forward with 1st step, rather than putting in a ton of work that might not even be considered. The group would like to take the 1st step only at this time, therefore avoiding doing extra work that might be ignored. Jeff will get a copy of the version and at next meeting we will reaffirm that it is the version that will be taken back to DCSL.

- d. Sabbatical Subcommittee/Faculty Professional Development ad hoc report (Nenagh Brown and Melanie Masters)

Discovered there was a toolkit with information for faculty member getting ready to apply for sabbatical. There was some criteria for the selection on the committee to use. The review of this information proved that the process has been dramatically improved over the last year or so, but there is some information missing or in need of improvement (like the reporting-back mechanism). A handbook would be created, covering the missing information. The group will start with sabbatical, and then possibly move on to faculty development issues. The group would like the ad hoc to continue with this work. The first decision should be how we keep record of decisions, what happens to the documentation? Institutionalize a subcommittee of the senate to oversee this process. The ad hoc will define its recommendations.

- e. Potential Changes to Petition to Audit Form (Pat Ewins)

Dean’s Council is requested that DCSL add a Dean’s signature onto the audit form. Pat, on behalf of DCSL, described the reasons why the request was made.

On the backside of the form there is some confusing language: lab classes are not typically allowed to be audited – students ARE participating in these classes rather than “watching” from the side, taking faculty’s attention from students who are enrolled in the course. Faculty are allowing students to audit classes such as dance, P.E., etc. where students can take a class for “fun” for virtually free (\$15 a unit). The Deans would like to have a second pair of eyes reviewing these requests. The Business Office is asking for clarification. Discussion regarding the costs, the value, and the benefit of auditing students took place.

Previously this had been a faculty decision, now they are asking this to become an administrator decision. There is no data to support the claim that this is an issue; we do not know the number of petitions, nor do we know which disciplines.

Motion: Phil moves that we approve the dean’s signature on the audit form.

Second: Dalila S.

Discussion: None

Yes: 1

Nay: 17

Abs: 5

Comment made: Should we make a recommendation on clarifying the language?

f. BP 7205 – Code of Ethics (draft)

This is the current copy of the policy with all recommendations considered. We will vote on this next meeting. We can suggest recommended changes, or we can accept it as is.

V. New Business

- a. Proposed District Grade Change Policy (placeholder)
No update.
- b. CTE Equivalency (placeholder)
No update.
- c. Part-Time Hiring/Resignations ad hoc report (Howard, Katherine, Nenagh, Jeff)
Meeting Thursday morning this week.
- d. Bricks! (Bridge or Wall?)
Raquel made the motion that the bricks be placed on the wall/Riley seconded.
Wall: 9
Bridge: 8
Too close to call; we will vote again next meeting.

VI. New Concerns

- a. Administrative Decision to Eliminate Block Scheduling for FINALS.
Some faculty members not showing up to administer finals week; and performance faculty would like to be paid for administering the final. Chancellor and Cabinet believe that this is a scheduling issue. The argument is that this clearly impacts what happens in the classroom, a 10+1 issue and faculty needs to be consulted. Dr. Meznick has suspended the change for Fall 2010. It is a given that there are faculty that do not show up to give their finals. Most faculty believe that this is a personnel issue.

VII. Announcements

- a. None.

Next ASC meeting: *March 2 — 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 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.