

# Academic Senate Council Minutes

Tuesday, September 1, 2:30-4:00 p.m. in the PCR

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

## Quick Recap:

Action Item Topic	Discussion/Comments	Action
Brief Orientation for new members		None
Reaffirm 2009-10 Goals for Academic Senate	Removed completed items and added two new goals.	Approved as amended
Review and Address Release Time Reduction	Discussed; Concerns raised. Resolution letter to be drafted and brought back to ASC next meeting.	Resolution letter to be drafted for next meeting.

- I. Public Comments (Those wishing to make public comments should be in attendance by 2:30 p.m.)
- II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of May 5, 2009)
- III. Treasurer's Report (Rex Edwards)
  - \$2541.82 checking
  - \$ 1221.07 savings
  - Year of the bricks – hoping for about 5 to 8 bricks to be purchased this year. This will catch us up. Two year cycle because of the difficulty in ordering and installation.
- IV. Committee Reports
  - a. Curriculum (MLaBarge)

Curriculum is encouraging more participation from faculty in curriculum review process. Division reps are looking for assistant reps due to large number of CORs going through the system. Voting is a concern, but those in attendance do not believe that it will be a problem having more than one vote.
  - b. EdCAP (RPetrello, JLoprieno)

LPutnam gave a quick update on the progress of the Self Study and program planning process. 2009-2010 Program Plans that were drafted in spring 2009 are open for final revision and submission. All plans will be submitted by next EdCAP meeting (Sept 22). The plans will be used in resource allocation processes, including the faculty prioritization process within Academic Senate. The program plan template is being updated for the 2010-2011 planning process to accommodate Business Service departments and hopefully improved for data entry. The 2010-2011 template will be reviewed by EdCAP at September 22 meeting.
  - c. Facilities CAP (PAbramoff)

1<sup>st</sup> meeting 9/16. New VP of Business Services: Iris Ingram. 3 main: EATM, early stages, Health Science going up quickly, Academic Center projected to be done in Spring 2010. Occupation as early as summer classes. Friday (8/23) John Sinutko and deans and architects met on the Acad. Center (33 classrooms) – another meeting this Friday regarding who will be occupying that space. Large classroom (80+) will be available in the building; Phil guesses that there will be 4 rooms that large. Three floors, at least one on each floor, he believes. There is quite a mixture, 34, 35, 40, 40+, and then 80+. Currently the areas hoping to move in will be Math, Social Sciences, English, a few of the new programs like massage therapy (office space) with classrooms in the Health Science building. 1<sup>st</sup> floor fountain hall will become student service office space as classrooms vacate. Eliminating trailers and the loss of Fountain Hall classrooms, and therefore Academic Center will not “gain” us much more classroom space. Will the current Health Science building be demolished when the new building is up? It has been talked about. ACCESS is moving, but discussions are still taking place – possibly Fountain Hall. Long story short, a lot is still undecided.
  - d. Faculty Development (MMills)

No meeting as of yet.
  - e. Fiscal (JBaker)

Meeting was cancelled.
  - f. TechCAP (No Rep?)

Rex Edwards will find out the meeting schedule.
  - g. Senate Subcommittees & Liaisons
    - i. Associated Students
    - ii. District Reports-DCHR, DCSL, DTRW, Consultation CouncilNo Reports
- V. Unfinished Business
  - a. **Brief Orientation for New Representatives**

New Representatives included: Linda McDill, Andrew Kinkella, Kathryn Adams, Stephanie Branca, Mary Mills. Each received a copy of the constitution, history of the senate. Senate deals with curriculum, degree/certificate requirements, grading policies, discusses educational program development, standards/policies regarding student preparation, faculty roles, faculty involvement in accreditation process, policies on faculty professional development, program review and discontinuous processes, process for institutional planning and budget development, and other educational matters mutually agreed upon. Senate is a consultation body working with AFT union.

**b. Review and affirm ASC Adopted Goals for 2009-10**

Rex distributed current goals. (Goals listed here for reference)

**ASC Goals for 2009-2010**

*Goal 1: Evaluate and recommend the Learning Community Advisory Committee for status as a subcommittee of the appropriate college standing committee.*

COMMENT: LCAC was instituted in Fall 2007 by Presidential charge. The Charge stated after two years, committee viability would be evaluated, for permanent status as a subcommittee of the appropriate sub-committee.

STATUS: Completed. This was voted on and approved at the last meeting of Academic Senate.

*Goal 2: Bylaw election revision*

COMMENT: Revise/amend bylaws to provide more specific guidelines for senate elections.

STATUS: To be completed. Discussion began.

**Bylaw Election Revision Discussion:**

Bylaw election revision – is this really necessary? Last year we formed a subcommittee to return with recommendations. The subcommittee never met; the recommendation was that we look at some of the language, and first of all determine whether or not we need to change the bylaws. (Adhoc committee included Melanie, Nenagh, Clint,) The subcommittee has been charged; they should come back with some work done. Nenagh was disappointed that they did not meet. Should it continue to plan to meet? Question was raised: does this committee actually exist because it was formed last year? Do we need to reform the committee with a new motion to form a new committee?)

Riley moves to recharge the adhoc committee; Nenagh 2nds; Passed unanimously.

Adhoc committee charge: (1) Determine whether we need to revise/amend by-laws, and (2) Revise/amend and consider bylaws to provide more specific guidelines for senate elections.

Volunteers: Nenagh (if possible due to being on sabbatical), Kathryn A., Clint H.

Meeting times: right after ASEC

**Point of Order:**

Can faculty on sabbatical participate in faculty activities such as adhoc committees? The rules are set to protect those on sabbatical. Clarification is needed.

*Goal 3: Tenure Handbook*

COMMENT: Develop a handbook to guide faculty and administrators through the tenure process at Moorpark College.

STATUS: To be completed in 2009-2010.

*Goal 4: Maintain active link in the accreditation process as we prepare for a Fall 2010 site visit*

STATUS: To be continued in 2009-2010.

*Goal 5: Work with the Vice Presidents to develop a strong faculty-management partnership*

STATUS: To be continued in 2009-2010.

*Goal 6: Maintain connection with the contract negotiation process, also considering limitations.*

STATUS: To be continued in 2009-2010.

Kathryn moves to remove completed items from goals, Melanie seconds. Passed unanimously. Goal 1 (Learning Communities) will be removed from current list.

**New goals to be added:**

*New Goal 1: Viability of the Academic Senate at Moorpark College*

COMMENT: Continue to increase the strength viability of the Academic Senate at Moorpark College.

CONCERNS: Release time is not in the contract. It was always an “understanding” rather than a contract issue. Is it different for each campus; is that why it isn’t on the contract? It is not protected if it is not in the contract. It is based on historical agreements. It has been forwarded to the AFT for inclusion in the next contract negotiation.

*New Goal 7: ACCESS Exam Proctoring Policy*

COMMENT: ACCESS referrals for extra time on exams for ESL students. This is not a disability issue.

***CONCERN: Is there a policy/agreement among instructors for students needing additional time for language barriers?***

John moved to amend ASC goals with new items; Melanie seconded; passed unanimously.

Melanie moves to accept the previous revised goals for this year; John seconded. Passed unanimously.

**V. Unfinished Business (continued)**

**c. Review and discuss ASC Release time Reduction (attached)**

Discussion:

Comment: the long-term survival of ASC is dependent on availability of release time. We are being directed to determine the new release distribution with the total reduction in Academic Senate release time, moving from a 2.0 FTEF to 1.40 FTEF (a reduction of 0.60 – the equivalent of three class releases). This is a directive (see Memorandum dated August 1, 2009 attached).

Our current release is as follows:

- Current: 1.0 President, 0.4 Curriculum, 0.2 Secretary, 0.2 Vice President, 0.2 Treasurer
- Last Year's Proposal: 0.8 President, 0.4 Curriculum, 0.2 Secretary, and 0.0 for VP and Treasurer.

We need to discuss new structure. Question from the senate reps: Is this a cut that is happening at all three campuses? It is rumored that OC is not going to implement this. We have not heard from VC. It is the impression that this is a district level directive. The decision that needs to be made appears to be: How do we divide the release time that is left?

Can we make a statement that we oppose and feel that we should have been consulted prior to this directive? Cuts are being made without consulting departments, faculty, and staff. We need to state that this short term cut will have long term implications. This is not just money; this is about power and governance. This ASC body is moving us in the right direction in regards to governance, and the district is removing ACS involvement by limiting the amount of release time. This reduction in faculty involvement will become apparent in the accreditation process. District will be assuming more power. Melanie requested more information from the other campus senates across the state to determine if similar cuts are being made in other districts. Mary requests that we find some colleges about our size and call their academic senate president to gather information in regards to common release time.

We should provide language for the justification to KEEP the 2.0 level of release. We need to have the statewide academic senate release info so that we can make a strong case to keep our current level of release.

Nenagh moved that we draft a response/resolution to the letter expressing our displeasure/discomfort with the decision to reduce the release time by the next meeting. Mary seconds. Passed unanimously.

Rex will meet with Clint and Melanie to craft a response. We ought to include that we would like to revisit the release time decision at a certain point in time (the cut is temporary, rather than permanent and we will bring it back to the president of the college to reverse the release back to the original 2.0).

Last year's discussion resulted in: 0.8 president, 0.2 for secretary, and 0.0 for VP and Treasurer. We will not submit our results right away – it will show that we will cave to the directive to make reductions. We would like to see what OC and VC plan to do, and let them know our decision to disagree.

## **VI. New Business**

- i. 1<sup>st</sup> Reading (Request for Approval): BP72XX Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies  
Rex reported that equivalencies raise very serious legal issues. District policies appear to be boiler plate. We are one district and therefore these are district level policies.]
- ii. 1<sup>st</sup> Reading (Request for Approval): AP 72 XX Minimum qualifications and Equivalencies  
College policies to be read very carefully. Please go through and determine appropriateness.
- iii. Making Decisions Document  
This document is available on portal. Read through the document carefully. Does it properly describe the Academic Senate? What would be a means of defense if the Senate comes under attack? What in The Making Decisions document could be cited?

## **VII. New Concerns**

Some programs have been eliminated

- Applied Music
- Golf (male 16 or 17) and (female 9 ) and Wrestling (25 students)
- Nursing lost two full time faculty positions, not being replaced. These are mandated positions by the Board of Certified Nursing.

Academic Senate end time ... should we end at 4pm, or allow for 4:30 end time? 4pm will continue to be goal.

## **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