

<b>Academic Senate SBVC</b>	<b>AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30</b>
---------------------------------	----------------------------------

## Minutes of November 19, 2014

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>Call to Order</b>		
	<b>Approval of Minutes from November 19, 2014</b>		<b>Motion</b> by A Au for approval of the Minutes of November 19, 2014. <b>2nd</b> by N Sogomonian. <b>Voice vote</b> – unanimous save two abstentions.
	<b>President's Report</b>	<p>J Gilbert reported on the following matters (attached):</p> <p><b>Legislative Agenda for 2015:</b> pending areas are dual enrollment, adult education, CTE, accreditation, accountability/affordability, transfer, and implementation of bachelor's degrees. Some local senates (mostly from large campuses) appoint a Legislation Liaison to track current/pending legislation affecting CC's – too large a task for the president alone.</p> <p><b>Common Assessment Initiative:</b> will develop, free of charge, an assessment tool available to all CCC's; it will include a validated collection of multiple measures available to colleges along with assessment preparation. Common placements (cut scores) will still be determined locally. SB 1456 requires use of a common assessment to receive SSSP funding. A resolution passed which excluded some writing assessment from being fully computerized.</p> <p><b>Online Courses – Instructor Content and Student Authentication:</b> As a means of ensuring regular and effective instructor-initiated contact (required by Title 5 § 55204), 81% of surveyed instructors use email, 76% use discussion boards, and 16% use chat rooms. As a means of authenticating students, 100% use a secured login and password through a course management system, 78% give proctored exams, 54% use writing style software for anti-plagiarism. Plenary materials are accessible at <a href="http://asccc.org./events/2014/11/2014-fall-plenary-session">http://asccc.org./events/2014/11/2014-fall-plenary-session</a></p> <p>Next Executive Senate meeting (Nov. 26) will be virtual.</p>	

**Academic Senate  
SBVC**

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<b>New Business</b>	<p><b>Fall Plenary Review:</b> A Au addressed new FACCC standards. Mission Statement requirements have changed; SBVC's are currently too cryptic. Expectations now include degrees and credentials offered, how we commit to student learning/achievement. Aggregation of data re Program Review is emphasized. Distance Ed was discussed. Self-evaluation cycles for colleges with good reports will be seven years; otherwise, six. Other topics included: human resources, PT faculty, Standard Four (governance). J Gilbert mentioned discussion and resolutions addressing parameters defining success at a CC – going beyond degrees/transferring, e.g. did a student accomplish his/her ed plan? A Au concluded that gender equity was a major topic. J Stankas said that the state commission is pushing for schools to be able to track a specific course, e.g. Chem 101, and be able to disaggregate three-year success trends re gender, ethnicity, etc. He contrasted the challenges of collecting data in large, popular multi-section courses as opposed to infrequently offered classes. Standard 2.01 passed; it says that as a component of evaluation, faculty and administrators who will have direct bearing on student learning will have SLOs assessments as part of their evaluation. "Faculty participation in the SLO process could be a component in their own evaluation, but the results of student learning achievement assessments should not." He noted that 2.01 makes no distinction between FT and adjunct faculty and suggested this as a matter for the union.</p> <p><b>Interim Management Policy Suggestions:</b> last year District Assembly discussed having a policy in place regarding interims, but no action was taken. Issues include: how interims are selected, evaluated, service time limits. A Chatterjee said there used to be a committee to select interims; candidates who wanted to stand for the permanent post had to go through a committee selection process; they were also evaluated. J Lamore: time limits lead to an endless revolving-door; J Stankas: formerly, interims were excluded from the permanent pool, but that practice ceased because of some highly desirable interim candidates. "There's usually some collegiality to the process of appointing interims." A Chatterjee: it is an oddity that an interim has more tenure/security than a dean with year-to-year evaluations and contracts. J Gilbert will pool ideas and forward them to District Assembly. Improved language could possibly be inserted when AP/BPs regarding management evaluation are up for review.</p>	

Academic Senate  
SBVC

AD/SS 207  
3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	<p>Old Business</p>	<p><b>Student Complaint Form:</b> S Lillard said the union would be in dialogue with VP R Shabazz to resolve issues regarding faculty and permanent records. The current contract, Article 17, delineates how students log complaints against faculty. The process is clear; however, there isn't a specific form. R Pires distributed copies of her research. She suggested waiting until the accreditation report comes out. Schools with a complaint process have a dedicated web site; page 1 is generally entitled: "Complaint Process Notice," with directives for local complaints and links to the ACCJC and State Chancellor's office. SBVC and the District do not seem to have this. Most sites link complaints to the school's grievance policy. Valley's is currently under modification. She noted discrepancies between the grievance policy and the faculty contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Students have 180 days to file a grievance (Policy) vs. 10 days (union contract).</li> <li>2 Students file complaints with VPSS (Policy) vs. immediate supervisor (contract).</li> <li>3 Forms will be maintained in Office of Student Life (Policy) vs. no mention of records (contract).</li> </ul> <p>R Pires cited Lane College (OR); its form disallows complaints against faculty being filed using the website complaint process; rather, students lodge complaints with the appropriate division dean, subject to dispute resolution procedures. J Gilbert said the item would be readdressed Dec. 3.</p> <p><b>Bylaws – Standing Committees:</b> J Gilbert led a discussion about deleting/merging standing committees. Executive committee said that Ed Policy, Student Services, and Elections are vital. Equity/Diversity, and Student Services could perhaps be merged. An ad hoc committee could be formed whenever certain issues arise; do Legislative, Personnel, and Financial need to be <i>standing</i> committees? J Stankas, from his perspective as past president, said that legislation is generally tracked and addressed by the senate president. The campus Budget Committee could serve in place of Financial. In his view, merging Equity/Diversity with Student Services possibly would create an impression that diversity is not a campus-wide priority; also, with the disaggregation of data coming from the Chancellor's office and required of the campus for accreditation standards, Equity/Diversity "would have something to say." J Gilbert's proposal would be to strike Financial and Legislative, leaving Senate with six standing committees. Language for all committees still needs to be edited/clarified. J Lamore: by definition, a standing committee has regular work to do; otherwise, an ad hoc group is more efficient.</p>	





<b>Academic Senate SBVC</b>		<i>AD/SS 207</i> 3:00 - 4:30	
Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action