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| lgavlogo | Gavilan College Academic SenateTuesday, October 4th, 2016 from 2:30 – 4:00 p.m. \*\*new location: ART 103 (across from the Theater Entrance) |

**MINUTES**

**ATTENDANCE**

A. Rosette, M. Turetzky, N. Andrade, S. Lawrence, B. Arteaga, P. Hendrickson, E. Venable, S. Dharia, L. Tenney, J. Maringer-Cantu, J. Hooper, L. Stubblefield, D. Achterman

**GUESTS**

K. Moberg, S. Doss, D. DiDenti, A. Delunas, W. Ellis, L. Halper, S. Carr

1. **Opening Items: (5)**
	1. Call to order at 2:33 pm.
	2. Welcome and Roll Call
	3. Approval of Minutes: September 6, 2016

**MSC (S. Lawrence/J. Maringer-Cantu). Vote: 2 abstentions (B. Arteaga, L. Tenney) . Approved as presented.**

* 1. Approval of Agenda

**MSC (B. Arteaga/S. Lawrence). Vote: unanimous. Approved as presented.**

1. **Public Commentary: (5)**

*This portion of the meeting is for members of the public to address the senate. No actions will be taken. Each individual is limited to one minute.*

S. Dodd introduced herself as the SLO Liaison. Her emphasis is to target courses that have not been assessed within the last five years. She announced the divisional meeting which will include the global basis of assessment so it is done on a regular basis.

1. **Reports: (15)**
	1. Standing Reports:
		1. ASGC

D. DiDenti reported that (1) There will be a Town hall meeting through the Gavilan Democratic Club (2) The remodeling of the Student Center survey will be distributed and finished before the end of the fall semester (3) Three bills that were sent forward to the General Assembly and passed. One went to the state assembly that included: shower access for homeless students, and a fourth seat was vetoed. The mental health bill was sent back to the senators. (4) ASGC is looking at a new ID card system that is tied to the Banner system. This will allow tracking of students getting multiple cards and tracking students who drop courses (5) there was also a concern of conflicts with scheduling of courses that occur at simultaneously and maybe looking at scheduling items. This is a common problem with the STEM students who end up attending other colleges for their required courses.

* + 1. College President

Dr. Rose welcomed S. Dodd and discussed the critical piece of student learning outcomes. The department chairs had a great amount of dialogue about the scheduling of courses that was centered on data. The challenge was given that if no one owned certain real estate on campus, except for certain exceptions, what could be done differently. This will be looked at for fall 2017 and looking at a Monday through Friday 8 am – 6 pm schedule. All faculty will be involved and how to look at scheduling based on student need from counseling, student degrees and other factors. She also announced that the upcoming winter intersession will be the largest course offering as of date.

Dr. Rose also announced that the department chairs will be taking a field trip to Coyote Valley to view the site and have the opportunity to see what is occurring up in that area. She also mentioned that the campus was awarded a third STEM grant. The DOE visited the campus and Dr. Rose congratulated those involved in preparation for the visit. Good things are coming but it can only be done when there is collective conversation and a review of past practices and new ideas. A question was asked about the SEM grant if the engineering portion will be brought back. Dr. Rose replied that this is an open conversation and the department is discussing this option. K. Moberg added that the Educational Master plan should answer these questions. Dr. Rose also added that these conversations need to be held and looking at SLOs, with S. Dodd’s help, is a step in moving forward.

Dr. Rose mentioned that the Administration is moving to the CD Center and possibly renaming the center to the Career Development Center. A. Rosette asked if the department chairs can pursue something similar to the full-time hiring plan instead of doing it at the last minute. Dr. Rose was open to looking at that analysis.

* + 1. Vice President of Instruction

Comments were included in the College President’s report.

* + 1. Vice President of Student Services

K. Moberg informed the senate on how multiple measures can place more students at college level with greater success as well as competency mapping that is discipline driven. Student Services will be moving to the CD Center. She also announced that the Health Fair is October 5th and the Food Pantry has served over 2000 visits. There is also a vamping up of the University Visits to encompass all groups targeted by the equity report.

* + 1. Senators (please include any input regarding ongoing AS discussions)

S. Lawrence: She announced that there was training on campus that looked at the capability of SLOs and better assessment. This training can be given to instructors. Canvass will be on campus for training and testing.

* + 1. Senate President

A. Rosette reminded the senators there are two vacant seats on IEC, the Strategic Planning committee (1 person), the Equivalency Committee (1 person, particularly from CET). In appointments, there is not a difference between full-time and part-time. Also, the Educational Master plan is moving forward. Once approved by the board, the consulting firm will present at Academic Senate. The Health/Safety/Grounds Committee is in the process of splitting into two committees and is seeking input. R. Morales and K. Sato are on the committee and questions/comments can be forwarded to them. He also mentioned that the Coyote Valley Educational scheduling is an ongoing conversation and questions should be sent to the department chair.

A. Rosette announced that there is an exemplary program award through the Academic Senate. This year’s theme is contextualized teaching and learning. They are due by November 8, 2016 by 5 pm. It was asked that this information be taken to the departments for further discussion at the next meeting.

* 1. **Academic Senate Standing Committees**

*Curriculum*: L. Tenney updated the senate on the work that the committee is performing.

1. **Information:**
	1. **Distance Education Evaluation Changes (Sabrina Lawrence) (10)**

S. Lawrence distributed “Online Course Design Standards” to the senators. This is information about the Online Education Initiative with an online course rubric. She gave history of how this rubric was created. The Course Design Rubric addresses four different areas and four different categories that the course can be evaluated. Evaluators are trained. Many of the campus’ online instructors are evaluated. S. Lawrence advised that those involved in the course, such as the dean and department chairs, will be trained to understand and look at different areas of evaluation. This rubric will allow the instructor to structure their course as well as how others can evaluate the course. All instructors through the cohorts are being trained on this rubric. At the end, the cohorts will be evaluating the other instructors within their cohort based on the rubric. A. Rosette asked senators to take the information back to the departments and to be very careful about the evaluation process that can create two standards which leads to friction and controversy. S. Lawrence replied that the rubric is looking at the design of the course and not how the instructor is teaching the course. This is more of a tool for the instructor.

1. **Discussion:**
	1. **BP 3280: Grants Application Follow-up (5)**
* The Senate will discuss how to have the Grant applications created

A. Rosette gave background on the BP. B. Arteaga asked if the workgroup would create the form. The workgroup can do the work but needs help. D. Achterman and L. Stubblefield will help the workgroup. The criteria are well placed in the BP and would apply to the new grants. The target date would be at the end of November for approval.

* 1. **BP/AP 3710 and 3720: Updates (10)**
* The Senate will discuss how best to contribute to the modifications of these board policies and administrative procedures

A. Rosette discussed the updates. He distributed a document that dealt with Data Integrity and can be used for discussion. S. Lawrence pointed out that since this is targeting computer use it should go through shared governance. Dr. Rose informed that the question of who has access to what data pointed to these BPs/APs but can have added language to better protect students and the campus. J. Maringer-Cantu replied that the Tech Committee has alluded to the question of safety but not to this extent. S. Lawrence added that the student use piece and this piece can be tied together. A. Rosette asked senators to take the information back to their departments and get feedback. Questions that arose were around privacy and monitoring. Discussion needs to be held on the language within the BPs/APs and bring back with proposed recommendations. This will be brought back in November.

* 1. **BP/AP 5040-5700: Review (Kathleen Moberg) (10)**
* The senate will review and discuss proposed changes of these BP/APs in anticipation for future senate approval.

K. Moberg gave an overview of these BP/APs. These are changes that reflect the state standards. Many changes are insignificant and only reduce the amount of text. A. Rosette asked the senators, especially Student Services, to look at these and give feedback. This will give the senators more information from those who have expertise in those areas.

* 1. **Civic Engagement Presentation (Leah Halper) (20)**
* Leah Halper will present the latest Civic Engagement efforts and invite the senate to contribute to ongoing initiatives.

L. Halper distributed reports and the mission statement to the senators. A question was asked how funding is received for different events. L. Halper replied that the idea is to look at what is being done and how to institutionalize the piece. A lot of funding is committed to the Learning Commons and discussion is being held at what kind of efforts can be done that is student-centered. K. Moberg added that some colleges have Civil Engagement Centers that can be created on campus. D. Achterman added that any ideas can be sent to those involved with the grant and partnerships can be created. L. Halper included that there are certain things that have to be done with the grant. A. Rosette added that there needs to be Civil Engagement infused in the college that can be accessed after the funding is gone. L. Halper added that discussion needs to be held on what kind of engagement faculty can give. She distributed a graph that highlighted different areas that affect South County and how Civil Engagement can help. There is a lack of education in certain areas, such as Diabetes. Each tier will get students involved. J. Maringer suggested that this is a piece that can be discussed in union with the Equity Committee.

A. Rosette asked the senators for pros and challenges to service learning. B. Arteaga believes this is a great idea. One thing that is seen in counseling is that students avoid a course that has a service learning portion attached. The concern is how to present this not as additional work but work that will benefit the student’s community. L. Halper responded that this is not additional work but is integrated within the course content that requires education. The students who are poorest are most motivated to help out agencies that helped them. S. Dharia added that additional work can be spun as a benefit to the student, such as college application or scholarship inclusion. L. Tenney asked that it would be beneficial to have a list of service learning courses.

A question arose which asked what happens if a student doesn’t have a clean record. L. Halper added that there are agencies who will take students with a marred background but it differs with each course. There haven’t been issues with this recently. D. Achterman added that the tiers are a model of different ways a student can participate. Another conversation that can be held is at what level the department can engage to make a greater impact on the community.

Dr. Rose added that this work is a foothold to adding service engagement as part of the campus graduation requirement that can be done through different methods and modes.

L. Halper asked for ongoing discussion with the senate and how this could happen. A. Rosette asked senators to ask their respective departments what level of civil engagement they feel is achievable and if they want a presentation on civil engagement in their department.

**VI Action:**

NONE

**VII Closing Items:**

* 1. Open Forum: (time permitting)
	2. Items for next agenda
		1. Mental Health services for Students (Alice Dufresne-Reyes)
		2. Institutional Data Processes and Priorities (Peter Wruck)
		3. Next meeting: October 20th, 2016

**VIII Adjournment by consensus at 4:04 pm.**

**MC (B. Arteaga)**