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| lgavlogo | Gavilan College Academic Senate  Tuesday, September 19, 2017 from 2:30 – 4:00 p.m.  LOCATION: North Lounge |

**MINUTES**

**ATTENDANCE**

N. Dequin, N. Andrade, A. Stoykov, A. Rosette, D. DiDenti, B. Arteaga, O. Zamora, J. Hooper, S. Dharia, L. Halper, C. Velarde-Barros, A. Delunus, L. Stubblefield, D. Achterman, J. Maringer

**NOT PRESENT**

P. Henrickson

**GUESTS**

K. Rose, M. Bresso, K. Moberg, F. Lozano, R. Brown, A. Benich, A. Van Tuyl, K. Warren, P. Wruck, R. Hannon, K. Kramer, M. Doverberg

1. **Opening Items: (5)**
   1. Call to order at 2:35 pm
   2. Welcome and Roll Call
   3. Approval of Minutes: September 5, 2017

*September 5, 2017 Meeting Minutes*

**MSC (A. Delunus/C. Velarde-Barros). Vote: 1 abstention (L. Halper). Motion passes.**

* 1. Approval of Agenda:

N. Dequin asked that the committee add AP 5301 and move the Information item D. Athletic Department Information discussion first.

**MSC (A. Rosette/A. Delunas). Vote: All in favor. Approval with suggested changes.**

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.*

None.

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

D. DiDenti reported on (1) Club Day today; it was pirate-themed and 50-60 clubs attended the event. Pizza was served. (2) On October 17, six ASGC members will be attending the CCCSAA conference from 10/13-10/15. (3) The Day of Peace meditation is scheduled for Thursday, September 21. (4) David stated that his last day of serving as the Academic Senate student representative is Friday since he will be starting a full time job and leaving Gavilan.

* + 1. College President

K. Rose appreciates (1) opening up the Senate meeting for the Athletic Department to speak about the football program. This openness reflects upon our willingness to step into difficult conversations. Dr. Rose encourages us to read up on the CCC Athletics standards. (2) She wants to give us a heads up about our upcoming Accreditation study and to review our core standards, regulations and policies. (3) She stated that we are continuously reviewing and rewriting our college policies. (4) She stated that Constitution Day was yesterday. (5) The President’s Forum is next week and all are invited to attend.

* + 1. Vice President of Academic Affairs

M. Bresso reported (1) on the Constitution Day event, and she thanked Dana Young for setting up the Constitution Day activities, especially for the Library display that includes the “New York Times printout” as a resource. (2) She reported that the Integrated planning team is working on identifying areas that are duplicating efforts and processes that are operating in silos. They are looking at these processes institutionally and recommending more effective ways. Integrated planning is one of the college goals, and we are looking at how our processes inform one another? (3) Since Accreditation is on the agenda as an information item, she will wait until later to discuss it.

* + 1. Vice President of Student Services

K. Moberg reported on the Financial Aid department working very hard serving students. She stated that there are many changes coming up in financial aid including the renaming of the BOG to Promise Grant.

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

A. Rosette wanted (1) to apologize for missing our first Senate meeting. (2) As Senate VP of Academic Affairs, he is working with the integrated planning team. He and Eddie Cervantes are in the process of updating the Shared Governance manual. He is setting up a working group and asking any senator who is interested in joining their task force to contact him. They are currently researching other colleges’ manuals specifically Skyline and Marin, since they have more progressive and effective models. The plan is to have the first draft of the new Shared Governance manual ready by the November meeting, and they anticipate adoption by the end of the Spring 18 semester. (3) The adjunct faculty compensation is moving forward. There are some part-timers holding down whole departments. (4) PLO and SLO mapping is next on the agenda for curriculum. (5) The lecture hour factor is being reviewed and criteria is being evaluated.

B. Arteaga stated (1) as the Senate VP of Student Services, one of her goals is to work on updating the faculty handbook. In the past, it has always been updated by the Academic Affairs office, and Pilar is currently working on the 16-17 edition. Blanca stated that Pilar would like feedback on the new faculty FAQs. A. Rosette asked about how we can ensure that the information from the new faculty handbook is reviewed by the Senate and that the information is relevant and coherent. M. Bresso said that the goal is to update the obvious out-of-date items. N. Dequin stated that the goal is for our Senate VP to work with Pilar in this process. A. Rosette also suggested that some Deans work with us in updating the Shared Governance manual. They could look at them in detail serving the purpose that is intended and create it together. (2) B. Arteaga stated that October 5 is the DACA deadline for renewal. They will be holding a DACA workshop on September 28 from 9am-12 in SS 111. Please make an announcement in your class, and refer anyone interested to Blanca. She also mentioned that Catholic Charities provides assistance weekly.

* + 1. Senate President

N. Dequin reported (1) that the Senate hoped the faculty co-chair of the Department Chairs would sit on the President’s Council as the other faculty representative, but since we have no volunteer as yet, she is recommending that one of our Senate VPs attend in the meantime. (2) A. Rosette is getting information from the statewide Academic Senate on the Faculty Hiring Process to share at the next meeting. (3) In accordance with our new Senate goals, the Senate VP of Student Services (Blanca) is assigned to work on updating the Faculty handbook. The Senate VP of Academic Affairs (r2row) is assigned the responsibility of updating the Shared Governance manual. B. Arteaga said that she would create an electronic version and email it to the Senate, so members could annotate and make changes electronically.

* 1. Academic Senate Standing Committees

None.

1. **Information:** 
   1. Civic Engagement – Leah Halper (5)

L. Halper reported (1) that she will be sharing the Senate responsibility with Marc Turetsky to represent the Social Science department. (2) She wanted to share a story about the importance of civic engagement and setting up relationships with agencies in the community. The first LGBTQ Center was established in Hollister. She met with the director and the center is open for 3 hours a week. Leah told the director that Gavilan students want to help and support through service learning. The director was very surprised and encouraged by the support. (2) L. Halper distributed the Civic Engagement Report to Senate Sept. 2017. She gave a brief outline of the activities in Year Three of the Title V grant. She highlighted several areas such as: Service learning (new agencies and new focus on student research), One Book, A Closer Look (bring your students), the Speakers Bureau, Peace Day (September 21), Civic Engagement website, Curriculum work on the Social Justice Studies ADT with first-ever Intro to Women’s studies class, Student debates and possible participation in the Graduation Pledge. She reported on the professional development presentation at the Gilroy Art Center. (3) She stated that it is very difficult to get speakers for the Speakers Bureau, and she distributed a sign-up sheet for the departments. A. Rosette stated that this is amazing, and it shows a tremendous amount of work, and we applaud you and your group. A. Delunas asked about needing help with speakers on other topics. A. Rosette asked about the Philosophy of Love as another topic. Leah responded that you can bring on board whatever you are interested in. (4) Leah distributed flyers on several Closer Look workshops such as: Gender, Sexuality, and Identity, The Holocaust, Survival, and Forgiveness and The Russians and Us.

* 1. Mentoring – Leah Halper (5)

L. Halper reported (1) on the mentoring responsibilities and the faculty handbook. She expressed the need for part time faculty to sign up for mentoring. She distributed a handout on the Mentoring Report to Senate Sept. 2017. She highlighted many activities from the report on programs for new faculty such as: surviving the faculty evaluation, supporting student integrity, website resources and best practices. N. Dequin asked about mentoring for the faculty evaluators who were trained as faculty observers. She believes that this topic is still under negotation. K. Rose stated that the training needs to be updated. She remembers the film debut and training the masses at the Convocation day. This video is still online, and it is out dated. K. Rose said that Dr. Bresso should coordinate this training. A. Rosette suggested that the Best Practices document include literature on helpful evaluation tips, different teaching approaches (group work, lab, lecture), pedagogy and teaching methods. Leah encouraged people to email her with topics to include. Leah stated that Robb Overson and her suggest, “everyone should be mentoring everyone”. A Skills Bank would be a nice edition with the “train the trainer” philosophy. J. Hooper stated that the English Department has tons of resources on their website. J. Maringer asked her about the trainings in the TLC, and Leah responded that this would be more of a one-to-one training with each other. She would like to put out the idea of a Skills Bank, so send your comments and questions to her.

* 1. Accreditation – Dr. Michelle Bresso (5)

M. Bresso reported (1) that the Accreditation visit is scheduled for Spring 2019, and it may be scheduled during the last week in February or the first 2 weeks in March. Dr. Rose and I have both completed the ACCJC training and will be serving on Accreditation teams for other colleges. Dr. Rose will be serving on the visiting team for Foothill DeAnza and Dr. Bresso will be serving on the visiting team for the College of the Desert. Thanks to Ken Wagman, our faculty liaison, for setting up our teams. The members will be going to the ACCJC training on how to prepare for our WASC visit at the end of September. You will hear a lot about this new acronym ISER, it stands for Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The focus of the report is “less is more”, and they expect writing that is “tight and succinct”. This report will be a self-reflection of who we are, reflect on and make improvements. The faculty representatives on the Standing Committee are Ken, Doug and Herb Spenner. So far we have faculty leads for several standards such as: Standard 1- Eric Crook, Standard 2 – Leslie Tenney, Standard 3- No faculty rep, Standard 4 – Nikki. Each standard needs faculty engagement, so consider volunteering to participate in the process. Blanca will be leading the student involvement.

**Discussion:** A. Rosette asked what the official role of the Senate is in accreditation? He had a few suggestions about the chairs being formed outside of the Senate. The Senate President is supposed to appoint all faculty. The Senate is the voice of the faculty and they should be involved in appointing and recruiting. They are currently just being informed, not being involved in the process.

N. Dequin stated that one of the Senate goals is to be highly involved and the first step is going to the ACCJC training next month, and then we can figure out how it directly involves us and be helpful in terms of navigating our way through accreditation. What is our involvement and how should we address this process? What involvement would you like to see? A. Rosette stated that as the teams are composed, the Senate should have a centralized appointment – not just voluntary basis, plus a commitment to report back to the Senate and keep us informed. The Senate doesn’t get to see the report until the end as Information; our involvement needs to be a proactive role. We are trying to change the culture of silos, so we need to be involved along the way. Ken Wagman – as faculty liaison – is actively seeking volunteers, and it is senate responsibility. This liaison is an official GCFA appointment. The appointment to institutional committees is by the Academic Senate President. The team leaders for each standard should also be the obligation of the Senate. D. Achterman would like to use the Senate influence, and it may strengthen the process. Dr. Bresso said that she would send the list to Nikki and ask that she put forward the requests for names where are areas are not being met, gaps, get more people involved ensuring that the product be more cohesive and better informed for all.

D) Athletic Department Information – Nikki Dequin (5)

**Discussion:**

N. Dequin started the Athletic Department discussion. The Department is planning to hold a campus-wide forum to address further concerns of the faculty related to the news articles and the investigation on the football players. Mike Dovenberg, the head football coach, introduced himself. L. Halper explained the reasons why she got involved and sent the emails about the articles to the faculty. She stated that Hartnell has a panel comprised of faculty, administrators and students that have some oversight over eligibility issues and others related to treatment of athletes. N. Dequin expressed that she was not ignoring the faculty when they call, but she was not able to discuss the investigation until there was a complete understanding of the pieces involved. K. Kramer stated that he has been at Gavilan for 11 years, and he is happy to hear that people want to help. He thanked Leah for sharing the articles and the thoughts behind them. He meant no disrespect in his email, and he is encouraged that faculty are concerned. These athletes are part of a larger issue related to housing and food. The issue is the how we deal with student athletes especially through recruitment and support. We want the processes we use to be transparent, and we are bound by specific rules. J. Hooper stated that the English department had a conversation about what happened. She stated through their own past experiences, some English faculty have dealt with football players who are homeless and need food. They drafted a letter about these issues and sent it to the President and both Vice-Presidents expressing their dismay about what happened. She suggested that a larger forum address not only the incident, but answers to so many questions people might have such as: why this happened, are they acclimating to Gilroy or Hollister, what are some of the specific problems or issues they are facing and how can we help? She would like the open forum to focus on respect, openness, and serve not devastate. K. Kramer stated that he wants people to understand the relationship with our student athletes are governed by rules and regulations from the State, and essentially our hands are tied. In the open forum, we can ask questions about how we can help these students across campus. N. Dequin asked everyone to please encourage your students to attend. A. Rosette asked about the initial discussion at the forum, who will be leading, and the clarity of information that will be communicated. He stated that this is an institutional not academic issue. L. Halper suggested the forum be scheduled during college hour and D. Achterman offered the large room in the library.

1. **Discussion:**
   1. Academic Senate Goals (5)

N. Dequin stated that this year’s Senate goals include: updating the Shared Governance manual and the Faculty Handbook. A. Rosette added that the Senate be involved in the full-time hiring policy and the lecture/lab equivalency since we need closure for both. L. Halper suggested that we might want to discuss Jerry Brown’s 1st year of college completely free program. Nikki said that she would look into it.

* 1. Finals Schedule – Ken Wagman (10) – Tabled.

N. Dequin stated that the former process for creating the final schedule is Ken and Jan Chargin produce it. Ken would suggest a more formal process.

* 1. AP 5520, 5035, 5530, 5500 (10)
  2. BP 5030; 5035; 5000 (10)  
     A. Rosette stated that both Aps and BPs look at student services, but it appears that the policies are shifting the disciplinary action from the VP of Student Services to the VP of Academic Affairs. For student conflict – creating an official grievance officer for students shift changes. A. Rosette said that in BP 5500, the green sheet is crossed out and replaced with the outline of record, which implies the course outline contract. K. Moberg stated that the course syllabus and course outline of record are two different documents. Any disciplinary actions are directly related to the course syllabus (formerly the green sheet) that the faculty member uses directly in class. K. Moberg suggested that any changes be sent directly to her.

1. **Action:**
   1. AP 5010, 5011, 5013, 5015, 5020 (5)

*It was motioned to discuss and approve the AP 5010, 5011, 5013, 5015 and 5020 with the changes that were suggested at the last meeting.*

**MSC (A. Rosette/D. Achterman). Vote: 1 abstention (L. Halper). Motion passes.**

B. Arteaga recalled the discussion to remove the word *alien* from AP 5020, and D. DiDenti recalled the discussion to change the word *natural* to *biological*. D. DiDenti stated that there was confusion in AP 5013 on why the spouse was not included or whether it is talking about the parent.

**MSC (B. Arteaga/C. Velarde-Barros). Vote 1 abstention (L. Halper). Motion passes with changes.**

* 1. BP 5010, 5020

*It was motioned to discuss and approve the BP 5010 and 5020.*

**MSC (D. Achterman/A. Delunas). Vote: 1 abstention (L. Halper). Motion passes.**

* 1. Guided Pathways Leadership Task Force (5)

*It was motioned to discuss and approve the Senate’s involvement in establishing a Task Force that will provide direction to the creation of an institutional committee on Guided Pathways that was recommended at the last meeting.*

**MSC (A. Delunas/D. Achterman) Vote: 1 abstention (L. Halper). Motion passes.**

Discussion: N. Dequin asked several questions about the Senate involvement such as: Is this task force going to look at the campus community and our role in Guided Pathways? Are they going to talk about and propose a way to create an institutional entity that will accomplish guided pathways goals? Is the task force going to establish membership for an institutional committee? Are the members going to decide where we are going? Are they going to develop the process to meet the timeline for funding? Are they going to complete the self-assessment? A. Rosette asked Karen if this task force is going to be structured as an instructional committee or are they only going to be doing things or taking action? If it is an institutional committee, then they will have to create bylaws and such and report back to the Senate. He stated that first we need to be specific, and second, we need to establish the 1) What will the committee do? 2) What is the scope of the project? 3) Is this a subcommittee of the Senate or an institutional committee? and 4) Will this committee research the scope of the funding source? K. Warren stated that the FIG recommended to her that the Senate create and approve a task force to establish what we need to do to meet the expected timelines. A. Rosette asked Karen if this timeline is reasonable for the work that needs to be done. K. Warren stated that she believes it needs to be a broad institutional involvement, and it will be a 15-20 hour commitment for the members involved. A chair should be selected to oversee the formality of the application process and apply for the funding. The task force will need both campus and district support along with continuing to educate the larger campus. J. Hooper asked about the funding process and whether it is grant-based. Karen replied that the funding is individualized per college, and the money is for the general overview of activities. The funding covers the inquiry and planning process only, there are no positions or programs provided. D. Achterman itemized the list of task force priorities as such: 1) Select chair, 2) Complete the formal application, 3) attend to the timeline, 4) create a plan and 5) seek participation. He suggests that the task force proposes a way to create the institutional task force by April or May. N. Dequin states that given the timeline dates, the task force members need to identify the urgent items and facilitate completion of the necessary items. J. Hooper states that the task force could follow the application process. A. Rosette that the task force meets monthly, and the Senate would like to see a draft of the institutionalization by Spring. He said that he would be happy to work with the task force. B. Arteaga asked who would be part of this task force? K. Warren suggested that current members of the FIG want to be part of it (L. Tenney, J. Stewart, and J. Weiler). N. Dequin suggested that the composition of the areas need to be diverse, for example, 5 faculty, students, classified, VPs/Deans etc. We need to discuss the composition of the task force, so we might want to extend the meeting.

*A. Rosette made a motion to extend the meeting an additional 5 minutes.*

**MSC (A. Rosette/D. Achterman) Vote: All in favor. Motion passes.**

A. Rosette made a motion to table this discussion until the next meeting, but due to the timeline deadlines, it was suggested that we continue the discussion. K. Warren stated that her ideal task force composition would include: 6 faculty, 2 classified, 2 students, 2 VP, 1 Institutional Researcher, and 2 Deans. She said that since the Pathways FIG is an education group, they do not have the responsibility to respond to the state guidelines that were issued over the summer. D. Achterman stated that the task force should start meeting, select a chair to oversee some of the formal application process, facilitate writing of the plan and make sure that the task force communicate with the campus. He suggests that we recommend the creation of the task force and leave the staffing of the institutional committee open for a later decision. He asked when does the Senate want the feedback about the assessment and plan? Since the assessment is due November 15, the draft needs to come to the Senate in October or early November. Nikki will send out an email requesting participation aside from the people who have indicated interest.

*D. Achterman made a motion to approve the creation of a Guided Pathways Task Force with membership created by the Senate, and they need to report back to the Senate and bring the Assessment plan back to the Senate two weeks before the state deadline.*

**MSC (D. Achterman /A. Rosette) Vote: 1 abstention (L. Halper). Motion passes.**

1. **Closing Items:**

**A)** Open Forum: (time permitting)

**B)** Items for next agenda:

Integrated Equity Plan

1. **Adjournment by consensus at 4:10 pm**

**A motion to adjourn was made by L. Halper.**

**Next meeting: October 3, 2017**