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**MINUTES**

**ATTENDANCE**

N. Dequin, P. Henrickson, A. Stoykov, L. Halper, A. Arid, A. Rosette, B. Everett, S. Dharia, O. Zamora, N. Andrade, J. Hooper, D. Achterman, J. Maringer, A. Delunus, B. Arteaga, K. Wagman, C. Velarde-Barros

**NOT PRESENT**

L. Stubblefield

**GUESTS**

K. Rose, M. Bresso, K. Moberg, P. Wruck, R. Brown, F. Lozano, A. Benich, C. Mantia, S. Sandler, J. Wilson, R. Hannon

1. **Opening Items: (5)**
	1. Call to order at 2:33
	2. Welcome and Roll Call
	3. Approval of Minutes: October 17th, 2017

**MSC (A. Delunus/D. Achterman). 2 Abstentions (L. Halper; C. Velarde-Barros). Motion passes.**

* 1. Approval of Agenda

**MSC (A. Delunus/C. Velarde-Barros). All in favor. Motion passes.**

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: (20)**
	1. Standing Reports:
		1. ASGC

B. Everett stated that the ASGC has approved a letter that will be sent to the Board regarding the student use of college hour. Next Friday, they are having a special meeting to go over the general assembly parliamentary procedures.

* + 1. College President

 Dr. Rose was very excited about the installation of an amazing oil painting by Susan Peterson of the Gavilan duck pond. She would like to name the pond. She offered the senators to stop by to see it. She will talk about the updated Strategic Plan later.

* + 1. Vice President of Academic Affairs

M. Bresso discussed the update of the accreditation process, and the teams are meeting and starting to write to the standards. A new piece in the accreditation process is called the quality focus essay (QFE). This is a brief document that shows our plan toward addressing a project that is helping us improve how our students succeed. We are all engaged at this point in Guided Pathways, with many faculty involved in this process, and this seems to be the most likely area to address in this essay. As a requirement, this report needs to be new, and on something that we are not currently doing. However, with Guided Pathways, we are in phases, and she asked ACCJC if we are currently in phases, can we use the next phase of this topic, and they said they would accept it. Overview of how the project we are addressing helps us focus on student success, what our plan is to work the project, and where we are in that plan. The QFE will get reviewed by the team, but it will not receive any commentary as part of the accreditation evaluation. She wanted to bring this to you, and she would be interested in a dialogue. It is possible to address two efforts in the QFE, so we can do Guided Pathways and another one. Thank you to the many faculty that are already engaged, and we do need additional help.

* + 1. Vice President of Student Services

K. Moberg wanted to thank everyone involved in Transfer Day; it was a great success.

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

P. Henrickson reported on the same lines of Guided Pathways, her department is looking toward starting an Education Pathways, and they are participating in a regional grant for $30,000. Along with the funding, this grant helps us become a member of the Teacher Preparation Pipeline (TPP) STEM/CTE Collaborative. She distributed a handout on the TPP. They have completed the Letter of Intent (LOI), and they are mapping all the resources available at Gavilan. The grant application is due in December. This membership will give us support, and we will have access to the monies of the other larger colleges. It is a win, win for our students and possibly for our student teacher and service learning placements.

L. Halper stated that the Social Science department has been working on a lot of curriculum, She would like to celebrate the creation of a new course, Introduction to Women’s Studies, which will be offered at Gavilan first in Fall 2018 semester as part of the new Social Justice Studies ADT. At the suggestion of the Counseling department, the Social Science Department has started working on a Social Work ADT and they have applied to the committee and both of these areas overlap with civic engagement and social science. Speaking of civic engagement activities, she wanted everyone to share the invitation to Mosh Hoshimoto’s presentation at 2:30 in Sera Hirasuna’s class in the Library Study area. She also invited everyone to the presentation on the Russians by Marc Turetsky, Craig Mosher and Peter Howell on Thursday night in Morgan Hill Community Center at 7pm. They will try to videotape both presentations to share on GavTV.

N. Andrade wanted everyone to visit the newly renovated gymnasium. Tomorrow our women’s volleyball team is playing toward the conference championship. The soccer team is playing their last home game. The men’s basketball team is playing at SJ City College. The football team is in their last week. A large core of young men still competing, and it is very courageous of them.

 J. Maringer stated, as Senate Secretary, she was updating the Academic Senate website and noticed that the 2016 list of senators was missing, so she sent a list around for senators to confirm their department representative during that year.

* + 1. Senate President

N. Dequin stated that she attended the Academic Senate Plenary, and it was a great experience. She met a lot of Math and English faculty from various colleges. They discussed a lot of resolutions in areas such as Guided Pathways and accreditation and the role of the Senate. Regarding Guided Pathways, she stated that each college needs to make it their own, and faculty voices are important and the students need to have a voice. AB705 was a hot topic, and we will discuss it on our next agenda. When she receives the next resolution packet, she will share it with everyone. She discussed the important role the Senate plays in the accreditation process and the Vision for Success.

* + 1. Senate VP of Academic Affairs

A. Rosette discussed the Faculty Professional Learning Committee’s follow up on sabbaticals. He encourages members to apply, and the application is due December 1. The committee has developed and shared the rubric, so applicants can understand the ranking. Contact Denise Besson or Susan Turner if you have any questions. He discussed the status of the task force meeting to discuss the Curriculum Committee’s bottleneck of the course proposals in CurricUNET. They will continue to work on these issues. He is also working with a task force to update the Shared Governance Handbook. The goals include: clarify the shared governance process, make it clearer on how to participate and define what is officially sanctioned by the institution. There has been good work on it, and they will have a draft to show Nikki and Dr. Rose for review, and then early spring to share with the Senate. Nikki said thank you to the committee for their hard work.

* + 1. Senate VP of Student Services

B. Arteaga discussed the new placement tool that is listed under the Gavilan Assessment test website. For any students who have earned a 2.5 or B in English or Math are determined eligible for English 1A or transfer level Math courses. The student will complete an override in banner to register for that Math or English course. The Counseling department is opening up a new Kickstart orientation on November 15, 2017. This orientation will have videos and information that is “to the point” and concise. Students can print out the information or certificate and take notes if they choose. The new Student Handbook was revised by the Student Services department and will be available on November 15. She stated that Transfer Day was better attended than last year. The dates for assisting for CSU/UC applications in PB19 include: Wednesday, November 8 (2-4pm);

November 17 (10-1pm); Thursday, November 20 (2-6pm); and Thursday, November 28 (1-4pm). Please let your students know regarding these dates. They could also go to the Transfer Center or to the Counseling department. For incoming new high school students, there will be an orientation on November 15, from 1-3pm. She has already received suggestions and additional comments regarding the survey for the Faculty Handbook, which we will discuss.

Ken wanted to comment about the new assessment tool, and when the Math department had a meeting, they discovered mistakes with this tool, and so if you could stop it, we are looking at getting our version to you.

* + 1. GCFA President

K. Wagman stated that the GCFA is working on our contract, and the big issue is retroactive pay. Ken will be sending out an email to give dates to talk to faculty. The District is not willing to give us retroactive pay, but they have agreed to adding more money on the salary schedule that he feels is equivalent. One of the reasons that we are so rushed, is that we want the raise to be effected on the November 30th paycheck so we do not miss out another month of the raise. I want to acknowledge Dr. Rose for working with the Board to get this to happen. Thanks to you and the Board. Since we will not be getting retroactive pay in the future, our negotiations will start earlier next year, so a survey will be coming soon. Send good vibes and wishes to our negotiators, Nate Osborne, Rey Morales and Robb Overson. A. Rosette asked about the 80% release time total for the VP positions of the Senate, and Ken stated that yes, the 80% will be funded with this new contract. R2row asked about the committee chairs resources. Ken stated that it was not on this year’s contract, so we can add it to next year negotiations. Regarding the SLOs/PLOs work, officially the .5% raise will be for training on how to use Canvas, Guided Pathways, SLOs/PLOs, etc., but we are not required to do them. Ken stated that the stipends would be determined by the departments in consultation with the VP of Academic Affairs office & the Institutional Research area. J. Hooper asked about the reasons why we are not receiving the retroactive pay since we have in the past. Logistically, Ken stated that when the District left the Santa Clara payroll system, they made it very easy to give percent raises, but very difficult to give retroactive paychecks. He is not sure why with today’s technology that this is a problem with the new system. You will get a December 31 paycheck from Wade’s email, not on December 17. This .5% raise will be listed on the salary schedule, and the retroactive pay is not listed on the salary schedule or towards retirement.

* 1. Academic Senate Standing Committees

C. Velarde-Barros reported on the Equity committee. They are updating the resources and support materials to go on the Equity website. They are working on the equity framework and we are hoping to get feedback from the campus community about our Principles of Community. We are updating other materials when we are asking the funded programs to come back with their observations included on their reports of the changes that are occurring. We want to ask everyone to think about attending the 2-day training on March 9/10 at Mission College. We would like to get together a team to attend this training. We are going to be presenting a workshop on December 8 called “Showing Up for Racial Justice”. Leah and Kimberly Smith are working on this Friday workshop. Leah reported that it is a workshop on ways European Americans can learn how to support communities of color. It is a follow up to what is happening in the Charlottesville, country and the world, and to continue with the athletic discussion that was started a couple of weeks ago. Everyone (staff & faculty) is invited, and we just got the funding yesterday. We are in the planning stages and the workshop will last 3 hours. Carla stated that the goal is to create a larger training series to be offered in the Spring and Fall for professional learning opportunities. She also wanted to mention that the Equity committee has made a commitment that the remaining funds be designated to professional learning activities.

1. **Information:**
	* 1. Guided Pathways Self-Assessment (5)

C. Mantia is the co-chair of the Guided Pathways task force, and she will give the report. On November 2, the committee asked faculty, staff and students to come and review the elements of the various areas for Guided Pathways. They called it a workday, and they did a little mega-majoring clustering and talks with the various people who came by. We are still assessing the data from the workday. She distributed a handout on the 14 key elements of the self-assessment tool and the flyer for the next meeting. It is also available on the [Guided Pathways website](http://www.gavilan.edu/academic/guided_pathways/index.php), and she will send the link to Jane to add to the Senate website. We encourage everyone to attend the meeting on November 9 from 11-1pm in the TLC because we want your input, questions, inquiry and concerns. The point of the self-assessment is that we are going to be submitting it to the Chancellor’s Office for a non-competitive grant for $600,000. We need the self-assessment completed by December 23, and we will need to submit a work plan by March 30, 2018. We need to show a really good indication on how we are going to have Guided Pathways at Gavilan, and I echo Nikki’s statement on “making it our own”. We are at the beginning just like everyone else. We can tailor this to our population and make it meaningful. We are no longer looking at it as an initiative, but as a way to help our students succeed and complete Gavilan in a realistic time frame. The PIO office will be coming out with information, and Jan Janes is working on it. R2row asked when the Senate approved the task force, it was to address the more immediate need of the self-assessment and determine how the committee would be institutionalized, for example, whether or not it will be a standing committee. Cherise said that we are working on the self-assessment only at this time, but she believes that this assessment may inform us on how to move forward and possibly determine the type of committee needed. Blanca wanted to make sure to clarify who are the representatives from the Senate and who is specifically assigned. There is a specific group that is tasked to make sure this assessment goes through and we need to be clear on the reps if we need to contact them. Nikki stated that we are not a committee yet; it is a task force. When it is time, we need to formalize and institutionalize it into a committee with all campus constituents involved for their input. We need to have all campus constituent groups’ input for the self-assessment. R2row said that what Blanca was referring to was that we created the taskforce to include a finite set of membership that included: faculty (5), administrators, students, classified staff, etc. Jane stated that the number was stated in the minutes. Doug would like to add the list of members of the taskforce to the agenda for the next meeting as an information item.

* + 1. One Book – Scott Sandler (5)

S. Sandler and J. Wilson are excited to present the civic engagement activity funded as part of the Title V initiative called “One Book”. They distributed a handout introducing their slogan “One Book, Many Perspectives, One Community” and the values of the project. They discussed the dreams of the project on what might “One Book” look like on our campus. Scott stated that after surveys were conduct, the book they chose this year was “Just Mercy” by Bryan Stevenson, and they purchased 200 student books with Equity money. He stated that the book discusses several areas such as: imprisonment, poverty, capital punishment, mental illness, imprisonment, race relations (Black lives matter), and children tried as adults. Scott reported that the book covers a lot of activism, and the message that when we see injustice, we have to beat the drums of justice. He said this book crosses many departments such as: Economics, AJ, English, Theatre, Child Development and Sociology. We want to get this book to as many hands as possible. He stated that there are a lot of different ways to engage with this text in our classrooms. You can research the community models at Chico and Pasadena City College. At Pasadena, they have a poster day. Other ideas include: speaker series, graffiti walls, art /empathy gallery, film day or any event to remove certain stigmas. Jillian said that many instructors have already adopted this text in their classroom already; for example, Grant Richards will use this book for his film class. On the civic engagement website there is a link for the [Gavilan One Book](http://www.gavilan.edu/student/civic/One%20Book.php) webpage, and there are themes, supplemental materials and sample curricula listed for you to use. Jillian said there is many ways to engage with this text without reading the whole book. Doug said thank you to both Scott and Jillian for their hard work, and he is super excited about it; it’s an easy read and this book is available in an audible format in the library. The potential to bring community members together in this conversation is really strong. The public library is interested in participating with us on this topic. The whole purpose of this is to create a community conversation around a topic of importance and to use that text to really help inform that conversation. Scott wanted to state that it is not just Jillian and I, but many other people on this group such as Cherise and Sydney LaRose. Dr. Rose stated that she is very proud of the work that this group as well, and she would like to share with the Board that we are doing with this project. She has already listened to the book on her commute. She would like to engage in this topic in many ways such as: bringing it to the President’s forums, possibly creating podcasts on it and speaker forums in the community. She would like everyone to support this project. This is not only a way to leverage, of course, the obvious work of our college, but it should be a legacy building movement that creates this social justice theme, or community conversation. Let her know how we would like her to present it to the Board. Scott reported you can contact us with any feedback or concerns that you have and you are invited to attend a Brown Bag on Thursday, Nov. 16 at 5pm in the TLC. R2row asked if this was a multi year event. Scott said they would be doing it for this semester and next semester. R2row wanted to let Scott know that Christine is the coordinator of the Library Art Gallery, so he could contact her.

* + 1. Integrated Planning Committee (5)

Nikki would like to know more about the integrated planning committee. K. Moberg stated that the Integrated Planning committee replaced the Grants Council. It is a huge undertaking. It is an attempt to create an umbrella of what we are doing institutionally, and we are looking at all the different funding streams, our enrollment goals, our initiatives and outcomes that we all have and how does this all roll into something tangible and understandable for where we are going as a college and what impact it has on our students. We are trying to articulate what it looks like in a graphic. There graphic is posted on our [Integrated Planning website](http://www.gavilan.edu/committee/int_plan/index.php). This graphic shows all the different areas where they are currently receiving funding, and we want to make these areas readily accessible if anyone has a question. We need faculty input to look at things structurally both on the fiscal side and on the student service side. We want to see it visually and also how to instruct a process and integrate the documents. This is a large task, and we need additional people to help us put together a plan. Dr. Bresso stated that just like Guided Pathways isn’t a single focus, integrated planning is not just about instruction or student services, it’s about the engagement of all for student success. Integrated planning has the same scope operationally and institutionally. We want to connect, understand and make sense of our part in the whole process, and we will be better able to do our work. Everything is integrated, and if it is not, we would ask if this is appropriate, should it be involved or should we stop doing it. We need to make sense and understand our work to ensure all of our efforts are meeting the needs of our community. R2row asked how the structure and this process is integrated into shared governance. Is it an operational committee, institutional or an organizational committee? Where does this fall under our shared governance structure?

1. **Discussion:**
	1. Athletics (15) –Athletic Dept.

Nikki reported on the documents that she shared with the Senate members (AP5700 and BP 5700) and a link to the [California Community College Athletic Association (CCCAA](http://www.cccaasports.org/landing/index)) that states the constitution and bylaws that govern athletics. Leah asked for information for people that didn’t attend the forum. What happened? How did it happen? Why was it handled the way it was? How can departments help? Was it handled appropriately and did we follow our policies. Nikki stated yes. Jessica couldn’t attend the forum last week because she was teaching, and her department shared some concerns. There was a general sense of some of the questions being answered and people who were interpreting the rules believed they were doing the right thing. How can we prevent this from happening again in the future? She asked if anyone has reached out to those 17 young men? R2row hasn’t had time to review the board policies. If anyone has reviewed those policies, has anything been identified that may need changed or more concrete? Leah did review them, and colleges that have successful programs with their athletes have a support group like Hartnell. It is not a student club, it is a college wide best practices group where everybody is represented, and they look out for their student athletes. R2row asked about procedures, but Leah stated that they are boilerplate; these practices are in addition of the procedures. Nikki answered Jessica’s question and no one has reached out to these young men at this time. Jessica also asked about what concrete things are being done, so this cannot happen again. Nikki is not sure if this is a Senate discussion at this time, maybe looking at the policies as R2row had suggested to see if changes need to be made. Ron wanted to make sure everyone understood that nothing criminal happened and there were no laws broken, just rules were broken regarding constitution and bylaw. As an institution, our requirements are very narrow in what type of support we can offer our students. As far as the event itself, there was no penal code broken, only our rules and regulations that we are governed as a member of the CCCAA. R2row asked if this is the same or different from our conflict resolution appeal process. It is a separate process and there is an appeal process within the constitution and bylaws. We committed the violation, and students were the victims and ineligibility was the result. These students chose to leave our institution, but I will help them any way I can. If a student decides to attend another institution within our system, we can help that other institution file an appeal to have the student’s eligibility reinstated. Doug stated that our 10+1 what is the take away from the institution and are there any recommendations from the Senate. Educating our coaches & revisiting often, discussing recruiting and preparation so this doesn’t happen again. Understand that our student athletes are your students and majoring in your areas. It takes a lot of support and resources to adequately run an athletic program. He is impressed with the hands on of our faculty and the interaction of the faculty with the students even with the size of our college. What you can do: encourage your student athlete, give them support, engage with the students, collaborate and attend the games. As instructors, you are their coach too. R2row stated that what the senate can do is follow up on Leah’s suggestions of a support group that looks at athletes’ success.

* 1. New Faculty Handbook Survey (5)

Blanca reported on the updated version of the Faculty Handbook Survey. Some of the feedback included: Question #2 was not relevant and with question #4 utilize the scale instead of how often do you see yourself using it. She would like to go through each question and discuss the changes. In question #7, is there information about off-site, what information would be most useful, how do I print, where do I get my keys? She wants to get as much feedback as we can. Jane asked if you are going to add text fields where faculty can fill in information, and if so, could you add some examples so people know what you mean, for example: how to print, where do I find a key? Blanca said that she is working with Ryan Shook, and they will be working with Qualtrics to develop the survey. R2row would suggest to add a question if they are interested in being on a focus group. Sejal stated regarding question #7 on what parts are not useful, it might be helpful to add where they can find the faculty handbook somewhere in the survey. Also in questions 2 and 3 they may not be that relevant to the overall survey, because you are looking for ways to update the handbook. Jane added that initially we wanted to know if the faculty member was new, this might be helpful as compared to a faculty member who has been here a long time. If the survey can be tailored toward those answers, then it might be helpful to keep that question. Nikki asked how we could provide her feedback on this survey. Blanca will send it out by next Tuesday for your comments, and then she can send it out to all faculty by next Friday.

* 1. AP 5570, AP5610, AP5525, AP5510, AP5210

Nikki stated that there were not very many changes, and we will bring these back to the next meeting for a vote. R2row suggested that Nikki work with our student representative to review since these policies have a lot to do with students.

* 1. Strategic plan

K. Rose reported on the update of the Strategic Plan. You have a copy of it in your packet. The Strategic Planning Committee has been working on this update since last year. This is the final update, and there are 6 strategies. The plan is college-wide cultural practices that will encompass ongoing practices that will allow us to do instructional improvement, administrative services improvement, and student services improvement. It will allow us to have critical conversations when things come up like the football program and beyond. The Strategic Master Plan is really an important document. It is a touchstone document that connects the Program Plans and the Program Reviews. It is important that you review it and thank you Nikki for adding it to the agenda today. It will go to the President’s Council and the Board next week for review with the final approval at the December Board meeting. After this approval of this 5-year strategic plan, we have decided that it is way too long, so we are going to meet again to start writing a draft of a 3-year plan. The planning group includes Andrew, Cherise and Peter. We have taken out some strategies.

Doug would like to make the motion to extend the meeting 5 minutes.

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

R2row asked if this was a 5-year plan and the new one will be a more refined final version. He asked if it would be aligned or incorporated with the Educational Masters Plan and Facilities Master Plan. Dr. Rose stated that it was 5-year, and they have will incorporate these plans when the Facilities Master Plan is completed. Andrew stated that Facilities Master Plan may be completed in January 2018. Jane asked about the connection of the Principles of Community, Institutional Learning Outcomes and the College mission. Kathleen stated that the ILOs are really coming along and she commends the Senate for their work. The Principles of Community is under review, and Carla is a part of that committee. The College mission needs to be reviewed and possibly the value statements in the catalog. The SLOs and PLOs need to be mapped to the ILOs, and a lot of work is being done in those areas. A huge amount of work is being done to align the core planning documents to the next 15 years of practice institutionally, so great work. R2row asked about the Technology Master plan and Kathleen stated that the IT department has gone under some reorganization, and then we plan on updating it. The Strategic Plan will come back to the senate as an action item at the next meeting. Kathleen thanked the Senate for adding this plan to the agenda and for the additional five minutes to discuss the changes.

1. **Action:** None.

1. **Closing Items:**
	1. Open Forum: (time permitting)
	2. Items for next agenda
2. **Adjournment**

 **A motion to adjourn was made by A. Rosette.**

**Next meeting: November 21, 2017**

**Senate Responsibilities: “10 + 1”**

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies
4. Educational program development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
6. District and college governance, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports.
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
9. Processes for program review
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
11. *Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the Academic Senate.*