

**District Academic Senate  
Approved Minutes  
Thursday, April 26, 2012**

**I. Organizational Matters**

**A. Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m. by Co-Chairs Dianne Dorian.

Senators	A	P	Senators	A	P
Clark (WVCAS) Student Services		X	Kelly (WVCAS) Social Science		X
Bowers-Gachesa (WVCAS) PE		X	O'Neill (MCAS) ESL		X
Dorian (MCAS) Co-Chair		X	Retterath (MCAS) Math & Sci.		X
Ghodrat (WVCAS) Bus		X	Shoemaker (WVCAS) Co-Chair		X
Johnston (MCAS) Philosophy		X	Winsome (MCAS) Math & Sci.		X
Kea (WVCAS) At Large		X	Guests: C.Cox, F.Kobayshi, C.Vinson		X

**B. Order of the Agenda**

No changes were made to today's order of the agenda (M/S/U – Kelly/Kea).

**C. Approval of the Minutes for October 27, 2011**

The minutes for the October 27, 2011, meeting were accepted and approved as submitted (M/S/P – Kelly/Bowers-Gachesa).. **1 abs**

**II. Oral Communication from the Public**

There was no oral communication from the public at today's meeting.

**III. Announcements & Information**

No announcements were made at today's meeting.

**IV. Old Business**

**A. Discussion re: DC/DBAC re: Consolidation & Membership**

Lance reminded the Senators of previous discussions regarding the consolidation of the District Council (DC) and the District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC) and the concern that the faculty representation was inadequate. Last year, the District Academic Senate opposed the proposal to merge the two bodies, but the DC voted for the merger with only one faculty representative on the council. The DAS decided to focus on the membership and to determine at a later date how to proceed. The Senate Presidents worked with the Chancellor, and it was agreed that there will be equal representation of faculty, students, district and administration. Lance asked for direction as to how the DAS would like to proceed at this time.

Discussion ensued, and it was stated that DBAC acts as an advisory committee. The Senate is necessarily involved in the budget processes as outlined in the 10+1. In the past the Senate was involved in the operation of those processes. Lance advised that an informal group comprised of Michael Renzi, Pat Fenton, Worku Negash, Lance and a classified representative is studying the RAM, with the intent to flesh out the RAM (**WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THAT?**). This is a work in progress. Concern was expressed that DBAC was not actively reviewing the budget, but

rather reviewing the budget as an informational item. When votes tend to be unanimous without discussion, there is no shared governance without input from the constituents.

Ultimately, it was agreed that, in light of the fact that a new Chancellor will be on board in the near future, it would be best to wait until the new Chancellor becomes familiar with the district and its processes. It was also stated that Randy Castello has a great deal of long term knowledge on the budget, and it would be advisable for her to be involved in the process with the new Chancellor.

## **B. Review & Update DAS 2012-13 Goals**

The following goals were revisited by the Senators and updated as follows:

- A. ACE/Senate Liaison Agreement – To date, no change has been made to the agreement.
- B. Local Minimum Qualifications Reassessment Discussion – This issue is on today’s agenda for Discussion ( See Item V.B).
- C. Development of District Shared Governance Procedures - It was agreed that this issue should be Discussed with the new Chancellor.
- D. Course Repeatability – this is an ongoing curriculum issue. Cathy Cox, Chair of the MC Curriculum Committee suggested that the Prerequisite Implementation Procedures Development Task Force be charged with this task. The task force is meeting on May 16<sup>th</sup> and will continue in the Fall. There should be a district procedure that allows for each college to have its own procedures, as long as they meet the State’s requirements.
- E. Redeveloping the Executive Management Hiring Practices – It was noted that there were only four faculty members on the Chancellor’s Search Committee out of twenty. The committee had two representatives from every constituent group, resulting in a preponderance of classified and administration. The Senators were cautioned not to impinge on the relationships established with other groups. It was opined that Executive Management Hiring Committees should have a preponderance of faculty. Discussion veered to questions and concerns relative to the appointment of an interim president. The Senate Office was asked to research for an existing District Executive Management Hiring policy. **GRA – DO**
- F. Addressing the Achievement Gap – This issue will be addressed next year.

No other goals were added to the above list at today’s meeting, and the list was approved as stated Above (M/S/U – Ghodrat/Kelly).

## **V. New Business**

### **A. Discuss Revisions to Article 26, Faculty Evaluations, For ACE Contract**

Pat Fenton, ACE President, has addressed both college senates on this matter. He has requested that the Senates consider revisions to the articles in the contract on the faculty evaluation process. It is Pat’s view that this matter falls under the purview of the Academic Senate, and he would like the process to serve as a mentoring tool, have some academic value and integrity. He would like the process to be a smoother, simpler process. He would have liked some feedback this semester, as the articles are being considered in negotiations.

Dianne advised that a task force will be formed and will be charged to consider issues relative to the current process to assist Pat in negotiations. The following issues were raised by the Senators:

1. Frequency of evaluation - there is some confusion regarding how often evaluations should take place.
2. How do we resolve concerns when a poor instructor places friends on his/her evaluation committee and receives a stellar evaluation? What is the value of an evaluation if nothing happens? When students discuss their concerns with counselors, they are advised to speak with the department and/or division chair, and to state their views in the instructor's evaluation. Discussion ensued, noting that the Distance Learning Committee (DLC) at each college has been working on revising the evaluation forms. Cindy indicated that the MC DLC is uncomfortable with the process. The DL form and face-to-face form should be done in tandem. The two Distance Learning committees have met and drafted a document they agreed upon by consensus. The document might serve for face-to-face as well and serve as a model for other forms. It was based on Best Practices and Techniques. It was noted that according to Title 5, the forms are supposed to be the same, and the issues of concern need to be addressed as well as the process.
3. The issue of Institutional Responsibility is a long standing concern. The faculty evaluation process was intended to improve teaching. There is no way to assess this matter in the evaluation process. There are many ways to fulfill ones institutional responsibility and the evaluation should include a way to identify what has been done to fulfill the responsibility prior to the assessment period. There are no checks and balances in the current procedure. There are no consequences or incentives to meet the goals set by the individual. Pat has suggested that we might consider letting those who just want to teach, to teach. Those interested in participating in college activities should be rewarded. Other suggestions included docking faculty who do not participate 3.3 hours allotted for participation, or include in the contract that faculty members have to serve on at least one committee in a four year cycle. It was noted that PG&D credit is given to those who serve on committees, and there is a provision in the contract that allows retirees to get re-employment as a part-time faculty member if they have received an exemplary evaluation.
4. Forms should be relevant and apply to faculty in all positions - instructors, counselors, librarians, etc.
5. Student Surveys - It was suggested that all surveys be conducted electronically. Cindy noted that distance learning student surveys are sent via Angel and the return is lower. It was suggested that a way to make certain all students respond be considered. Students are told the surveys are confidential, and yet there have been incidents where their comments have been revealed. Students then are reluctant to participate. Student surveys should be taken after grades are submitted.
6. Training on observation and how to use the information is needed.
7. People on tenure track are evaluated often, and the process should not be complicated.
8. A concern is who keeps the information, sorts through it and forwards the recommendations on to the instructor?  
(At this time a motion was passed to extend the discussion M/S/U - Ghodrat/Retterath).  
It was reported that faculty have been told that the Office of Instruction will provide recommendations prepared by the last evaluation team.

**B. Consider Recommendation to Review of Local Minimum Qualifications**

The Senators were asked to consider a recommendation from the Equivalency Committee that the current local minimum qualifications be reviewed by all disciplines and either reaffirmed as valid and necessary for the discipline, amended or removed. It was explained that the State's minimum qualifications serve as the lowest level of qualifications, and local minimum qualifications can be

established by local colleges as long as they are above the State's qualifications. There are some local qualifications currently in place that hamper the hiring process, and they have not been reviewed for a number of years. It is also recommended that the review process coordinate with the ASCCC's two year cycle.

After a brief discussion, it was agreed that the recommendation should also include the word "update," as well as an opportunity for disciplines to add local qualifications if they wish. Since the disciplines at both colleges must agree on the local qualifications, language should be included that states if there is no agreement, the qualifications revert to the State's minimum qualifications.

The Equivalency Committee is to make its recommendation to the Academic Senates at each college, and, if passed at both Senates, the recommendation will then go to the Board for approval.

**C. WVMCCD Administrative Procedures Revisions for Program Discontinuance, Academic Freedom and Course Approval**

Last year the Senates approved the District's policies. Lance reported that he has not been advised to revisit and review the revisions to procedures that activate the policies. Dianne explained that Chapter 4 deals with academic affairs, and the MC Curriculum Committee has been assigned the portion on Course Approval, a Program Discontinuance process is in place but must be detailed and in compliance with the Ed code; the portion on Academic Freedom is currently being reviewed. Others have been assigned areas from Chapter 4, but it was emphasized that the entire chapter deals with academic issues and must be brought back to the Academic Senate for approval. Any changes in language must be acceptable to and approved by both college Academic Senates.

Dianne presented proposed changes to the language on program discontinuance as well as academic freedom based on the advice of a consultant to ensure that the rights and responsibilities of employees are stated correctly. Lance asked his Senators for direction as to how to proceed. It was basically agreed that the recommended changes from Mission College be considered for approval at West Valley College. Lance will bring Kuni up to date on this matter.

**D. Review Draft Document for District Cooperative Work Experience Education Plan**

Frank Kobayashi, Director of Work Experience, presented a draft document for the Senate's consideration. This document was developed with a consultant using language from Best Practices across the State, and it includes language from Title 5. He explained that the State Chancellor's Office is requiring that a District Plan be provided to assist with reviews.

A brief discussion ensued, and it was agreed that Frank will distribute the document to the Senate Office for distribution to all Senators for their review. To assist in the evaluation of the document Frank and Stephanie will attend each Senate meeting to explain the plan.

Dianne and Lance thanked Frank for attending today's meeting. Lance thanked Wendy Bowers-Gachesa and Tim Kelly for their service on the West Valley College Academic Senate, as well as the District Academic Senate.

**E. Consider Change to Associate Faculty Hiring Process**

This item was postponed and will be addressed at the college Academic Senates.

**VI. Future Agenda Items**

No new items were added at today's meeting.

**VI. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. (M/S/U - Kelly/O'Neill). These minutes are respectfully submitted by Grace Hazán, Academic Senate Secretary.