|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Senate Committee Minutes | | | |
| october 24, 2017 | | 11:45 AM - 1:00 pm | room 475 |
| note taker | respectfully submitted by Caree Lesh & Angie Arietti | | |
| Attendees | Arredondo, Josue | Fielding, Richard | Mossadeghi, Yasmin |
| Arteaga, Elena | Figueroa, Surian | Nieves-Cardenas, Carmen |
| Austin, Naida | Gardea, Jaquelyn | Posey, Jessica |
| ~~Beach, Randy~~ | Garibay, Adrianna | Quintana, Pablo |
| Bowlin, Stephen | Griffith-Jackson, Shaunte | Rempt, Andrew |
| Brenner, April | Hecht, David | Shaffer, Rob |
| Buehler, Lukas | Hopkins, Kesa | Taffolla-Schreiber, Candice |
| Buul, Abdimalik | ~~Lesh, Caree~~ | ~~Van Stone, Mark~~ |
| Caschetta, Todd | Louie, Laura | Vicario, Marie |
| ~~Caspi, David~~ | Lynch-Morissette, Emily | ~~Whitsett, Jessica~~ |
| Cliffe, Karen | Martinez-Sanabria, Maria E. | Williams, Janelle |
| ~~Cuddy, Luke~~ | McAneney, Danielle | ~~Yoder, Leslie~~ |
| Davis, J.D. | McDaniel, Cynthia | Yonker, Susan |
| Detsch, Steven | McGee, Tony |  |
| ~~Edwards, Diane~~ | McGregor, Cynthia |  |
| GUEST/s |  | Rebecca Wolniewicz |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Names in red indicate AS Executive committee members. | | |  |
| **Call to order; Approval of Agenda (Action Item)** | | | ANDREW REMPT |
| Discussion | A motion was made to approve the agenda and was seconded. | | |
| Approval of agenda. M/S/C. Unanimous | | | |
| **2. Approval of Minutes from 10-17-17 (Action Item)** ANDREW REMPT | | | |  |
| Approval of minutes. M/S/C. Unanimous | | | |
| **Public Comment (Information Item)** | | | ANDREW REMPT |
| Discussion | Join Lukas Buehler on 11/9/17 from 12:00-1:00 p.m. in room 392 for a talk on ancestry testing, sponsored by MESA.  At the December 6th ATC meeting the agenda will include a discussion on working out a better communication system between IT and Faculty.  APR is due a week from tomorrow at midnight, be sure you are on top of it and get it turned in on time.  Plenary resolution for Fall 2017 have been sent out. Please contact Caree Lesh if you have comments, corrections, changes or questions. | | |
| **President’s Report (Information Item)** | | | ANDREW REMPT |
| Discussion | SLO’s challenges were discussed with Renee Kilmer, specifically focusing on lack of sustainable resources to get the work institutionalized. We are struggling with eLumen and getting point people. | | |
| **SCEA Report (Report)** | | | Rob s. shaffer |
| discusson | We have our first tentative negotiation meeting on 11/3. Our team has been ready for over 2 months. At Rep Council this week, we will be discussing potential Governing Board member vetting for Norma Hernandez’s seat. Nora Vargas has been given an early endorsement; but nobody has been endorsed for Norma’s soon to be vacated seat. | | |
| **Program Discontinuance: Photography AA (1st Read)** | | | micajah truitt |
| discusson | The teach out plan has been in place for Photography for a few years now. There is a new AA in career technical, so this is where the students who are left in the old AS degree will wind up and this has been in place for 4 years. Photography faculty have met with the counselor several times, and have few to zero students left who have not completed their degree in 4 years. Please send questions to Micajah Truitt.  Once this is approved next week a letter will go to the Superintendent/President to move forward to the Governing Board.  Micajah was thanked for stepping into the ATC Chair position. | | |
| **DACA Resolution (2nd Read/Action)** | | | andrew rempt |
| discusson | A motion was made and seconded to approve the DACA resolution. The VPHR has confirmed this is not in conflict of our campuses Policies and Procedures. The motion passed unanimously, with one opposed. | | |
| **Pro/Con Voluntary Large Capacity Sections (2nd Read/Action)** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | Rules for the debate were discussed. A motion was made to approve the resolution with grammatical corrections the friendly amendment that if there is not an adequate agreement on compensation with SCEA by the end SP 2019, there would not be a pilot moving forward. It was noted that if this resolution passes the Senate will have a chance to weigh in on compensation and support issues.  Pro- The Co-chair of the Enrollment Management Committee noted that this is where the topic was born. It is important that this is faculty led and not for classes where this is not a fit, but those that lend themselves to a large class format. Faculty would have to work with Chair’s and Dean’s to offer these classes. Grossmont offers 21 sections with large capacity option. We also need to track for student success in the pilot.  Con- Before we begin to form an ad hoc committee, we need to look at data on class size and academic outcomes. Stanford research shows class size has an inverse relation to success.  Pro-A faculty member spoke to support the friendly amendment, agreeing with our Administrations history it is important to have the sunset clause. We need to make sure this does not become compulsory. Astro 100 classes take 60 students, but that is mainly due to lack of professors available to teach that topic. It is an inequity that needs to be addressed.  Con- Communication is a vote against based on not having a specific plan and that it is likely to negatively impact part-time faculty. Efficiency needs to be talked about across campus and not just for faculty.  A point of clarification is that any plan that moves forward will be vetted through Senate.  Pro- This can be done, despite administration. Some people’s favorite classes at University have been with 500 students. We are smart enough to make sure this does not lead to us creeping up classes on the whole. We need support for these classes, not more money.  Con- Teaching support is a big concern. Finding tutors and money for tutoring is already a problem with power study. We need to know what teaching support means.  Pro – Commonly social science is an area for this to happen. This was put into the enrollment management plan to generate revenue at the college in the name of student success. The body or research is inconclusive if large class size hurts instruction and student success. Reference link will be sent to Andrew so they will be sent to the Senate documents for today’s discussion.  Con- Administration is already looking at rooms and they have not even talked to faculty yet. If we are going to do this we need to look at rooms for safety and we need help with added work for SLO’s etc.  Pro- Discipline specific some classes make work better this way, such as orchestra and choir. Those classes already have a large class max and they are doing it already because it makes for a better class. Students and community members interfacing in this setting works great.  A point of clarification is that very few classrooms will actually accommodate large class size. Physical changes would have to be made to classrooms. This would have to be addressed in negotiations. The new MSE building has two rooms to fit 60 and one for 100, but main campus as of now only has maybe 4 rooms to accommodate this and some have only one point of entry.    Con- Online might be particularly impacted by Administration pushing this. Distance Education should be exempt from this.  A point of clarification is that Grossmont’s large class capacity is about 60-65.  Pro – A lot of our students transfer to large institutions, so this could prepare our students for this type of University setting. There needs to be support for students as well as faculty.  Con- We need to identify classes that would do best with this format. Our function at the Community College is to get student up to level and not weed them out in a large sink or swim setting.  A motion was made to extend to extend for 5 minutes was seconded and the motion passed.  Pro- We need support, but certain time slots can really benefit from having more space and allow wait listed students to be accommodated.  Con- If you have a large capacity class, and we have 20 enroll out of the 60 – is class cancelled? This needs to be part of the discussion. When do large capacity get cancelled and what happens to those students. The devil is in the details and we need to see specifics.  It was pointed out that when Tim Flood was asked last Spring in the Senates Large Capacity class workshop about resources being put toward this he was not able to commit.  Tim Flood brought this to Grossmont.  The motion passed 21 to 10. | | |
|  | | |  |
| **Adjournment** | | | andrew rempt |
| Discussion | The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 | | |
| The next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, November 14, 2017 from 11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in Room L 246. | | | |