

Academic Senate Council Minutes
Contra Costa College
2600 Mission Bell Drive, San Pablo, California 94806

Monday, August 21, 2023		2:15 – 4:00 pm	Location: SAB211/ZOOM (See link below)
VOTING MEMBERS MUST ATTEND IN PERSON			
2:15	A	Call to Order (Quorum consists of more than 50% of currently filled member positions.)	
		Academic Senate President: Gabriela Segade Voting Representatives CIC Chair/AS Vice President: Leslie Alexander LA: Erica Watson, Joseph (Randy) Carver SS: Lorena Gonzalez, Camille Santana AACE: Michell Naidoo, Elisabeth Schwarz NSAS: Deborah Dixon, Chao Liu CTE: Michele Redlo Distance Education: Randy Carver Adjunct Faculty: <i>Vacant</i> Non-Voting Representatives: Senate Assistant: Sabrina Chan, Academic Senate Assistant Classified Representatives: Karen Ruskowski, <i>Vacant</i> ASU: <i>Vacant</i> ASCCC Liaisons: CCMS - Lucy Giusto OER – Maricela Ramirez Relations with Local Senates – Katie Krolikowski	Meetings in person SAB211 Members of the public can also access the meeting via Zoom https://4cd.zoom.us/j/7111046353 Meeting ID: 711 104 6353 Dial by your location +1 669 900 6833
2:15	B	AGENDA ITEMS	
2:15	1	Approval of members attending in person, approval of members in remote attendance (5 min.) – Attending in person: Chao Liu, Elisabeth Schwarz, Erica Watson, Camille Santana, Lorena Gonzalez, Randy Carver, Leslie Alexander, Michell Naidoo. Attending remotely: Karen Ruskowski, Deborah Dixon, Sabrina Chan Absent: None Guest: Anton El Khoury, Romus Reese	
2:20	2	Approval of Agenda (5 min.) – Gabriela amended the agenda to add new member joining the Council: Michele Redlo – Moved to approve agenda as amended: Lorena. Second: Michele R. In favor: all present	
2:25	3	Approval of minutes from May 1st, 2023 (5 min.) – Postponed due to lack of administrative assistance.	
2:30	4	Public Comments (5 min.) – No comments from the public.	
2:35	5	Proposed additional question for faculty evaluations – Discussion only (This is a UF/AS area) (10 min.) – Gabriela reports that several people are not satisfied with the measures of student success. It was suggested to ask more questions, but the evaluations are negotiated by the UF and management, so we cannot change them. Gabriela mentioned that many programs have the following statement: “I have learned a lot in this class.” A member felt that this question has to do with the instruction. Chao: It is hard to specify what it means by “I learned a lot.” He doesn’t expect this question to provide much useful information. Gabriela mentioned from previous experience that the question elicited some useful information. Elisabeth: results are also dependent on the course. Some courses are team taught and an instructor may be penalized by the curriculum or another instructor who works with them. Gabriela emphasized that courses are not about how much progress students make but about reaching a certain milestone—that is the specific knowledge the students should master in the class. Moved to table measure: Chao. Seconded: Randy. In favor: all present.	
2:45	6	Generative AI: What are faculty needs? Training? Resources? Ideas for professional development. (15 min.). – Erica said there is a lot of movement on the subject. She can do resources for colleagues, but she does not think that we are ready to offer professional development. Erica has been attending talks but it’s mostly possible	

		scenarios, not very substantial content. Erica said that she could have something for the Council to look at in October. Michele R pointed out that in nursing AI is used mostly in positive ways. It is a tool to learn, and we should embrace it while realizing that students can use it to cheat.
3:00	7	<p>10 + 1 – Faculty development: Having Academic Senate review curriculum offered for faculty development: Nexus and flex – We should conduct needs assessment – The Council discussed the need for more rigorous process for approving grants – Funding and vetting for faculty-led trainings. (20 min.). Gabriela stated that the Academic Senate Council should examine the curriculum for Nexus, which is the professional development program offered to new faculty. We should identify all the needs and then put out a call for proposals. People who are competent and willing to do the preparation can get compensated from PD funds. Lorena points out that PD can be very procedural and doesn't pay attention to curriculum and instruction. She argued for sending people to pedagogy conferences that focus on equity. The Council discussed the amount of funding given by the grants on the one hand and how many people can get funding. They discussed asking grantees to come and share with the campus what they learned. Randy mentions that the new ACCJC guidelines will soon require demonstrating what was achieved with the professional development offered. Gabriela said that many of the suggested equity-driven interventions have been short workshops or conferences. When we implement equity-oriented interventions, we need to differentiate the instruction because if the instruction is the same for everyone, often the students from higher socioeconomic status are more likely to take advantage of support services. The Council discussed starting by evaluating the Nexus curriculum as it is now. Then we will collect information from faculty about their needs.</p>
3:20	8	<p>10 + 1 – Student Learning Outcomes: How can the Senate guide the process? (10 min.). Gabriela mentioned the fact that SLOs are under the 10 + 1, so the Academic Senate should be involved. Until recently the SLO Coordinator was a classified person. Chao said measuring outcomes is a challenging process. Michele R said we should have workshops so that faculty are more proficient in measuring outcomes and understand their importance. Gabriela announced that she had invited Michael Kilivris, SLO Coordinator, to come to the Academic Senate Council to discuss SLO policy. Chao says eLumen does not provide much support for SLO. Leslie told the Council that the previous SLO Coordinator used to look at the outlines every content review and assessed the SLOs.</p>
3:30	9	<p>10 + 1 – New division/administrative structure: feedback, concerns, recommendations for evaluating the pilot period (10 min.). Gabriela described the timeline of how she learned about the new administrative structure and said there was a lack of adequate consultation with the Academic Senate. Elisabeth said she did not find the process useful for her division and particularly her program. The process did not consider the types of students in each program and division. Erica said it doesn't really matter how the programs are divided into divisions and that the deans and other administrators should work together to help students rather than changing the whole structure. Library was not even mentioned in the flowchart. BioTech was misplaced in CTE. Culinary Arts was also misplaced with Fine Arts. Gabriela relayed Katie's idea that divisions are one thing and pathways are a different one. Camille mentioned that some of the divisions don't even have the same names as the pathways.</p>
3:40	10	<p>ASC Committee Reports and Continuous Improvement (20 min)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum and Instruction (CIC) – Leslie said she attended the ASCCC Curriculum Institute over the summer and will meet with Karen, Jason and with Gabriela for an orientation. • DE report – Randy: The DE group developed a very strong strategic plan, and they will be working on that. • OER & ZTC Report – No report • CTE Report - No report • Planning - No report
4:00	11	Adjournment – <i>Next meeting: Monday, September 18, 2023 – 2:15-4:00 pm</i>