

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m.

Present: Richard Akers (President), Dionne Perez (FSCC), Sue Van Hattum (NSAS), Leverett Smith (NSAS), Alissa Scanlin (SS), Shondra West (Classified)

Absent: Fritz Pointer (VP), Chris Tarp (Student Services), Ellen Geringer (Faculty Development), Rick Ramos (LAVA/Career and Technical Training), Eric Sanchez (CLASS)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS: Joe Ledbetter, Wendy Williams

CONSENT ACTION ITEMS:

Agenda was approved.

Minutes of August 18 were approved.

Mentor Teacher Nomination Voting ballots with 30 faculty nominations were distributed to the Council. A request for faculty nominations was asked from all constituency groups: Faculty Senate Council, Management Council, Classified Senate Council, and Student Council. Nominations were received from all groups except Classified. These names made up the voting ballot. Only full-time tenured faculty names were accepted. The Faculty Senate Council gave faculty a rating of 0 to 5 points on the categories of collegial, classroom, and college. They were submitted to Faculty Senate President, Richard Akers, to be tallied and he will contact the ten highest rated faculty to ask them to participate in the program. The first priority pool will be faculty who were nominated by two of the constituency groups.

NEW BUSINESS:

Employee Code of Ethics A revision to the Employee Code of Ethical Behavior is being considered at the District Governance Council. Richard emailed faculty for input in regards to this revision. The following is a summary of the comments that were received by Richard via email. There is a concern as to the conflict of ethics and loyalty to the institution; a fear that this may be interpreted as to a requirement to report as opposed to assuring protection to those who do; concern as to the definition of the term trustworthy; concern as to privacy issues and issues of personal association: and, concern about the connection to disciplinary action impossible dismissal with the preceding gray areas.

Sue Van Hattum objections and explanations to the new revisions are noted as follows:

General Principles

- 1) Trustworthiness - Delete "loyalty." Demanding loyalty is not appropriate in an ethics document. In all discussions of ethics, when the issue of "obeying orders" (or similar) comes up, think about unethical orders. Can being loyal to an institution conflict with my deeper ethical stances? Perhaps.
- 2) Respect Responsibility - Delete "demonstrating the ability to respond to expectations." Same issue. I don't respond well to expectations I don't agree with, and I certainly see this as an appropriate ethical stance

Standards of Ethical Conduct

- 1) "Comply with all District policies and procedures" (point 2) should be deleted. Same issue as above.
- 2) "Appear to conflict" (point 3) - We can't know how other people will interpret our actions. Being responsible for appearances may not make sense. Is there another way to get at this? Perhaps when the interests are financial, it is important to avoid even the appearance of conflicting interests.
- 3) Point 4 is worded well in part, asking us to only "take into consideration the potential harm." However, there is also immense potential good in developing personal relationships with students; teaching is in part about making connections with students. This point ignores the two-sided nature of this issue.
- 4) Point 8 – "authorized activities." Instead of defining things in a top-down way by using the word "authorized," can we word this in a way which describes the proper uses of District property and resources?

The Council discussed Sue's concerns and came to the conclusion that it would be best to keep the current Human Resources Procedure 1040.08 as it is written. It was pointed out that the revised policy addresses District responsibilities and should be included in the current policy. Richard said that Helen's intent in revising the policy was to protect the "whistleblowers" because of the grade change scandal. He said that Donna worked on this revision for the past year with all constituency groups through DGC. If the DGC approves the revision, it will go before the Governing Board for approval. Wendy Williams asked is there is some sort of protocol, or

procedure in place when/if someone accuses another of a wrong doing to avoid creating havoc. The accused must have a right to respond to the allocation. This would protect both the accuser and accused. Joe Ledbetter's comment was that there is too much unenforceable language in the revision and that the UF is not worried because of that reason. Richard will forward these views to the DGC.

Integrated Planning Process Joe Ledbetter presented his Concept Paper on Combining Program Review, Content Review and Student Learning Outcomes. Content Review is a review of the course outlines every six years as required in Title V and is funneled through the CIC. Program Review is done every four years. Department unit plans are done during program review. The SLO process is another separate process that has no requirement of a timeline yet. Joe would like to see all these processes combined into a single process making it a glorified Program Review every six years. Wendy said that Program Review is management oversight but that SLO is purely faculty driven and separate from Program Review with CIC and DIC as faculty oversight. It was motioned and approved that the next political step would be for the Academic Senate Council to forward this concept to the Council of Chairs and if there is enough voice then it will be taken to the President's Cabinet.

Distinguished Scholars Program McKinley had approached Richard about establishing an Honors Program. In doing research on this matter, Richard learned that the ASC previously approved a Distinguished Scholars Program in 2000, which is in existence but is apparently not utilized or recognized. It was agreed that there is no motivation for faculty, or students, to undertake this and no monetary resources, or transfer incentive dedicated to it. Richard will confer with Mack about these issues and also a clarification between "I", "H", and the honors program associated with AGS.

Class Cancellation Richard stated that there should be a policy created not to cancel classes where academic integrity outweighs the budget as far as class cancellation is concerned. Joe said it would reduce C Contract. The Council agreed not to pursue this issue.

Review of Discipline List Every two years the ASCCC conducts a review of the state-wide Discipline Lists used as the minimum qualifications for Faculty in California Community Colleges. Departments should review the Discipline List that was emailed to all faculty. One new discipline proposed is Biotechnology. Currently the minimum qualifications for Biotechnology falls under the Biological Sciences discipline because there is no state approved discipline of Biotechnology. Therefore, for a faculty to teach a biotechnology course, one must qualify under the minimum qualifications for Biology. The proposed minimum qualifications for Biotechnology will be a Bachelor's in Biological Sciences AND two years of full-time related work experience OR the equivalent.

Revision of Faculty Evaluation Forms The Senate in conjunction with the UF is proposing a revision to the Faculty Evaluation forms. The forms that the UF task force has been working on were distributed. Richard would like to see an expansion of the narrative regarding to only commenting on what was observed during classroom evaluation. He feels that comments should be allowed by the department chair, in observation of the faculty under evaluation's behavior, other than the day of classroom evaluation. One of the task force's proposals is to require a written self-evaluation that includes goals and objectives, related to teaching, included in the evaluation process. Alissa Scanlin will send Richard an extended self-evaluation checklist that they use in the Counseling department. Wendy Williams would like to see included in the self-evaluation, a statement of how the faculty incorporates the results of the SLO assessment. Wendy will email the accreditation standard to Richard that says that since outcomes are collected over a longer period of time, this process needs to have a paper trail. She would like to see a statement along the lines as "These are the challenges I faced since my last evaluation." This issue will be returned to the next agenda.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Faculty Survey To enable the Council to create a survey which can be used to prioritize the issues which are most important to our faculty, the Senators were asked so submit questions that could be included in the survey. An ad hoc committee will be created charged with creating the survey. Eric Sanchez, in his absence, was selected to work with Richard and Lynette to create the faculty survey.

Long-term Mentor Teacher Process An ad hoc committee consisting of Leverett Smith and Helen Kalkstein was created to work with Richard to establish the long-term teacher mentor process.

Faculty Committee Participation All full-time faculty have contractual obligations which should be enforced. The Senate Office will begin the process of tracking faculty committee participation

ASC Bylaws The bylaws will be emailed to the Senate with the last revisions suggested by the Council last semester before being returned to the Council for approval on the next agenda.

COLLEGE/SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS There were no reports.

SENATE ANNOUNCEMENTS and OPEN DISCUSSION: There were no announcements from the Senate.

PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: There were no presentations from the Public.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting will be October 6.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
Lynette Kral**