

Reedley College Academic Senate Minutes
Tuesday, September 11, 2012 (2:00-3:30PM)
Reedley Campus LRC 104 | Madera Center AV1-207 | Willow/International Center AC1-149

1. Meeting Called to Order @ 2:05 PM / Quorum @ 2:05
2. Roll Call / Review of Senate Members and Guests.

Officers		Present	Absent
President	J. Ragan	X	
V.P. for Senate Bus.	L. Dobusch	X	
V.P. for Curric.	P. Gilmore	X	
Secretary	R. Garza	X	
Rep. to ASCCC	S. Curry	X	
M.O.F.A.	J. Leech	X	
Immediate Past Pres.	B. Turini	X	
WI Senate Pres.	Jeff Burdick	X	

Guests:	
Jim Gilmore	
Linda Carvalho Cooley	
Marilyn Behringer	

Department	Senator	Present	Absent	Department	Senator	Present	Absent
Adjunct Fac. (1)	Vacant		X	Fine Arts & Soc. Sci. (1)	J. Ledgerwood	X	
AG & Nat Resources (1)	N. Gutierrez		X	Fine Arts & Soc. Sci. (2)	Vacant		X
	J. Soderland		X				
Auxiliary (1)	Vacant		X	Science & Tech. (1)	R. Fleuridor	X	
Business (1)	E. Sandoval		X	Science & Tech. (2)	B. Smith-Bush		X
Business (2)	D. Meier	X		Phys. Ed. & Health (1)	J. Hacker	X	
Business (3)	F. Underwood			Phys. Ed. & Health (2)	B. Fonseca		
Comp., Lit. & Comm. (1)	E. Berg	X		Phys. Ed. & Health (3)	Vacant		
Comp., Lit. & Comm. (2)	R. LaSalle	X		Manufacturing (1)	Vacant		X
				Math & Tech (1)	L. Mata	X	
				Math & Tech (2)	C. Montgomery	X	
Counseling (1)	G. Spear	X					
Counseling (2)	C. Bos			Reading & Lang. (1)	S Aguirre		
Counseling (3)	Vacant		X	Reading & Lang. (2)	N. Maryanow	X	

3. Consideration of 8/28/12 minutes.
 - o Move to approve 8/28 as submitted S. Curry; second R. Fleuridor. Approved as submitted; 1 abstention.
4. Amend agenda, if necessary.
N/A
5. Department Reports
No reports
6. Committee Reports

District Standing Committees

- Communications Council
Meeting 9/25
- Strategic Planning for District-wide Facilities Committee
- Information System. Advisory Committee
- Strategic Planning

District Ad Hoc Committees

- AR 7120 Review (B. Turini)
 - o B. Turini: spoke with Interim Assoc. Vice Chancellor Diane Clerou; picking up where things left off with Rowe; asked to put on back burner until next semester.
- District Resource Allocation Model Task Force
 - o J. Gilmore: Met last Friday. We have come up with a plan for distributing lottery funds; although there was a lot of discussion, it is essentially an ftes model. Reedley College is going to lose money based on this model. The next discussion will concern health fees. B. Turini: Any consideration of a factor that considers community

of need? J. Gilmore: There was consideration of programs of need but not the broader community. S. Curry: Is there a model of evaluation to determine if this works or not. J. Gilmore: Yes, when the taskforce becomes a committee it will be revisited annually. M. Behringer: Any discussion of maintenance needs? J. Gilmore: Yes, but it was thrown out. They want it ftes based. D. Meier: Has any consideration been given to the fact that logical conclusion suggests that eventually all the money will go to Willow? R. Fleuridor: The emphasis is on the big picture. The main concern is to divide money as fairly as possible between the colleges, and that the colleges then decide what programs they will fund or not fund. S. Curry: Concerned that we have not actually seen the model/document. J. Gilmore: They want it to go to the Board first. B. Turini: Has anybody brought into the discussion the district's reserve funds? J. Gilmore: This model is for those funds coming in that need to be allocated. B. Turini: Aren't those [reserve] funds, funds that can be allocated or are those funds a Board decision? L. Cooley: What happens to instructors of a program that gets cut because a college decided not to fund it? J. Gilmore: I think the board would not allow that to happen. P. Gilmore: We're doing this to ourselves right now. All CTE programs are being strangled to death, rather than making a decision act on something. J. Ragan: These concerns should be forwarded to Richardson or Jim so that they can carry them back to the next meeting.

Academic Senate Standing Committees

- Academic Standards
- Curriculum (P. Gilmore)
 - Looking at repeatability and operating agreement.
- Faculty Professional Development (Flex) (L. Dobusch)
 - New person added to the committee.
- Equivalency
No report

Academic Senate Ad Hoc Committees

Faculty Evaluation Form Review (L. Dobusch)

- Met two weeks ago; finalizing the document.

Equivalency Process Review (B. Turini)

- Waiting on the State Academic Senate

State Center Federation of Teachers (A.F.T. Local 1533)

- J. Ragan reporting on behalf of D. Borofka: 1) general membership meeting tomorrow in FCC faculty dining room at 5pm; 2) Union finalizing endorsements for the upcoming trustees elections—four areas contested. Members will be notified when a list is finalized; 3) CFT is working to familiarize the effects of the ACCCJC and negative use of accreditation. California has more community colleges on warning than the rest of the country combined.

College Ad Hoc Committees

- College Council Committee Review
B. Turini: Has not convened/unsure of status.

College Committees

- Salary Advancement
- Scholarship and Financial Aid
- Matriculation
- Staff Development
- Program Review
Meeting Sept. 21st
- Sabbatical Leave
- Technology Advisory

Reedley Campus Committees

- Budget
- College Council
Meets tomorrow 9/12

- Distance Education
- Enrollment Management
- Facilities
- Health and Safety
- Staff Development
- Strategic Planning
 - Met yesterday. Modified operating agreement to add Madera/Oakhurst representation; going to College Council tomorrow for a first read, and will be coming through the Academic Senate as well. Doing an internal and external scan.
- Student Conduct
- Student Success

7. Old Business

7.1 RC Accreditation Follow-up DRAFT response (referred by Accreditation Liaison/Consultant)

- S. Curry: Main concern is that the document lack explicit explanations. (See #12 below for specific suggestions as forward by S. Curry to the Secretary via email.)
- B. Turini: In recommendation 3, first paragraph (page 42), lines 3-4, in reference to the April 10th Academic Senate meeting, we did not approve the integrated planning document, the body approved the Academic Executive Committee response to the document.
- J. Ragan: all comments forwarded to the secretary will be forwarded to M. Behringer.
- M. Behringer: all recommendations will be considered and included to the extent that they can; in some instances recommendation may conflict with one another.
- B. Turini: Move to divide the document in five parts for consideration: 1) Introductory Materials; 2) District Recommendation 1; 3) College Recommendation 1; 4) College Recommendation 2; 5) College Recommendation 3. Second by J. Ledgerwood. Approved.
- B. Turini: Move to endorse the Introductory Materials (part one of five) with condition of the stated continued updates that will occur. Second S. Curry. Approved.
- B. Turini: Move to endorse District Recommendation 1 (part two of five) including any recommendations the secretary may receive and forward to M. Behringer. Second S. Curry. Approved; one abstention.
- B. Turini: Move to postpone consideration of College Recommendation 1 (part three of five) until the meeting of 9/25. Second S. Curry. Approved.
- S. Curry: Move to endorse College Recommendation 2 (part four of five), with any recommendations received by the secretary and forwarded to M. Behringer. Second L. Dobusch. Approved.
- S. Curry: Move to endorse College Recommendation 3 (part five of five), with any recommendations received by the secretary and forwarded to M. Behringer. Second L. Dobusch. Approved

7.2 RC Integrated Planning document (referred by Accreditation Liaison/Consultant)

- J. Ragan: Any comments sent to the secretary will be forwarded to M. Behringer.
- R. LaSalle: Comments forwarded to secretary (see #12 below). I've met/spoke with M. Behringer numerous times; she has explained and I understand that we are in the eleventh hour and that not everything will make it into the document, but if there is one thing I could emphasize it's that we need a better narrative of figure 2, and I just had a conversation with her prior to this meeting that leads me to believe we are headed in the right direction. She gave me an example that made [figure 2] make sense; I encouraged her to include that kind of example in the document.
- B. Turini: Is there an embedded evaluation and assessment cycle for the Integrated Planning model itself? M. Behringer: The Integrated Planning model works on the same schedule as the Strategic Plan; so it needs to be reassessed when the Strategic Plan ends. B. Turini: Perhaps a sentence can be added that makes it explicit that it needs to be evaluated and assessed upon revision of all new Strategic Plans. This explicit state of a review cycle will give us an identified time to take up these remaining concerns.
- B. Turini: Move to endorse as amended. Second S. Curry. Approved.
- Note: additional comments in #12 below as sent to the secretary via email.

7.3 District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (DBRAAC) Operating Agreement (referred by Communications Council)

- B. Turini: Move to approve as submitted. Second P. Gilmore. Further discussion: J. Ragan: No model has been provided; I've been told it is coming, but I've seen nothing yet. Two votes in favor. One abstention. Motion does not pass.

7.4 College Council Operating Agreement change (referred by RC AS Executive Committee)

- B. Turini: Move to ask College Council to add a line to their operating agreement that specifies that an "Academic Senate alternate" be an option to fill a voting seat. This is similar to Enrollment Management and other committees. Second S. Curry Approved. One abstention.

8. New Business

- 8.1 District Integrated Planning Manual (referred by Communications Council).
 - Take back to departments for feedback/comments. Please look for language consistency.
- 8.2 AR 2410 Final Draft (referred by Communications Council).
 - Take back to departments for final feedback/comments.
- 8.3 Resolution regarding Proposition 30 (referred by Department of Fine Arts and Social Sciences).
 - Take back to departments for final feedback/comments.
- 8.4 Resolution regarding Proposition 32 (referred by Department of Fine Arts and Social Sciences).
 - Take back to departments for final feedback/comments.

9. Informational Items

10. Future Agenda Items

- 10.1 Reedley College Procedure Governing Program Revitalization, Consolidation, Suspension, and/or Discontinuance
- 10.2 Program Review procedures
- 10.3 Staff Development Committee procedures
- 10.4 J. Gilmore: Look into what it would cost to fund the proposed course cuts for the Spring; ask Board to consider funding should Prop 30 fail?

11. Officers' Reports

11.1 President – Jeff Ragan

- 11.1.1 Dept Chairs meeting to be reported on next meeting.
- 11.1.2 BOT meeting: Clovis Center renamed → State Center Community College District Office North. Appointment of Interim Vice President of Instruction and Student Services and Interim Dean of Students at RC was postponed—to be announced at a special board meeting on September 13th.

11.2 WI Academic Senate President – Jeff Burdick

- Willow International Academic Senate was accepted State Academic Senate.

11.3 MOFA – Jay Leech

- Communication with RC has been good.

11.4 Vice President for Senate Business – Lore Dobusch

(No report)

11.5 Vice President for Curriculum – Pam Gilmore

Concern that something will need to be done to address the control of grant money; an issue that is becoming apparent in Curriculum and will require our attention/action.

11.6 Secretary – Rick Garza

(No report)

11.7 State Representative – Stephanie Curry

(No report)

11.8 Immediate Past President – Bill Turini

J. Burdick needs a title change to Clovis Community College Center Academic Senate President.

12. Other thoughts

12.1 Comments concerning Accreditation response from S. Curry (sent via email to Senate Secretary):

Pg 22- Paragraph 1 under Descriptive Narrative change endorsed to reviewed by the Academic Senate in Spring 2012

Page 22 -Recommend expanding more on Integrated Planning and explicitly address the 6 subsets of the questions. Reading through the document many of the six and implied but I think the connections need to be more clear for the reader especially with regards to the links to resource allocation and district planning. As a reader I would like to see a paragraph addressing each section of the question.

Pg. 25, 26 Charts . There seem to be too many figures/charts. I would recommend taking the ones on strategic planning out and instead putting them in evidence.

Pg. 27-29. How do these student services examples relate to integrated planning? It just seems like a list of non related activities. They don't seem to show the link between planning and resource allocation.

Pg 30-31. Need to discuss timeline in text if going to keep it in document.

Pg 32 Recommend a step on applying integrated planning model especially with regard to resource allocation since we are just adopting it.

Pg 37 Recommend Paragraph 2 example of adding budget rep to program review committee be put into College recommendation 1 as an example of connections between planning and resource allocation.

Pg 42 Recommend a paragraph on attempts to integrate Madera/Oakhurst faculty into RC committees and their new committee/division structure. We seem to address Willow in the document well but need to expand on Madera.

12.2 Comments concerning the Integrated Planning document from Ryan LaSalle (sent via email to the Senate Secretary):

1. Overall, the Integrated Planning document lacks a concise and specific description of what it is and how it will work. There are inconsistencies between the figures and narratives and there are many gaps in describing how integrated planning will work at Reedley College. Perhaps this task is complicated by the fact that there are many entities, documents, and committees involved in a planning process that cannot realistically account for all of it with any clarity.
2. The structure of the document (content and organization) should logically reflect the key components of the figures used. However, the current content and headings seem like a random list of things associated with integrated planning. Consider rethinking the headings included in the document...currently, they are: Long and Short Term Planning, Important Documents at Reedley College, Mission Statement and Core Values, Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan, Program Review, and Evaluation Processes. For example, if Figure 1 is used, wouldn't it be a good idea to create headings such as Development, Implementation, Evaluation and describe what's illustrated on page 1? The same would go for Figure 2 where the Annual Planning Cycle and Strategic Planning cycle would be explained and detailed with appropriate headings in the text.
3. Figure 1 uses terms such as "intertwine" but the diagram doesn't accurately reflect that relationship. The term should be changed to match the graphic or the graphic should be changed to reflect the description.
4. Figure 1 needs a clearer narrative to describe/explain what is happening in the image...what is meant by inputs, outputs, and throughputs?
5. Under the heading Important Documents at Reedley College, the description of what happens isn't reflected in the figures. For example, things are recommended to the College Council and happen in this committee that are highlighted in this paragraph but none of this is illustrated in the figures. Shouldn't we see "feedback is reported to college council" and "the body agrees to all of the proposed changes/comments..."?
6. Figure 2 doesn't provide the element of "time" to show when specifically (and which) entities carry out the actions labeled on the figure.
7. Figure 3 shows a hierarchy (vertical relationship) but nothing to denote any information regarding how these work laterally. This is in conflict with the narrative on page 5 that states "the Strategic Plan outlines our strategy for addressing the mission, the Education Master Plan..." and indicates a different relationship than is shown.
8. The lengthy definitions of the Ed Master Plan, Strategic Plan, etc. seem out of place here...obligatory definitions but not "integrated" into this integrated planning document.
9. Under the heading Evaluation Process, there is little detail regarding how and when these actions will take place. The Evaluation Process is a major part of Figure 1 and yet it is relegated to a brief vague paragraph at the end of the document. Consider changing (and moving).

12.3 Comments concerning the Integrated Planning document from Linda Cooley (sent via email to the Senate Secretary):

First of all they refer to "campuses" rather than colleges - that is a problem. It should state colleges/center that have applied for candidacy - that is consistent with our operating agreement. Language matters!

Secondly the handbook says that we will "adopt the district goals and objectives" we NEVER said that we said "ALIGN" there is a BIG difference. We do not want to adopt all of those goals and objective we want our strategic plan to be in alignment but some of those goals are specific to the district and do not pertain to us.

12.4 Comments concerning the Integrated Planning document from Eileen Apperson (sent via email to the Senate Secretary):

Note that Eileen's comments were sent embedded in a draft of the Integrated Planning document itself, as highlights and notations that could not be extracted for direct inclusion here, but the document was forwarded to M. Behringer and she acknowledged receiving it.

Meeting adjourned at 3:39 PM. Next Meeting September 25th.

DRAFT