



Curriculum• Degree Requirements• Grading Policies• Program Development• Student Prep & Success• Governance
Accreditation• Professional Development• Program Review• Planning & Budgeting Processes• Others as agreed

Resolved, that the Academic Senate appoint the following faculty to these committees:

Unlimited Membership – None

- Julita McNichol – Transitional Studies – Voting member
Kate Gougoutas – Transitional Studies – non-Voting member
- Dana Jae Labrecque – Broadcast Electronic Media Arts
Lillian Marrujo-Duck – Social Sciences
Lisa Romano – New Student Counseling

Francine Podenski; Steven Brown;

Not Present: Todd Rigg Carriero, Ms. Bob Davis, Wendy Kaufmyn, Carole Meagher, Kitty Moriwaki, Fred Teti

Abstentions: Dana Jae Labrecque, Lillian Marrujo-Duck, Lisa Romano

- There are seats available on the Basic Skills Committee for faculty from 1 – CTE, 1 – Counseling, and two others.
- There are 8 faculty slots on the Accreditation Issues Committee, so there are 5 remaining openings.
- Concert & Lectures still needs a faculty coordinator. This position used to be funded with reassigned time. It needs a description and reassigned time.
- The Committee on Committees is reviewing several committees that are in between the PGC and Academic Senate, including the Institutional Review Board, Finance, and District Facilities. We will bring these to the PGC to figure out where they fit within the governance structure.

A. Consent Agenda

- Resolution 2 (page 3 needs clerical corrections.)
- Coordinator selections – pull for the input process

(ns)(v)(d)044e-wa .00 41 > tTJ EMC (t)-2 (i)-2 (ons)-1 (-)s -11-25 (n)2.5 - 0 Td [(G)--3s)-1 (

Excellence Awards:

- Rosario Villasanas – Child Development
- Cynthia Dewar – Distance Education
- Sami Kudsi – Honors Program
- Mark Piper – LGBT Studies

In addition, if approved as an alternate,

- Judy Hubbell – Music

M Francine Podenski; **S** Steven Brown; **M**

Not Present: Ms. Bob Davis, Wendy Kaufmyn, Carole Meagher, Kitty Moriwaki, Fred Teti
Abstention – Monica Bosson

C. Chancellor suggested Academic Person of the Year Award

- In Collegial Consultation, President Marrujo-Duck pointed out to the Chancellor that we are more collaborative than choosing one person.
- Many groups of people contribute to the betterment of the College and to single out one is not the desire of the faculty. Everyone deserves an award. If we go forward with it, an outline for the process of the selection is requested.
- There will always be people who are overlooked, yet deserving. So, it's too difficult a decision that could entail unintended divisiveness.
- Is there a way to position this so as to allow the Chancellor a way to recognize people at the school?
- Perhaps faculty pay raises would be a way to recognize our excellent work?
- Monica will take the sentiment of the Council back to Collegial Consultation with the Chancellor.

D. Suggestions for Program Review Improvement – Program Review Committee

- Pam Mery – We have been looking at the data to provide support and information so that it can be done more clearly and more fruitfully. This was high on the Visiting Team Report feedback as well as Department Chair feedback related to January FLEX and Program Review. We are looking at Annual vs. Comprehensive Program Review with emphasis on certain components, e.g. tying Program Review to the Mission of the College doesn't need to be answered annually, but SLO assessment will be.
- We also have a Faculty Program Review Committee as it's a separate line item of the 10+1. In Program Review, there is the planning side, i.e. budgeting, etc., and there is also the evaluation of each program, the direction, etc., and this is intended to be in faculty hands.
- Concern over the counseling data that is compiled but with no results coming back to the department from surveys, etc. There needs to be much more communication about that and a feedback loop.
- They are working on this with Lydia Jenkins on SARS data and counseling survey data.

- There was a more effective process back in the 1980's with comprehensive reporting occurring every 6 years with small group in each department contributing and each Department and Dean would get time with the Program Review Committee. We would recommend, continue, contract, or expand. Everyone would talk a lot and there would be direct discussion – for example, if someone mentioned the facilities were a problem, then the Director of Facilities would be brought into the discussion. Currently, there is a list on the Planning website of building reparations to be done, but no discussion among us.
- Concern with the lack of collaboration within the Student Services division. There 0.002 Tc -0.002 T

- Discussion will continue at the April 8th meeting.

F . Discussion of Press Conference & Enforcement of Student Code of Conduct. – Samuel Santos

- The policies for the district claim that the most senior person in the room is in charge. Closing the doors to the public in the first place created this tension. Brice Harris made a statement to open the doors. As the most senior member in the room, the State Chancellor should have been in charge.
- Students were within their rights to practice their freedom of speech. No authority attempted to control the crowd. If the doors were unlocked, there may have been more civility.
- Samuel Santos described his method of what he does when a student has been accused of violating the code of conduct. He asks what is going on with them. There is no guilt, shame, or blame. He tries to be reasonable. We have a code of conduct in the classroom. Outside of that, what is the responsibility of administrators and faculty in mentorship roles? Students are expected to follow directions. If someone from the College says, “please stop talking,” that is a directive that should be followed.
- Concern over the way students were treated at Conlan last year and this has been building up. Administration has been leaving us out of conversation for years. We heard of Agrella’s departure via a tweet from State Chancellor Brice Harris, and people have been locked out of open meetings. The modus operandi of this administration is to shut us out, and then they are surprised when they are met with anger.
- It was an organized demonstration in the room. When the students approached the table, it was a political action. The police behaved themselves. Tim Killikelly came up to diffuse it. Afterwards, the students were shaking hands with the new Super Trustee. Everything turned out well.
- The student code of conduct was revised a few years ago; d we want to revisit it?
- There were Classified Staff and Faculty

- One observance are Egress laws. There should always a separate exit out of a meeting. This is why we need the PAEC, for safety, among other things.
- There is no Administrator Code of Conduct in Title 5. That language has been repealed.

G. Process for Senate Input into Coordinator Selection – Lillian Marrujo-Duck

- Senate discussion before the final resolution

■ 5.0 .04 ■■ -■

Whereas, the Academic Senate recognizes the institutional interest in the roles and responsibilities of faculty coordinators and co-chairs engaged in work that benefits the college as a whole; and

Whereas, the Academic Senate supports the role of faculty in selecting faculty leaders to fulfill faculty coordinator and co-chair roles; be it therefore,

chairnd cnndche21 >>BDC s0 (a)4 ((s)n i)-6 [(ch) DWch
 Wigede ieas4 (l)-1- (o)-4 (l)-s-4 (s)- T*ndW

lch;ha a