ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
May 19, 2011
3:00 p.m. – SSV 151

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT**

3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
    a. **April 28, 2011 (attachment)**
    b. **May 5, 2011 (attachment)**

5. **REPORTS**
    a. **Student Learning Outcomes Committee – Melanie Parker**
    b. **Faculty Professional Development (Flex) Committee – Kathryn Mitchell**
    c. **Program Review – Carol Eastin**
    d. **Tenure Review – Jennifer Gross**
    e. **Accreditation – Santi Tafarella**

6. **ACTION ITEM**
    None

7. **DISCUSSION ITEM**
    a. **Faculty Administrative Rights for Computers Draft (attachment)**
    b. **Academic Senate Accomplishments (attachment)**

8. **SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
    a. **Announcements**
    - 2011 Faculty Leadership Institute – June 16-18, 2011 - Monterey, CA (TBC)
    - 2011 Student Learning Outcomes Institute – July 13, 2011 - San Diego, CA
    - 2011 Curriculum Institute – July 14-16, 2011 - San Diego, CA

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
May 19, 2011
3:00 p.m. – SSV 151

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
   Mr. Christos Valiotis, Academic Senate President, called the March 19, 2011 Academic Senate meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT**
   - Mr. Christos Valiotis distributed copies of the May Revised budget dated May 18, 2011 to Senators for review. He provided a brief overview on the new budget information.

     Based on the new budget information there is a $6.6 billion increase in state revenues which was not originally anticipated. These new revenue findings are included in the May Revised Budget. The newly announced budget information is part of the normal State budgeting process. With the new revised budget figures Legislators can work to finalize a state budget. Governor Brown is hoping to use the additional revenue funds to buy down the state deferrals and is not expected to use any of the new funds to support growth. The Chancellor's Office is recommending that districts anticipate the original level of funding cuts stated in the January projections (catastrophic scenario) regardless of the new budget revise information.

     The information coming out of the Legislative Analyst Office is they don't understand how the state has an increase of $6.6 billion dollars in the budget. Therefore Governor Brown is not anticipating the newly found revenue to be available for future years. However, State property tax revenues have increased from previous years, and Governor Brown is recommending allowing community colleges to keep extra funding from property tax revenues. Property tax revenues are estimated to be 1.4 million for Antelope Valley College (AVC). Mr. Eric Skinner, Executive Vice Chancellor, from the Community College League of California indicated the elimination of Proposition 98 funds is no longer justifiable with the current budget information. It was the projected elimination of Proposition 98 that prompted the catastrophic scenario of a $10 million dollar cut. If the Proposition 98 funds are no longer in jeopardy then it would move districts to the second budget scenario, which would be much easier to mitigate with less cuts. Mr. Valiotis stated that neither the district nor the chancellor's office have made formal statements of potentially moving to budget scenario 2 in light of the new information. This is his personal interpretation of what could possibly happen, which is also the suggestion being made by Governor Brown. The Legislature will review the budget situation to make decisions on a State budget. Governor Brown also stated that the projected budget scenario is contingent on the Legislature agreeing to tax extensions, otherwise the funding from Proposition 98 are still at risk of being eliminated. There is a great deal of new information for senators to review and process. Mr. Valiotis indicated he has merely provided his personal interpretation of possibilities but cannot predict the final outcome for AVC.

   - The Faculty Union is currently in negotiations with the District and will provide an update of the process in the near future.

   - Governor Brown released the long term State liability information. The State of California will owe an estimated $180 billion in liabilities for the next 10 years.

   - On Wednesday, May 25, 2011 there will be consecutive meetings scheduled for the Strategic Planning and Budget Council (SPBC) and the Finance Budget Sub-Committee. The Vice President of Administrative Services, Ms. Deborah Wallace, attended the State Financial meeting where the May Revise budget was reviewed to determine the potential outcomes for California Community Colleges and obtain the Chancellor's Office recommendations. Ms. Wallace will provide a brief overview of

the discussions occurring at the State level and the Chancellor's Office recommendations based on the revised budget. All faculty are welcomed to attend the upcoming SPBC meeting to obtain first hand information on the new revised budget, as well as how the May Revise budget will impact AVC.

- Mr. Valiotis extended his gratitude to the faculty who attended the Faculty Recognition Day. In addition, he extended his gratitude to Ms. Susan Knapp for coordinating the event. Next year's event will hopefully occur in the newly constructed Theatre. Ms. Knapp will coordinate the event for one more year and the Senate will place a call for a faculty to coordinate the 2012 – 2013 event.

- The Honors Convocation is scheduled for Friday, May 20, 2011 from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. in the Fine Arts Quad. Mr. John Toth will be representing the Academic Senate.

- Mr. Christos Valiotis announced he will be attending the Fresno State University graduation ceremonies on Friday, May 20, 2011 due to AVC students graduating from the local AVC/Fresno State Engineering program. This will be the last graduating class of AVC students since Fresno will no longer provide a local Engineering Program. A few AVC representatives were invited to attend the commencement ceremonies and feel it is important to show support for the program and students. The cooperative AVC/ Fresno State Engineering program facilitated the graduation of thirty-four Engineering students which all have found gainful employment.

- Mr. Valiotis announced there is a possibility for this meeting to be the last Senate meeting of the academic year. He will try to determine his schedule and will notify Senators accordingly. Senators were encouraged to keep the meeting on their calendars until they receive formal notification from the Senate Office regarding the cancelation of the June 2, 2011 Senate meeting.

3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
   None

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   a. **April 28, 2011 (attachment)**
      A motion was made and seconded to approve the April 28, 2011 Academic Senate meeting minutes. Motion carried.

   b. **May 5, 2011 (attachment)**
      A motion was made and seconded to approve the May 5, 2011 Academic Senate meeting minutes. Motion carried.

5. **REPORTS**
   a. **Student Learning Outcomes Committee – Melanie Parker**
      Ms. Melanie Parker indicated the campus is making positive progress in developing Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). She estimated 60% of PLOs will have been completely developed for campus programs by the end of the 2010 – 2012 academic year. The estimated percentage was facilitated in large part by the Business, Computer Studies, and Economic Development (BCSED) division faculty. Ms. Stacey Adams initiated the momentum to have BCSED PLOs developed and submitted to the SLO Committee by the end of the academic year. She did a tremendous job in getting the BCSED faculty to complete this task. In addition, there are four other sets of PLOs in different stages of development which may also be completed before the end of the academic year. These completed PLOs will be included in the overall total number when completed. AVC has made significant progress towards meeting the fall 2012 Accreditation deadline. PLO forms can be found on the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee public webpage. Samples of completed PLO forms from various programs, as well as blank forms can be found on the website. Senators were encouraged to remind faculty that the Excel PLO form is a three page document. The PLO submission process requires a complete electronic PLO Form be submitted to Ms. Parker for review. The committee will review all electronically submitted forms and make revision recommendations needed prior to having faculty print hard copy forms for signatures and committee approval. Approved hard copy forms will be kept in the Office of Academic Affairs like approved SLO forms.

Mr. Ron Chapman stated the faculty in Social and Behavioral Sciences will be approving the PLO for the Sociology Degree which will be an additional PLO completed to add to the current total.

Currently, 100% of course SLOs have been completed and approved by the committee. Not all SLOs have been entered into WEAVE but all course SLOs have been completed. The next step will be to ensure that course SLOs are regularly assessed.

Ms. Parker requested Senators remind constituent faculty the deadline date to enter WEAVE data is June 10, 2011. This is the same date course grades are due. The committee established this deadline date knowing if additional time was allowed it would be significantly more difficult to obtain data after faculty leave for summer break. The committee realizes the difficulty in obtaining spring SLO course data information but encourages WEAVE Data Managers to do their best with the information submitted. The committee has been contemplating revising the assessment cycle timeline because data results must be submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in late May of each year which does not allow adequate time needed to capture spring data. The committee will try to determine how to adjust the data entry deadline to capture as much data information as possible. Ms. Parker indicated some of the changes are inevitable as the committee is working on establishing deadlines based on ACCJC reporting requirements. The SLO Committee will spend time discussing and thinking about the overall process before final decisions are made. For the current academic year the deadline date for WEAVE entry is June 10, 2011.

Ms. Parker reported she has received several panicked emails and telephone calls from adjunct faculty regarding SLO data. Many adjunct faculty aren't aware of what their responsibilities are in regards to SLOs. Ms. Parker stated she will be working with adjunct faculty, walk them through the process, and assist them in getting course SLO data information to the appropriate WEAVE Data Managers. A large majority of participants at the SLO/PLO flex activities are adjunct faculty. Many adjunct faculty want to be a part of the SLO/PLO process but are unaware of what their responsibilities are or how to acquire the necessary information to assist them in submitting their data. Faculty must take the lead in communicating SLO/PLO requirements and encourage adjunct faculty to attend SLO/PLO flex events.

Two WEAVE Data Entry days have been scheduled for Wednesday, June 8th and Thursday, June 9th in BE 310 from 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. These professional development opportunities have been coordinated to provide faculty the opportunity to meet in a computer lab and have access to Ms. Parker or Mr. Aaron Voelcker for questions and assistance in the data entry process. All faculty and Deans have been properly notified and it is also posted to the main page of WEAVE online. All faculty have read only access to WEAVE online to view data results for courses, as well as obtain pertinent SLO/PLO deadline information. The username for read only access is "avcuser." The password for read only access is "marauder." All pertinent SLO/PLO information is posted to the main page of WEAVE online. Senators were encouraged to remind constituent faculty to frequently check the WEAVE online main page for pertinent SLO/PLO information.

During the summer months, the committee will meet to develop a month by month SLO/PLO timeline for the 2011 – 2012 academic year. This is imperative to have established so faculty are aware of what needs to be done for the District to meet the SLO/PLO Accreditation requirements. In addition, the committee will be coordinating one of the mandatory ninety minute breakout sessions. The Faculty Professional Development Committee approved allowing a single breakout session dedicated to SLO/PLO work. The SLO committee will be working out the logistics to allow discipline faculty the opportunity to collectively engage in discussions regarding assessments and potential action plans needed. The ACCJC requires dialogue regarding SLOs/PLOs be sufficiently documented. The dedicated breakout session will afford divisions and disciplines to work in clusters and enter data into WEAVE during the breakout session. Ms. Parker indicated the committee will be coordinating campus logistics of meeting areas to ensure computer labs are available for groups ready to enter data. The primary goal for the breakout session is to get faculty to review assessment data results for the 2010 – 2011 academic year and get the discussion started if it hasn't already begun. All discussion can then be documented within the WEAVE online repository as required by ACCJC. The ninety

minute timeframe will not be enough time to complete the process but it will be a start in the right direction. Various SLO Committee members and SLO/PLO faculty facilitators will be stationed in the various divisions and computer labs to provide guidance and orientation of the SLO/PLO session. It will be a large task to organize but quite feasible with the assistance of campus faculty.

Mr. Ted Younglove has proposed implementing a fall and spring semester assessment week as a future professional development event. This professional development event will primarily focused on assisting faculty in understanding assessment, as well as provide an opportunity to administer General Education course assessments. More details will be provided on upcoming assessment weeks during the fall and spring semesters. Senators were encouraged to announce the various SLO/PLO event opportunities being offered throughout the 2011 – 2012 Faculty Professional Development (Flex) Program. There are several workshops for those trying to understand the process and assessment data. All faculty are encouraged to attend SLO/PLO training opportunities as this is an issue that can no longer be ignored. The annual assessment has to become part of the campus culture as the Chancellor's Office and ACCJC are requiring assessment based data reports.

Mr. Santi Tafarella inquired whether it would be feasible to have a ninety minute SLO/PLO session every semester to ensure we are meeting Accreditation requirements. Ms. Parker indicated this is something which needs to be worked out with the Flex Committee. Currently, having a ninety minute breakout session devotes strictly to SLOs/PLOs is a positive step in the right direction.

Mr. Ron Chapman inquired about the email announcement indicating submitting SLO data needs to include CRNs. Ms Parker stated CRNs are needed to keep track of the total number of course sections included in the aggregated data set. In addition, it also assists Faculty SLO Data Managers to determine which course sections have not been submitted and affords them the opportunity to try to acquire data by contacting individual faculty. This is in no way a means to identify faculty and can not be done with aggregated data. ACCJC reporting requires District's to track the total number of course sections included in aggregated data sets.

Mr. Christos Valiotis stated the SLO/PLO Assessment process is a critical issue. Not simply because of the upcoming Accreditation deadline set for fall 2012, but because this is an issue that needs to be included in the culture at AVC. Faculty need to include the assessment process as part of their everyday classroom routine. This is such a significant issue there needs to be more emphasis place on the progress in the bi-weekly Academic Senate meetings. The Senate needs to be a proactive body in ensuring the SLO/PLO process is being facilitated campus wide. Senators should work with the division/department/area Faculty SLO/PLO Data Managers to discuss pertinent issues they are facing and possibly provide a division/discipline report to the Senate body. Mr. Valiotis indicated including an agenda item on the Senate bi-weekly meetings will be included as a discussion item in the fall as this may be another means to document SLO/PLO discussions.

b. **Faculty Professional Development (Flex) Committee – Kathryn Mitchell**
Ms. Kathryn Mitchell reported the committee is currently reviewing submitted evaluations from faculty contracts and programmed events to incorporate some of the feedback when building future programs. The committee is working to use program evaluations more effectively when developing ideas for future programs. To date, the committee has completely compiled and reviewed adjunct contract evaluations for the fall 2011 semester and has compiled the majority of the 2011 – 2012 event evaluation forms. The remainder of the event evaluations will be compiled during the summer.

The 2011 – 2012 Faculty Professional Development Program events have been selected and approved by the committee. All approved events will be forwarded to the Chancellor's Office for final approval. The District is required to submit formal paperwork to the Chancellor's Office proposed Faculty Professional Development Program annually in June.

This year the scheduling of events has become very difficult. A majority of approved proposals are requesting Fridays during the fall semester. Faculty presenters with approved events for the 2011 – 2012 program will not receive date confirmation letters until the summer or just prior to the fall semester because of this scheduling problem. Senators were encouraged to make an announcement to

division constituents requesting faculty presenters willing and able to select an alternate day/time for their approved event to contact Gloria in the Academic Senate Office. Otherwise, events will be randomly selected and requested to select alternate dates.

The 2011 – 2012 program does not include any field trips. The committee did not receive any proposal requests for field trips which is why there aren't any included in the program. There is a liability issue when approving field trips which is why the district encourages staying away from approving off campus events but the committee is trying to salvage some wiggle room to allow for approving future educational field trip.

Another issue is the ambiguity of Intersession and whether there will be building shut downs similar to what will be seen in the summer months. It will be difficult to schedule Intersession and spring events when the calendar is still in a state of flux. Dr. Susan Lowry stated she is a member of the calendar committee and the 2011 – 2012 academic calendar has been approved and will not be changed. If any changes are to be instituted it has to be discussed at the calendar committee and the faculty union. The calendar for the year has been set and should not pose any problem with scheduling events for the 2011 – 2012 Faculty Professional Development Program.

The committee is currently finalizing the schedule for the fall 2011 Faculty Welcome Back Day (WBD). The event will take place on Friday, August 19, 2011 from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. There are currently two breakout sessions that have not been confirmed. The committee is awaiting a response from potential presenters/facilitators. The outline for the day has been established and approved by the committee. The spring WBD received a great deal of positive feedback regarding the ninety minute breakout session structure therefore the committee decided to adopt a similar structure for the fall 2011 WBD. Incorporating ninety minute breakout session opportunities provides more time needed to thoroughly cover topics without the feeling of having to rush through information due to time constraints. The day will include three ninety minute breakout sessions. The first two sessions will include four session options, whereas the third session will strictly be dedicated to focused SLO discussions among discipline faculty. The outline for the day will include the following:

8:00 a.m. – 8:15 a.m.	Get Acquainted – Meet and Greet / Sign in	
8:15 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	Morning General Session	Administration, Faculty Leadership, etc.
9:45 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.	**Session I:**	
	a. Campus Governance and Leadership	Christos Valiotis and Faculty Leadership Chairs/Co-Chairs/Coordinators
	b. Faculty Union: Understanding Your STRS Compensation Benefits and Know Your Rights	Dr. Susan Lowry and Faculty Union Leadership
	c. AP&P: CurricUNET Process Requirements / SB 1440: Transfer Degree Update	
	c. Not confirmed	
11:15 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. LUNCH		
12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.	**Session II:**	
	a. Vision – Brain Processing	Leslie Peters
	b. Understanding the Financial Aid Process	Sherri Padilla
	c. Campus Governance and Leadership	Christos Valiotis and Faculty Leadership Chairs/Co-Chairs/Coordinators
	d. Not confirmed	
	Session III:	
2:15 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.	a. SLO Division Workshop	Melanie Parker and SLO Committee members
4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Division Meetings	

All Faculty Professional Development (FPD) Contracts were due on Monday, May 16, 2011. Ms. Mitchell reported she is unaware of the total number of outstanding faculty contracts but is fairly certain there are several faculty who've failed to submit their contracts. Senators were requested to remind constituent faculty to submit their FPD Contracts.

The committee was faced with several issues throughout the academic year. They involved the loss of sign in sheets, faculty signing in to participate in online events but leaving the computer once logged into the session, and attendance verification for conferences, workshops, online events, etc. There were several events where the faculty presenters failed to submit the final sign in sheets. Ultimately, this means faculty are not awarded credit for attending a flex event because we do not have the appropriate attendance verification. Sign in sheets are the responsibility of faculty presenters. They need to ensure the Academic Senate Office receives the appropriate attendee sign in sheet for documentation purposes. Attendees are awarded credit based on the sign in sheets. The Chancellor's Office requires all District's participating in the Flex program to maintain hard copy documentation of FPD attendees. The Chancellor's Office requires programs include a plan, a contract, evaluation opportunities, and attendance records for all programmed events. In the event of an audit they can request to have access to all of these records. Faculty presenters who failed to submit the necessary attendance documentation will be closely monitored in the upcoming program year and if the problem persists the committee will deny any future proposal submissions. In efforts to not penalize faculty attendees, they were requested to provide some sort of attendance verification (i.e. request the faculty presenter or alternate attendee to vouch for their attendance). Having to request this from faculty attendees causes frustration on their parts and more work in the Senate Office. Faculty need to be aware of the importance of submitting the necessary attendee documentation. It is not required to create more work but is required for auditing purposes for the Chancellor's Office.

Another issue the committee has worked to resolve involves online CCC Confer events. It has been brought to the committee's attention that faculty are logging into online sessions and walking away from the computer. Mr. Greg Krynen, ITS Technical Trainer, reported this problem to the committee and has incorporated participation in online events (i.e. requesting thumbs up/down response, chat response, etc.) to ensure faculty are live on the other side of the computer. If a faculty fail to respond to session participation Mr. Krynen has noted on the attendance sheets that the faculty did not participate and is not awarded credit for the event. This is very frustrating for committee members to hear because this type of behavior would not be tolerated from a student in the classroom, yet the committee is forced to address these types of issues. In response to this issue, the committee has decided to revise the current online program evaluation worksheet, and require all faculty participating in online events to submit the supplemental evaluation worksheet with final contracts as verification of attendance and to be awarded credit.

In addition, the committee will also be requiring faculty to provide verification of attendance at conferences, workshops, and/or seminars. The committee can no longer accept the word of faculty that they attended the provided conference, workshops, and/or seminars. Again it is frustrating for the committee to have to include additional measures to ensure faculty are completing their obligation but over the past several years it has been brought to their attention that faculty are claiming hours for events they did not attend. The committee does not want to have to include additional verification requirements as faculty are stated professionals, and it adds to the workload of committee in processing contract paperwork. Faculty should be made aware that the new guidelines will include language indicating attendance verification is required for the 2011 – 2012 program year.

The 2011 – 2012 FPD Program Guidelines are being reviewed to include necessary revisions. Some of the revisions include verification of attendance to conferences, workshops, seminars, etc. In addition, faculty will be required to submit an online supplemental worksheet for any online event attended within the program year. Senators were encouraged to announce the changes in their divisions and remind constituent faculty to thoroughly review the revised 2011 – 2012 program guidelines. Any questions or concerns regarding the FPD Program should be addressed to Kathryn Mitchell via email at kmitchell18@avc.edu.

Mr. Christos Valiotis stated the FPD Committee and the Senate Office have become more of a police precinct in trying to make sure faculty are meeting their professional development obligations, and he is not comfortable with the current state of business. It is unclear how to resolve these issues but deems the role of the committee to institute policies and come up with ideas on how events will be useful educationally and instructionally, rather than trying to police the faculty that choose not to fulfill their contractual obligations.

c. **Program Review – Carol Eastin**
Ms. Carol Eastin reported this is the initial year which a Program Review (PR) Committee was established. The committee meets on a bimonthly basis to review annual report updates. In addition, the committee has thoroughly reviewed the rubric ACCJC uses to evaluate colleges in determining how well the District is addressing the issues ACCJC is requiring PR Reports to address. The rubric is an informational tool to coordinate PR Self Study Team Members and PR Peer Team Members to the same outcome. The committee has used the rubric to begin developing policies and procedures that prompt PR Self Study Team Members and Peer Team Members to speak to specific issues ACCJC are looking for in annual reports and Self Study Reports. The PR Procedures will be updated in the near future to reflect the necessary changes needed to speak to specific issues required by ACCJC.

Ms. Eastin indicated six of the eight areas/divisions/departments completed the required annual reports. The following areas/divisions/departments completed the required annual reporting process:
- Business, Computer Studies, and Economic Development
- EOPS (Extended Opportunity Programs and Services)
- Health Sciences / Child and Family Education / Child Development Center
- Social and Behavioral Sciences
- STAR (Student Transition and Retention)
- Technical Education

The following two areas/divisions/departments did not satisfactorily complete the required annual reporting process which was due in October 2010:
- Human Resources
- Student Development

The following comprehensive self-study report work continues. Five of the seven programs completed their self-study reports.

2010 – 2011 Self-Study Reports Received and Reviewed
- Financial Aid Office
- Palmdale Center

2010 – 2011 Self-Study Reports Received and in Peer Review
- Institutional Research and Planning
- Instructional Resources / Extended Services
- Physical Education and Athletics

2010 – 2011 Self-Study Reports Needed
- Enrollment Services
- Math, Science and Engineering

Ms. Eastin indicated she would like to obtain the Math, Science and Engineering Self-Study Report prior to the end of the semester but the time remaining in the semester does not facilitate ample time to formally review the report and turn it over to the Peer Review Team to start their work. Most faculty do not work over the summer months and the review process cannot be completed in such a short period of time. The Peer Review process for the Math, Science and Engineering Self-Study Report will not occur until the beginning of the fall 2011 semester.

The following seven areas/divisions/departments have undergone an orientation review for the upcoming PR cycle:

- Counseling
- Facilities Planning and Campus Development
- Information Technology Services
- Job Placement
- Language Arts
- Outreach / Information and Welcome Center
- Visual and Performing Arts

The Maintenance and Operations area will be oriented on June 6, 2011 and will complete the orientation process for the 2011 – 2012 Program Review cycle.

Dr. Susan Lowry inquired about summer Program Review work performed by faculty. Language Arts faculty are being directed to begin working on the Program Review process during the summer months. Is this a directive coming from Ms. Eastin or is this directive coming from the Dean? Ms. Eastin indicated the deadline to submit PR reports is October 31, 2011 to submit annual PR Reports and Self-Study Reports. There are faculty that choose to begin the process during the summer months to avoid having to work on this project the first two months of the fall semester. During PR Orientation meetings Ms. Eastin stresses all work performed for PR reports after July 1st can be claimed in St. #3 – College Governance and Conference for credit. Faculty can claim up to a maximum of 20 hours of credit in this standard and must account for their time working on PR. Program Review is moving into a cycle of annual evaluation of the various areas/ divisions/ departments by completing annual report updates or completing a comprehensive Self-Study. Many faculty will be eligible for credit due to working on PR.

Mr. Valiotis stated campus Program Review is going well and is another part of a change in culture being established at AVC. It is a new reality for the campus community and is not going away as it is a part of the Accreditation process.

d. **Tenure Review – Jennifer Gross**
Ms. Jennifer Gross reported all the third year Tenure reports have been submitted, processed, and faculty are meeting with their respective Vice Presidents. No recommendations were made for third year evaluees. All third year Tenure committees are expected to remain intact for the final year of evaluation. All fourth year committee work will be completed in December 2011. There will likely be a new hire in the discipline of Respiratory Therapy which will require a Senate Representative on the Tenure Evaluation Committee.

For the 2011 – 2012 academic year there will be one 1st year committee, no 2nd or 3rd year committees, and thirteen 4th year committees. At the end of December 2011 Ms. Gross indicated she will only be coordinating one Tenure Committee, which is significantly down from the 77 committees that were active when she began serving as the Tenure Evaluation Coordinator. A senator inquired how release time is awarded. Ms. Gross indicated release time is awarded on a sliding scale based on the total number of active committees.

The updated electronic peer input process utilizing Survey Monkey is much more user friendly and has been well received by faculty. Mr. Aeron Zetner, Research Technician, informed Ms. Gross that there were an unprecedented amount of peer input responses. He received and processed 590 responses from faculty. The large amount of responses was astounding and took two weeks to completely process. There weren't the frantic calls experienced with the previous electronic peer input process. Mr. Zetner indicated there were a few faculty inquiries as to why their names were not included in the Peer Evaluation list. Ms. Gross reported this issued occurred because the responsible party dropped the ball. The overall process worked very well but the astounding response generated a great deal of paperwork.

Ms. Gross indicated the next major project is to get the committees to reduce the amount of paper generated throughout the Tenure Evaluation process but have to work on creating a method where

confidentiality is maintained. An idea piloted with Ms. Sharon Lowry, Vice President of Academic Affairs, and Dr. Rosa Hall, Vice President of Student Services, was the creation of a restricted group among Ms. Gross and the two Vice Presidents to exchange confidential documents related to Tenure Evaluation. Creating a restrictive group would not jeopardize confidentiality issues and can be created for specific committee members to exchange specific Tenure Review Evaluation documents and forms.

Currently the expansion of the Tenure Review Coordinator job description is at a stand still. The Faculty Union has been in negotiations with the District for the 2011 – 2012 academic year. Ms. Gross stated she was unaware if the Tenure Review Coordinator job description expansion has been a topic of discussion during the negotiation process but all parties are in agreement on the necessity to expand the current job description to include coordinating Tenured and Adjunct Faculty Evaluations. The changes to the job description and duties require reevaluating the current release time based on the broadening of duties.

A Senator made an inquiry on what happens to peer reviews for Tenured Faculty. Ms. Gross stated it depends on which evaluation process the faculty selected (i.e. Peer, Self, or Administrative). Generally, for non-tenured faculty, the evaluations are provided to the person who chairs the committee which is usually the Dean, but not always the case. For Tenured Faculty if they are performing a Self Evaluation then the faculty would received the peer evaluation input. If the faculty selected a peer or administrative evaluation the selected peer faculty or administrator would receive the evaluation forms. Ms. Gross stated one of the main impetus to expand the job description for the Tenure Evaluation Coordinator is to streamline the Evaluation Process to ensure all campus constituencies are aware of the process and following the appropriate procedures. Tenured Faculty and Adjunct Faculty do not have a structured evaluation process as probationary faculty and the process needs to be made equitable for all faculty.

e. **Accreditation – Santi Tafarella**
   Mr. Santi Tafarella distributed a draft of the AVC Accreditation Steering Committee Mission Statement for review and input. He indicated the Steering Committee is discussing establishing a mission statement that accurately reflects the work charged to the committee. Mr. Tafarella attended an Accreditation Training opportunity in March 2011. During the training Dr. Barbara Beno, the President for the Accrediting Commission for California Community Colleges, emphasized the five major areas colleges should be working on to maintain Accreditation. These five areas are included in the drafted Accreditation Steering Committee Mission Statement. Senators were encouraged to review the drafted language and provide feedback to Mr. Santi Tafarella via email at stafarella@avc.edu.

   Mr. Tafarella reported the 2010 summer months were a very nervous time for AVC because we were trying to finalize the Accreditation Self Study Report. We came very close to not being able to pull the report together. The four hundred page report was ultimately approved by the Accreditation Commission but the district came very close to being in a great deal of trouble with having to pull the report together in such a short period of time. The Steering Committee has been discussing the need to keep the committee active during the off years rather than disbanding the committee until the next major Accreditation Self Study Report cycle. The idea of maintaining an active Steering Committee is in efforts to create a sustainability process where the approved Accreditation Self Study Report becomes a living document which is built upon year after year.

   One of the main reasons why the campus made it through the Accreditation process last summer is because of the broad institutional knowledge of Ms. Patricia Márquez. She was able to remember pertinent discussions occurring on campus at various meetings and requested the minutes to use as evidence of the discussions. She knows who and where to go to find the information needed to write and establish evidence for Accreditation purposes. The institutional knowledge of Ms. Márquez cannot be replicated by any future Accreditation Coordinator which is why Mr. Tafarella is recommending instituting a document repository for the campus such as google docs.

   One way to keep the Accreditation process sustainable is by instituting the use of google docs to annually capture the discussions occurring on campus regarding pertinent Accreditation issues (i.e.

SLOs, budgeting, planning, etc.). A Google doc is a searchable repository site which the campus can then use to acquire information needed for various reports. Mr. Tafarella reported he met with Mr. Greg Krynen, ITS Technical Trainer, to set up a District account in Google so that documents can be uploaded. The current Self Study Report will be uploaded to the site and anyone interested in searching specific information in the report can enter the key words and all documents or areas where the key word is found will become available for review. In uploading campus documents in a central repository will make the process technologically savvy and user friendly. This will also allow future Accreditation Team Member access to all the pertinent Accreditation documents in a central location. The ideal timeline will to have the google docs feature completely functional is in 2011 - 2012, which will require committee, division, discipline, and area meeting documented minutes or notes to be uploaded to the google docs site. Having all pertinent Accreditation documents in a central location will allow Accreditation Steering Committee Member access to performing searches on specific topics (i.e. SLOs) which they can then use to write the introductory paragraphs or summaries for Accreditation Standards. In addition, the documents can be easily linked as documented evidence used within the report. This is a new means to acquiring information in a central location and using the information to write future Accreditation Reports. The report writing process will then come together seamlessly.

One area of great concern is closing the loops of District processes. This is one of the major reasons why a coordinated SLO breakout session has been included in the Fall 2011 Welcome Back Day Program. Faculty will work in discipline specific groups to discuss the SLO process and document the discussion of the establishment of SLOs, results of assessment data, and whether corrective action revisions are necessary. All of this must be done to meet established Accreditation requirements. Formal minutes are not necessarily needed to document campus discussions but there has to be some sort of notes generated to provide an overview of the conversations occurring among discipline faculty.

Ms. Susan Knapp stated when instituting google docs it should be included in the Faculty Welcome Back Day General Session so all faculty are made aware of the transition and are provided the information prior to the semester starting. Mr. Justin Shores indicated a document repository already exists in WEAVE which faculty are also being requested to upload documents including SLO/PLO discussions. The campus can save time by instituting one document repository versus two. Mr. Tafarella indicated they are currently working on the details on how to implement the process and will work to minimize duplication.

Mr. Rick Balogh indicated Dragon Naturally Speaking Software is something that can be utilized to capture rough notes of conversations occurring relating to SLOs or Accreditation. The converted notes are very readable in a rough draft form. The only issue is that the software only recognizes one voice so all conversations occurring must be repeated by the primary user of the software. The conversation can then be uploaded into the computer and google document repository without having to format or correct meeting conversation. This would be a good way to capture conversations occurring across campus without the hassle of formatting and correcting the content.

Mr. Tafarella stated if the campus establishes and begins using technology as a main driving force to compile Accreditation Reports it will address an aspect of the Accreditation process by using technology more efficiently and effectively on campus as recommended.

6. **ACTION ITEM**
   None

7. **DISCUSSION ITEM**
   a. **Faculty Administrative Rights for Computers Draft (attachment)**
      Mr. Valiotis reported in October 2010 he announced the College Coordinating Council (CCC) requested the Distance Education and Computer Technology Committee (DECTC) to develop an Academic Computing Policy. Faculty Academic Computing Rights would allow faculty to download educational software to use in their courses has been a big issue for the past ten years. The CCC

agreed to charge the DECTC to draft a Faculty Administrative Rights Policy which would include faculty recommendations on what is needed for campus academic computing. There has been a great deal of discussion with the Information Technology Services (ITS) constituents and they aren't in agreement with some of the proposed recommendations. At this point, none of the verbal recommendations proposed to CCC regarding academic computing have been retracted but there is a need to finalize the process and complete the task with written recommendations to CCC. All the constituencies of the DECTC will not agree with the drafted policy but if the majority agrees the committee must move forward and present the recommendations for CCC to review and decide how to proceed. The CCC is one of the few groups on campus that have the authority to implement changes on campus.

Mr. Rick Balogh stated during the Accreditation Team Visit he spoke extensively with team member, Dr. Ian Walton, who is versed in Academic Computing Issues. Mr. Walton indicated the solution to the academic computing issues faculty experience at AVC is to incorporate a dedicated network server strictly for academic computing. This server would be separate from the college network server so security concerns can be alleviated since it would be a separate server from the main campus network server. The biggest issue discussed at DECTC meetings is security and not how to incorporate the academic computing freedom needed by faculty to facilitate courses. A dedicated server would allow faculty to have the autonomy to use educational software in courses as they deem necessary.

Dr. Lee Grishman inquired regarding the costs required to include a dedicated network for academic computing, and whether it would be more expensive than what the District currently incurs. Mr. Balogh indicated that it would be more expensive because of the additional personnel needed to manage the network. There are significant problems with trying to implement Academic Computing freedom with the current single network server. One of the main issues is the server is administered by ITS who do not place significance on instituting educational tools on the system as a priority.

Mr. Valiotis stated the issue of ITS not seeing Academic Computing as an important issue on campus has been a point of frustration for the past ten years and the cost to incorporate a separate Academic Computing network is really unknown. He doesn't believe a cost estimate was performed to determine the total costs but doesn't believe it would be as expensive as anticipated. There are ways of isolating sensitive data on campus. At the present time having a separate network dedicated to Academic Computing is a great recommendation. Mr. Valiotis inquired if there is anything we can recommend to gain Administrative Rights for Academic Computing under the current system?

Mr. Balogh suggested recommended including "education" in the IT Mission Statement so it reflects the importance of the educational component of computing. Currently, the IT Mission Statement does not include an "education component" or "faculty" therefore they don't recognize educational priorities as significant. The primary concern expressed at DECTC meetings have been the security of the network and not on the people using computers for educational purposes in a manner best suited for faculty and students.

Mr. Valiotis stated to preempt the restrictive ITS Computer Use Agreement Guidelines the Senate was prompted to take action on the Strata Recommendations. Faculty need to remember that the Strata Consultant Group was brought on to campus by the Board of Trustees. Faculty need to respond to the directive from CCC with documented recommendations in response to both the Strata Report and now the 2010 Self-Study Recommendations. Once the recommendations are submitted to CCC then it will be up to the council to determine how to proceed, but the burden of action would then be shifted to the hands of Administration and the Board of Trustees. Faculty will have completed their portion of the task by stating what is needed for Academic Computing. The drafted Faculty Administrative Rights Policy for Instructional Computing should be in an outline format indicating what is needed for faculty to perform academic computing (i.e. what kind of rights and access do faculty need so that they are not restricted in their educational endeavors.) The DECTC should not be concerned about how the policy will be carried out because that is the role of ITS. The DECTC needs to submit a drafted policy to the Academic Senate for ratification which will then be forwarded to CCC. It is

imperative to get this task completed as it will be easier to defend and justify proposed recommendations since both the Strata and 2010 Accreditation Self-Study Recommendations have cited Academic Computing needs should be addressed. It is very timely to create forward momentum on this issue.

Mr. Balogh indicated he would place this item on the next DECTC Agenda to discuss, finalize, and forward to the Senate for ratification.

b. **Academic Senate Accomplishments (attachment)**
Mr. Valiotis referred Senators to the attachment of the Academic Senate Accomplishments for review and input. He stated last year it was requested to move the finalization of Senate and Standing Senate Committee/Program Accomplishments to the beginning of the fall semester since there was still a significant amount of work being performed over the summer months. There was a great deal of uncertainty with the budget and given these issues he recommended delaying the year end reports. The Senate year end reporting will revert back to being completed at the end of the spring semesters. The attachment of the Academic Senate Accomplishments includes Senate Executive and Senate accomplishments. It addition, it includes some items that were completed by Senate Standing Committees or Programs. The Faculty Leaders will submit individual year end reports and are in the process of completing the task. Upon completion, Gloria will compile and forward them to the Board as an informational item. Senators were encouraged to provide feedback on the Senate Accomplishments if they see any changes or revisions are needed.

8. **SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
   a. **Announcements**
      - 2011 Faculty Leadership Institute – June 16-18, 2011 - Monterey, CA (TBC)
      - 2011 Student Learning Outcomes Institute – July 13, 2011 - San Diego, CA
      - 2011 Curriculum Institute – July 14-16, 2011 - San Diego, CA

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the May 19, 2011 Academic Senate Meeting at 4:43 p.m. Motion carried.

MEMBERS PRESENT			
Paul Ahad	Kathy Moore	Sandra Robinson	John Toth
Ron Chapman	Mike Pesses	Alex Schroer	Christos Valiotis
Lee Grishman (proxy)	Berkeley Price	Ken Shafer	Larry Veres
Glenn Haller	Harish Rao	Justin Shores	
Jack Halliday	Terry Rezek	Susan Snyder (proxy)	
Susan Knapp	Van Rider	Elizabeth Sundberg	

MEMBERS ABSENT		GUEST PRESENT	
Enrique Camacho	Mike Hancock	Carol Eastin	Kathryn Mitchell
Mark Covert	Casey Scudmore	Jennifer Gross	Melanie Parker
Luis Echeverria		Susan Lowry	Santi Tafarella

Annual Accomplishments
August 7th, 2010- June 3rd, 2011

In this report we present the AVC Academic Senate accomplishments for the period starting in August 6th of 2010 and ending with the spring semester of 2011. This deviates from the usual reporting period of June to June since the senate reported on the summer 2010 activities in last years' report. From this year on we return to our regular reporting period. The major accomplishment for this year was the submission of the Accreditation Self Study and the preparation for the accreditation visit. While this was a college-wide responsibility the senate played a major part before and during the visit. As everyone knows the visit went extremely well, which was reflected on the commission's final report. Under the leadership of Ms. Marquez and Ms. Lowry and with the assistance of everyone on campus, AVC's accreditation was reaffirmed with a few minor recommendations. Special thanks goes to Santi Tafarella, and Gloria Kastner that provided editing and administrative support. We continued to work collegially with the administration by participating in the MAC and CC meetings and we established a closer connection with the faculty union by attending the union leadership meetings and inviting union leaders to confer with the senate exec when needed.

As usual, we monitor the implementation of the established procedures such as Equivalency, Hiring, Tenure and Evaluation, and Program Review.

Summary:

1. Updated and Disseminated the Faculty Handbook.

2. Updated and Disseminated the Academic Senate Operating Procedures Handbook.

3. Revised Program Review cycle until 2016.

4. Continued to implement Program Review for non-instructional areas.

5. Completed the GED program evaluation for determination of the program's fiscal viability. The senate president, the program's faculty and the Institutional Research office worked in analyzing fiscal and enrollment data. The final review took place in the Fall of 2011 and the senate body decided to recommend that GED be eliminated as an AVC program because most of it's courses are already offered through our basic skills program.

6. Refined and almost finalized the review for the expansion of the duties of the Tenure and Evaluation Coordinator to include the responsibility for evaluation of tenured full time as well as adjunct faculty. It is now under negotiations.

7. The senate president, with the help of the executive committee, co-chaired all SPBC and SPBC finance and budget sub-committee meetings throughout the academic year.

8. The senate president and others from the executive committee, participated in all College Coordinating Council meetings (held once and sometimes twice a month).

9. The senate president co-chaired all Mutual Agreement Council meetings held monthly throughout the year.

10. Christos Valiotis actively participated in the development of AVC's WEAVE SLO database and led numerous faculty training sessions.

11. Held the Senate Executive and Leadership Retreat on August 27, 2010 and May 27st 2011.

12. Held the new senator orientation meeting on August 27^{h} 2010.

13. Assisted in the adjunct instructor orientation workshop on August 17th 2010.

14. Worked with local high schools to implement the PAWS program and develop the S-MAP pre-college math preparation and assessment program.

15. Selected Suzanne Malek as the 2010-2011 AVC Outstanding Adjunct Award recipient.

16. Selected Dr. Matthew Jaffe as the 2010-2011 AVC Scholar in Residence Award recipient.

17. Hosted the annual Faculty Recognition Day on May 18th, 2011.

18. Christos Valiotis attended Fall 2010 Area C Statewide Academic Senate meeting, and Fall 2010 state academic senate plenary meeting.

19. The AP&P committee approved two transfer degrees in Communications and Math in compliance with the SB 1440.

20. Christos Valiotis worked with the state academic senate foundation to identify possible grant opportunities for the state senate office.

21. Senate Leadership Elect Positions for 2011-2012;

    a. Senate: Maria Clinton
    b. AP&P: Linda Harmon
    c. DETC: Nancy Bednar
    d. Honors: John Vento
    e. SLO: Freddy Aviles

22. Approved Jennifer Gross for another three year term as Tenure Review Coordinator (2011-2014).

23. Academic Senate Executive 2010-2011: Christos Valiotis, Academic Senate President; John Toth, First-Vice President; Jack Halliday, Second-Vice President; Susan Knapp, Officer-At-Large.

24. Academic Senate Executive 2011-2012: Christos Valiotis, Academic Senate President; John Toth, First-Vice President; Ty Metler, Second-Vice President; Jack Halliday, Officer-At-Large.